Published by the International Labour Office, Geneva (Switzerland)
Printed by "La Tribune de Genève"
CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ................................................. VI

FIRST PART : LIST OF MEMBERS OF DELEGATIONS, ETC.

Delegations ................................................. XIX
Observers ................................................... XLV
Representatives of the United Nations, Specialised Agencies and Other Official
International Organisations ................................. XLVI
Representatives of Non-Governmental International Organisations .............. XLVII
Registered Observers of Non-Governmental Organisations ......................... XLIX
Secretariat of Delegations .................................... XLI
Officers of the Conference .................................... LI
Officers of the Groups ........................................ LII
Chairman of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office ............ LII
Secretariat of the Conference ................................ LIII
Selection Committee ......................................... LVI
Credentials Committee ....................................... LVI
Standing Orders Committee ................................... LVII
Finance Committee of Government Representatives ............................... LVIII
Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations .......... LVIII
Committee on Guarding of Machinery ................................ LX
Committee on Termination of Employment .................................... LXI
Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices ................................... LXIII
Committee on Social Security .................................. LXV
Drafting Committee .......................................... LXVII

SECOND PART : VERBATIM REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

1st Sitting : Opening of the Session; Tribute to the late Pope John XXIII;
Opening of the Session (concl.); Election of the President; Presidential address .......................... 3
2nd Sitting : Election of the Vice-Presidents; Appointment and composition of
the Selection Committee; Nomination of the officers of the groups .................. 10
3rd Sitting : First report of the Selection Committee: Submission and adoption;
Second report of the Selection Committee: Submission and adoption .......... 12
4th Sitting : Appeals concerning composition of committees; Time limit for
speeches; Report of the Director-General: Discussion .............................. 14
5th Sitting : Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.); Ratification of
the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation Instrument of
Amendment, 1962, by Albania, Argentina, Luxembourg and Poland ............. 35
6th Sitting : Third report of the Selection Committee: Submission and adoption;
Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................. 55
7th Sitting : Communication of the report of the Appeals Board; Fourth report
of the Selection Committee: Submission and adoption; Report of the
Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 77
8th Sitting : Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) ................... 97
9th Sitting : Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) ................... 117
Contents

10th Sitting: Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.); Point of order: Question of the participation of the delegation of the Republic of South Africa in the Conference; Motion to adjourn the sitting .................................................. 134

11th Sitting: Communication to the Conference of the results of the elections to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office; Fifth report of the Selection Committee: Submission and adoption; Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.); Point of order: Question of the participation of the delegation of the Republic of South Africa in the Conference; Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 142

12th Sitting: Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.); Ratification of Conventions by Colombia and the Central African Republic .................................................. 151

13th Sitting: Congratulations to the Soviet Cosmonauts; Point of order: Question of the participation of the delegation of the Republic of South Africa in the Conference and resignation of the President of the Conference; Election of a new President of the Conference; Point of order: Request for prior discussion of resolutions moved under the urgency procedure .................................................. 167

14th Sitting: Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.); Sixth and seventh reports of the Selection Committee: Submission and adoption; Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 191

15th Sitting: Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 211

16th Sitting: Point of order: Proposal to adjourn the 47th Session of the Conference; Eighth report of the Selection Committee: Submission; Motion to adjourn the sitting; Eighth report of the Selection Committee: Adoption; Order of work of the Conference; Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 230

17th Sitting: Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.); Report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives: Motion to postpone consideration of the question; Report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives (concl.): Discussion and adoption; Record vote on the resolution concerning the adoption of the budget for the 46th Financial Period (1964) and the allocation of expenses among member States for 1964; Statement of the position of the Government of India in regard to the participation in the Conference of the delegation of the Republic of South Africa; Point of order: Request for clarification on the procedure followed in the taking of a record vote; Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 239

18th Sitting: Statement by the President of the Conference regarding resolutions moved under the urgency procedure; First and second reports of the Credentials Committee: Submission and noting; Third report of the Credentials Committee: Submission, discussion and noting .................................................. 257

19th Sitting: Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 274

20th Sitting: Ninth report of the Selection Committee: Submission, discussion and adoption; Report of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery: Submission, discussion and adoption; Proposed Convention concerning the guarding of machinery, Submitted by the Committee on Guarding of Machinery: Adoption; Proposed Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery, Submitted by the Committee on Guarding of Machinery: Adoption; Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 304

21st Sitting: Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.); Statement of the position of the Government of Jamaica in regard to the participation in the Conference of the delegation of the Republic of South Africa .................................................. 323

22nd Sitting: Report of the Standing Orders Committee: Submission, discussion and adoption; Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.) .................................................. 342

23rd Sitting: Report of the Committee on Termination of Employment: Submission, discussion and adoption; Proposed Recommendation concerning termination of employment at the initiative of the employer, Submitted by the Committee on Termination of Employment: Adoption; Report of the Director-General: Discussion (concl.): Statement concerning the validity of the calculation of the quorum .................................................. 363

24th Sitting: Communication to the Conference of the results of the elections to the Asian Advisory Committee; Tenth report of the Selection Committee: Submission and adoption; Report of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices: Submission, discussion and adoption; Proposed Conclusions Submitted by the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices: Adoption;
Resolution concerning the placing on the agenda of the next Ordinary Session of the Conference of the question of hygiene in commerce and offices, Submitted by the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices: Adoption; Final record vote on the Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery; Report of the Committee on Social Security: Submission and discussion. 393

25th Sitting: Statement by the President of the Conference regarding resolutions moved under the urgency procedure; Report of the Committee on Social Security: Discussion (concl.) and adoption; Proposed Conclusions with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a supplementary Recommendation, Submitted by the Committee on Social Security: Adoption; Resolution concerning prevention of industrial accidents and occupational diseases, Submitted by the Committee on Social Security: Adoption; Resolution concerning the placing on the agenda of the next Ordinary Session of the Conference of the question of benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases, Submitted by the Committee on Social Security: Adoption; Final report of the Credentials Committee: Submission and noting; Report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations: Submission and discussion. 412

26th Sitting: Report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations: Discussion (concl.) and adoption; Final record vote on the Recommendation concerning termination of employment at the initiative of the employer; Reply of the Director-General to the discussion of his Report. 429

27th Sitting: Closing speeches. 445

THIRD PART: APPENDICES

Appendix I: Reports of the Selection Committee. 453
Appendix II: Credentials. 466
Appendix III: Standing Orders Questions. 478
Appendix IV: Second item on the agenda: Financial and budgetary questions. 482
Appendix V: Third item on the agenda: Information and reports on the application of Conventions and Recommendations. 512
Appendix VI: Fourth item on the agenda: Prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery. 566
Appendix VII: Fifth item on the agenda: Termination of employment at the initiative of the employer. 578
Appendix VIII: Sixth item on the agenda: Hygiene in shops and offices. 592
Appendix IX: Seventh item on the agenda: Benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases. 613
Appendix X: Election of the members of the Governing Body. 630
Appendix XI: Communications to the Conference. 633
Appendix XII: Miscellaneous decisions of the Conference. 637
Appendix XIII: Resolutions adopted by the Conference. 638
Appendix XIV: Convention and Recommendations adopted by the Conference: Authentic texts. 642

INDEX TO SECOND AND THIRD PARTS. 669
INTRODUCTION

The Forty-seventh Session of the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation was held at Geneva from 5 to 26 June 1963.

The following letter and memorandum concerning the session and communicating the agenda were sent by the Director-General of the International Labour Office on 15 September 1962 to all States which were Members of the I.L.O. at that time, and subsequently to the following States which became Members on the dates indicated: Rwanda, 18 September 1962; Algeria, 19 October 1962; Jamaica, 26 December 1962; Burundi, 11 March 1963; Uganda, 27 March 1963.

Sir,

I have the honour to communicate to you the agenda of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference, together with information concerning the date, place and organisation of the session.

1. Agenda of the Conference.

The agenda of the Conference, as determined by the Governing Body at its 150th Session (Geneva, November 1961), and by the International Labour Conference at its 46th Session (Geneva, June 1962), is as follows:

I. Report of the Director-General.
II. Financial and budgetary questions.
III. Information and reports on the application of Conventions and Recommendations.
IV. Prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery (second discussion).
V. Termination of employment at the initiative of the employer (second discussion).
VI. Hygiene in shops and offices.
VII. Benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases.

I enclose, for your information, a memorandum prepared in the light of the discussions in the Governing Body and at the International Labour Conference, which explains the scope of the items on the agenda and the procedure which the Conference will follow in dealing with them.

As I informed the Conference at its 46th Session in replying to the debate on my Report, I intend to devote my Report to the 47th Session to a broad review of the major programme questions which call for attention by the International Labour Organisation and to various questions of structure and procedures, for the purpose of enabling the Conference, in the general discussion, to consider any needs for adapting the Organisation and its programmes to changing world conditions. The Report will try to focus attention on essentials and will have two main aspects. The first part will attempt an assessment of the major labour and social problems towards the solution of which the I.L.O. should concentrate its efforts in the years ahead, with suggestions for programme development in these fields; the Report will describe these problems against the background of world conditions, including the relationships between social measures and economic policy, and the impact upon social policy of other claims for resources, and will also try to assess the position in respect of the needs for I.L.O. action region by region. The second part of the Report will discuss a number of structural and procedural questions raised in recent years. I intend to submit proposals for consideration of the Conference on many of the questions covered in my Report.

It will be recalled that in the course of my reply to the discussion on my Report to the last session of the Conference, I addressed an appeal to members of the Conference that there should be a one-year moratorium on the submission of resolutions relating to matters not included in the agenda of the Conference. Having regard to the matters with which I propose to deal in my Report to the 47th Session, it may be expected that the discussion on this Report will cover the whole range of I.L.O. action, and it might be unwise to upset the balance by giving prominence to a few aspects only for the reason that they were the subject of resolutions.
I accordingly venture to reiterate my appeal that, for the 1963 session of the Conference only, there should be a one-year moratorium on resolutions and should be most grateful if you would bring it to the particular attention of your country's Government, Employers' and Workers' delegates to the 47th Session of the Conference.

Every effort will be made to ensure that the documents submitted to the Conference are communicated to you well in advance of the opening of the session. In this connection, I venture to remind you that the timely preparation by the Office of the final reports for submission to the Conference depends essentially on the punctual communication by governments, by the dates stipulated, of their replies to and observations on the questionnaires and preliminary reports which are addressed to them.

It will be appreciated that the smooth working of the Conference depends on the delegates having an opportunity to study beforehand the documents prepared by the International Labour Office on which the discussions are based. The attention of your Government is therefore drawn to the importance of ensuring that the reports sent to it on the various items on the agenda are in the hands of delegates well in advance of the session.

2. Place and Date of the Session.

At its 150th Session (Geneva, November 1961), the Governing Body decided that the 47th Session of the Conference should be held in Geneva, at the Palais des Nations, and should open on Wednesday, 5 June 1963. The Conference is expected to continue until about 27 June. The dates of 3 and 4 June are left free for such meetings of the Government, Employers' and Workers' groups as may be necessary. The opening sitting of the Conference will be held at the Palais des Nations on Wednesday, 5 June 1963, at 10 a.m.

3. Composition and Attendance of Delegations.¹

In addition to notes on the items on the agenda, the enclosed memorandum contains information relating to the composition of delegations. Your attention is drawn particularly to the importance of constituting delegations on a tripartite basis, appointed in conformity with the provisions of article 3 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation.

Certain important considerations which the Credentials Committee of the 46th Session of the Conference desired should be brought to the attention of governments in this regard are set out in the memorandum.

For the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference, each delegate to the Conference may, in accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, be accompanied by two advisers for each of the following five items: III, IV, V, VI and VII. In order to make possible an equal representation of Employers and Workers on the committees set up by the Conference, it is desirable that, so far as possible, equal numbers of Employers' and Workers' advisers should be appointed in each delegation.

As noted in the memorandum, the regular application of the principle that as a general rule the sittings of the committees shall not take place at the same time as the plenary sittings of the Conference has proved impracticable in recent years as the result of the growth in the volume of business coming before the Conference. The Governing Body recognised this with regret at its 148th Session (Geneva, March 1961) and stressed the importance of delegations being so equipped as to enable plenary sittings and sittings of committees to be held without interference with each other's work when such simultaneity could not be avoided. Your Government is therefore requested to give consideration when composing its delegation to the importance of making arrangements for representation at the plenary sittings when such sittings are held simultaneously with the sittings of committees.

At its 123rd Session (Geneva, November 1953), the Governing Body of the International Labour Office instructed me to invite the governments concerned to explore, in consultation with the most representative organisations of employers and workpeople, and in such manner as appeared to them appropriate, methods of developing in practice the powers already existing under article 3 (3) of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation enabling member States to appoint, in appropriate circumstances, additional advisers from non-self-governing territories to each of their delegations. Article 3 (3) of the Constitution provides as follows:

Each Member which is responsible for the international relations of non-self-governing territories may appoint as additional advisers to each of its delegates:

(a) persons nominated by it as representatives of any such territory in regard to matters concerning the self-governing powers of that territory;

(b) persons nominated by it to advise its delegates in regard to any matters concerning non-self-governing territories.

I may also remind you that, at its 124th Session (Geneva, March 1954), the Governing Body agreed that, on the recommendation of the responsible member State, where the latter considers that this would be appropriate having regard to the constitutional, political, economic and social development of any non-self-governing territory for which that member State is responsible, such non-self-governing territory may be invited, through the member State

¹ The third, fourth and fifth paragraphs of point 3, which relate to non-self-governing territories, appear in the letter sent to the Governments of the following member States only: Australia, Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, the Republic of South Africa, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States.
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concerned, to participate by means of a tripartite observer delegation in sessions of the General Conference, with the rights and status accorded to observers under the present Standing Orders of the Conference.

I venture to express the hope that you will arrange to appoint your delegation sufficiently in advance so as to enable the delegates and technical advisers to prepare themselves properly for the work of the Conference.

In order to facilitate the organisation of the work of the Conference, it is essential that I should be informed of the composition of delegations at the earliest possible moment. I shall therefore be most grateful for any steps you may be good enough to take to ensure that the composition of your country’s delegation to the Conference is communicated to me as early as possible, and in any case not later than 15 days before the opening of the Conference.

The Governing Body at its 144th Session (Geneva, March 1960) stressed the importance it attaches to the fullest use being made of the opening days of the Conference. With this end in view, the Governing Body has asked me to request governments to notify delegates on their appointment that acceptance of the appointment implies an obligation to be available in Geneva for the work of the Conference, personally or through an adviser authorised to act as substitute, not later than the opening of business on the morning preceding the opening of the Conference and until the close of the Conference. In this connection, I venture to draw your attention to the fact that important votes, i.e. the final votes on the adoption of international labour Conventions and/or Recommendations, frequently take place on the last day of the Conference. It is essential that delegates or their duly authorised substitutes should be present when such votes are taken; they should accordingly make arrangements to be available until the very end of the Conference. I shall be most grateful for your co-operation in this matter and for any steps you may be good enough to take to ensure that the attention of the delegates from your country to the forthcoming session of the Conference is drawn to the obligation referred to above.

As mentioned above, the 47th Session of the Conference is scheduled to open at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, 5 June 1963; delegates or their duly authorised substitutes should therefore be present in Geneva as from the morning of Tuesday, 4 June and should be available in Geneva until the evening of Thursday, 27 June, when it is expected that the Conference will have completed its work.


It may be assumed that the discussion of the Director-General’s Report will begin, as it has done at recent sessions of the Conference, on the first Friday of the session. In order to ensure the smooth working of the Conference, it is most desirable that a number of speakers should be prepared to speak on that day, namely on Friday, 7 June 1963. I should therefore be much obliged if the attention of delegates could be drawn to this fact.

5. Election of Members of the Governing Body and Reconstitution of the Asian Advisory Committee and the African Advisory Committee.

In accordance with article 7, paragraph 5, of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, the period of office of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office expires during the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. Elections will therefore be held to select the Governments which have elective seats and the Employers’ and Workers’ representatives on the Governing Body.

In accordance with the decisions taken by the Governing Body at its 112th Session (Geneva, June 1950) concerning the establishment of the Asian Advisory Committee, this Committee will be reconstituted at the time of the elections to the Governing Body.

In accordance with the decisions taken by the Governing Body at its 149th Session (Geneva, June 1961) concerning the reconstitution of the African Advisory Committee, the elections for membership of the Committee will be held during the sessions of the Conference at which the elections for membership of the Governing Body are held.

6. Accommodation for Delegations in Geneva.1

I have the honour to be, etc.,

(Signed) DAVID A. MORSE,
Director-General.

MEMORANDUM ON THE 47th SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE
(1963)

A. DATE, PLACE AND AGENDA OF THE CONFERENCE

At its 150th Session (November 1961) the Governing Body decided that the 47th Session of the Conference should be held in Geneva and should open on Wednesday, 5 June 1963.

The agenda of the Conference at present consists of the following items:

I. Report of the Director-General.

1 Not reproduced here.
II. Financial and budgetary questions.
III. Information and reports on the application of Conventions and Recommendations.
IV. Prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery (second discussion).
V. Termination of employment at the initiative of the employer (second discussion).
VI. Hygiene in shops and offices.
VII. Benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases.

B. INFORMATION ON ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

I. Report of the Director-General.

In accordance with the Standing Orders of the Conference a Report by the Director-General of the International Labour Office will be submitted to the Conference. In his reply to the discussion on his Report to the 46th (1962) Session of the Conference the Director-General dealt particularly with the main needs for I.L.O. programme development and with the adaptation of I.L.O. machinery and procedures to changing world conditions. He said: "I intend next year to make my Report to the Conference bear upon these broad questions about the adequacy of I.L.O. programmes, the adjustment of the Organisation to a changing world. I ask you, in the meanwhile, to think about these matters seriously and be prepared next year to engage in a new, in a fresh dialogue. I think a full test of opinion on basic issues of programme and structure—fuller than we have ever yet had—would show more clearly what new steps are useful and practicable, and what could best serve the interests and objectives of our Organisation."

To serve the purposes outlined above the Report will have two main aspects: (1) assessment of the major labour and social problems towards the solution of which the I.L.O. should concentrate its efforts in the years ahead, with suggestions for programme development in these fields; (2) consideration of structural and procedural changes in the Organisation with a view to the more effective formulation and carrying out of I.L.O. programmes.

The Report will not attempt to cover every single aspect of the I.L.O.'s work but will try to focus attention on essentials. The Director-General intends to submit proposals for consideration by the Conference on many of the questions covered.

As regards the first aspect—needs for programme development—the first part of the Report will describe the major problems calling for I.L.O. action against a background of world conditions, including the relationships between social measures and economic policy, and the impact upon social policy of other claims for resources. The questions dealt with will include the points made in the Director-General's reply to the discussion of his Report at the 46th Session (1962): development of skills required in the labour force; strengthening of trade unions and devising of sound industrial relations systems; raising productivity and improving incomes and conditions in small industries and rural occupations; and social implications of technological change. Other problems will also call for special attention, such as the I.L.O.'s concern with human rights, employment, wages or incomes policy, and the principal current problems in regard to working conditions.

While concentrating upon a limited number of important problems, this part of the Report will at the same time attempt to assess the needs for I.L.O. action region by region. The second part of the Report—structural problems in the I.L.O.—will discuss a number of questions raised in recent years, such as the following:

— the future role of the International Labour Conference, as regards the type of questions which should come before the Conference for discussion and its function in relation to programme development in all spheres of I.L.O. action;
— various questions relating to the organisation of the Conference, including arrangements for committee work, procedure for verification of credentials, resolutions procedure, and periodicity of the sessions of the Conference;
— the need for review of existing Conventions and Recommendations in the light of changes in conditions since they were adopted, with a view to making them fully pertinent to current conditions and facilitating their application;
— review of the work of Industrial and analogous Committees and consideration of future needs for this type of work;
— regional arrangements required for I.L.O. action;
— the place of the I.L.O. within the United Nations system and in relation to forms of regional action of concern to the I.L.O. outside the United Nations system.

In view of the subject of this Report, the Director-General considers that it will be unnecessary to prepare the separate account of I.L.O. activities which has been presented in recent years.

It may be assumed that the discussion of the Director-General's Report will begin, as it has done at recent sessions of the Conference, on the first Friday of the session. In order to ensure the smooth working of the Conference, it is most desirable that a number of speakers should be prepared to speak on that day, namely Friday, 7 June 1963. Governments may therefore wish to draw the attention of delegates to this point.
II. Financial and Budgetary Questions.

The Conference will be called upon to consider and approve the budget of the International Labour Organisation for 1964 and to deal with any other financial matters that may be brought to its attention in accordance with the Financial Regulations.

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

Article 23 of the Constitution provides that the Director-General shall lay before the Conference a summary of the information and reports communicated to him by governments, in pursuance of articles 19 and 22 of the Constitution, on the measures taken to bring the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the Conference before the competent national authorities and to give effect to the Conventions which they have ratified, and on the position in their respective countries with regard to the subject-matter of Conventions which they have not ratified and of Recommendations. Articles 22 and 35 provide that governments which have ratified Conventions shall supply the Director-General of the International Labour Office with information and reports concerning the application of such Conventions in non-metropolitan territories. The Conference at its 47th Session will have to consider the information and reports supplied by governments in pursuance of the above-mentioned articles of the Constitution, together with the report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. The reports to be supplied this year under article 19 of the Constitution in respect of certain non-ratified Conventions and certain Recommendations will deal with the Convention and the Recommendation concerning discrimination in respect of employment and occupation, adopted in 1958.

IV. Prohibition of the Sale, Hire and Use of Inadequately Guarded Machinery (second discussion).

The first discussion on this subject took place at the 46th Session. By a resolution adopted on 27 June 1962 the Conference approved the report of the Committee appointed to consider this item and, in particular, approved as general Conclusions, with a view to the consultation of governments, proposals for a Convention and a Recommendation relating to prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery. The Conference decided to place the above-mentioned item on the agenda of its next Ordinary Session for a second discussion, with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a Recommendation.

Pursuant to this decision, and in accordance with article 39, paragraph 6, of the Conference Standing Orders of the Conference, the Office has communicated to governments the texts of a proposed Convention and a proposed Recommendation asking for their observations or amendments, if any (International Labour Conference, 47th Session, 1963, Report V (1): Prohibition of the Sale, Hire and Use of Inadequately Guarded Machinery (Geneva, I.L.O., 1962)). In the light of the replies received, a final report will be prepared containing the proposed Convention and proposed Recommendation, including any amendments, as a basis for discussion at the 47th Session.

V. Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer (second discussion).

A first discussion on this item in a slightly different wording (termination of employment (dismissal and lay-off)) took place at the 46th Session. By a resolution adopted on 27 June 1962 the Conference adopted the report of the Committee appointed to consider this item and in particular approved as general Conclusions, with a view to the consultation of governments, proposals for a Recommendation relating to termination of employment at the initiative of the employer. The Conference decided to place the above-mentioned question for a second discussion, with a view to the adoption of a Recommendation.

Pursuant to this decision, and in accordance with article 39, paragraph 6, of the Conference Standing Orders, the Office has communicated to governments the text of a proposed Recommendation, asking for their observations or amendments, if any (International Labour Conference, 47th Session, 1963, Report V (1): Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer (Geneva, I.L.O., 1962)). In the light of the replies received a final report will be prepared containing the proposed Recommendation, including any amendments, as a basis for discussion at the 47th Session.

VI. Hygiene in Shops and Offices.

Conditions of workers in shops and offices are a matter of increasing importance as larger and larger numbers of the work-force are engaged in these activities. The growth of this sector of employment is one of the striking characteristics of manpower distribution during the past few decades, not only in industrialised but also in developing countries.

Specific action by the I.L.O. as regards hygiene in shops and offices has been repeatedly requested by the parties concerned, through different bodies of the Organisation. As far back as 1935 the I.L.O. Correspondence Committee on Industrial Hygiene stressed the necessity for providing for adequate protection in connection with the occupational hygiene of office employees. In 1952 the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, at its second session, adopted resolutions on standards for hygiene in shops and offices, on
forms of action for improving such hygiene and on technical information and assistance in this field. Moreover, the Committee also unanimously requested the Governing Body to consider the above-mentioned resolutions with a view to the establishment of an international labour Recommendation on the subject. The Conclusions of the Committee on Non-Manual Workers at the 43rd Session of the Conference (1959) included the unanimous recommendation that “the Governing Body should consider placing the subject of hygiene in shops and offices on the agenda of an early session of the Conference with a view to the adoption of international standards on this subject”. Finally, the Advisory Committee, at its fifth session (Cologne, 1959) adopted unanimously a resolution inviting the Governing Body to consider the above suggestion of the Conference at the earliest possible moment.

This subject was considered by the Governing Body at its 147th Session for inclusion in the agenda of the 48th (1962) Session of the Conference, but was rejected in favour of other questions. At its 150th Session (November 1961), however, the Governing Body decided to place on the agenda of the 47th Session of the Conference an item entitled “Hygiene in Shops and Offices”.

The subject will be dealt with under the double-discussion procedure provided for in article 39 of the Standing Orders of the Conference. The Office has accordingly prepared and sent to governments a preliminary report (International Labour Conference, 47th Session, 1963, Report VI (1): Hygiene in Shops and Offices (Geneva, I.L.O., 1962)).

After a first chapter on the desirability of contemplating the adoption of international standards, the report gives a general review of national legislation followed by an analysis of national law and practice, by subject. A questionnaire is appended to the report; it includes one question inviting Members to indicate any particularities of national law and practice concerning the subject under discussion which, in their view, are liable to create difficulties in the implementation of an international instrument as conceived in the report, and to make specific suggestions as to how these difficulties may be met.

This report will be followed by a second one based on the replies of governments to the questionnaire, and indicating the main points to be considered by the Conference. Both reports will serve as a basis for discussion at the 47th Session.

VII. Benefits in the Case of Industrial Accidents and Occupational Diseases.

At its 134th Session (March 1957) the Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, instructed the Director-General to communicate to the Conference periodical reports on the working of certain Conventions in the field of social security adopted by the International Labour Conference during the period from 1925 to 1935.

Upon the further recommendation of the same Committee the Governing Body subsequently decided, at its 140th Session (November 1958), to call a meeting of the Committee of Social Security Experts and to place on its agenda the review and possible revision of several of the Conventions under reference. This action was based on the opinion repeatedly voiced within the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations that modern developments in the field of social security were rendering these pre-war instruments obsolete—a circumstance which might possibly have kept some member States from ratifying them.

The Committee of Social Security Experts considered the pre-war Conventions from every angle, including the extent and spread of their ratification and application and the difficulties encountered by ratifying States in complying with their provisions after amending their own systems in line with newer social security concepts.

With particular reference to the Workmen’s Compensation (Agriculture) Convention, 1921 (No. 12), and the Workmen’s Compensation (Accidents) Convention, 1925 (No. 17), the Committee deemed it advisable to continue to have a special international instrument or instruments (outside of the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102)), albeit “substantially altered to meet existing conditions”, to guide and encourage developing countries where employment injury schemes are “frequently the first social security measure to be put into operation”.

With reference to the occupational diseases Conventions, particularly the revised Convention (No. 47), the Committee felt that “the standards of compensation for occupational diseases should form part of a general instrument dealing with the compensation of occupational risks”. Thus the new instrument or instruments should cover both “benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases”.

At its 150th Session (November 1961) the Governing Body of the International Labour Office decided to place on the agenda of the 47th (1963) Session of the International Labour Conference the item “Benefits in the Case of Industrial Accidents and Occupational Diseases”.

The subject is to be considered under the double-discussion procedure provided for in article 39 of the Standing Orders of the Conference. The Office has accordingly prepared and sent to governments a preliminary report (International Labour Conference, 47th Session, 1963, Report VII (1): Benefits in the Case of Industrial Accidents and Occupational Diseases (Geneva, I.L.O., 1962)).

The report relates in summary form the background and some of the antecedents of the Governing Body’s action; it describes the relevant law and practice in a representative number of member States and includes a questionnaire. Governments are requested to reply to this
questionnaire and to give reasons for their particular replies. One of the questions invites governments to indicate any particularities of national law and practice liable to create difficulties in the implementation of an international instrument as conceived in the report.

On the basis of the governments' replies the Office will prepare a second report indicating the principal points which require consideration by the Conference. Both reports will serve as a basis for discussion at the 47th Session.

C. COMMUNICATION OF DOCUMENTS PREPARED FOR THE CONFERENCE

Every effort will be made to ensure that the documents submitted to the Conference are communicated to member States well in advance of the opening of the session. It will be appreciated that the smooth working of the Conference depends on the delegates' having the opportunity to study beforehand the documents prepared by the International Labour Office on which the discussions are based. The attention of governments is therefore drawn to the importance of ensuring that the reports sent to them on the various items on the agenda are in the hands of delegates well in advance of the session.

D. COMPOSITION OF DELEGATIONS

Article 3, paragraph 1, of the Constitution of the Organisation provides that each delegation to a session of the International Labour Conference shall be composed of four delegates, namely two Government delegates, one delegate representing the employers and one delegate representing the workers.

In accordance with the provisions of article 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, each delegate may be accompanied by not more than two advisers for each separate item placed on the agenda. Each of the last four items mentioned in section A of this memorandum forms a separate item placed on the agenda of the session. Moreover, as on the occasion of all previous sessions since 1945, the item "Information and Reports on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations" will be considered as a separate item within the meaning of the above-mentioned paragraph 2 of article 3, that is to say, with a view to the appointment of technical advisers. Under these circumstances each Government, Employers' and Workers' delegate to the 47th Session may be accompanied by not more than ten advisers. In order to ensure an equal representation of Employers and Workers on the Committees of the Conference it is desirable that, so far as possible, equal numbers of Employers' and Workers' advisers should be appointed in each delegation.

The principle, derived from the application of the above-mentioned paragraph 2 of article 3, that as a general rule the sittings of the committees shall not take place at the same time as the plenary sittings of the Conference has proved impracticable in recent years as the result of the growth in the volume of business during the session. Moreover, as on the occasion of all previous sessions since 1945, the item "Information and Reports on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations" will be considered as a separate item within the meaning of the above-mentioned paragraph 2 of article 3, that is to say, with a view to the appointment of technical advisers. Under these circumstances each Government, Employers' and Workers' delegate to the 47th Session may be accompanied by not more than ten advisers. In order to ensure an equal representation of Employers and Workers on the Committees of the Conference it is desirable that, so far as possible, equal numbers of Employers' and Workers' advisers should be appointed in each delegation.

The Members undertake to nominate non-Government delegates and advisers chosen in agreement with the industrial organisations, if such organisations exist, which are most representative of employers or workpeople, as the case may be, in their respective countries.

In connection with this provision of article 3 of the Constitution, the Credentials Committee of the 46th Session of the Conference (1962), having before it cases where several representative organisations existed in one and the same country, made the following statement in this regard:

This article requires: (a) that there shall be consultations; (b) that consultations shall be entered into with the most representative organisations of employers and of workpeople, in the country in question, provided such organisations exist; and (c) that the delegates finally appointed should be chosen in agreement with the said organisations.

Certainly, agreement cannot always be reached. But genuine consultations undertaken in good faith are essential in Advisory Opinion No. 1 of the Permanent Court of International Justice—which relates particularly to countries where there are several representative organisations—"it is stated, in particular with regard to the obligation laid down in paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Constitution, that—"

The engagement...is not a mere moral obligation. It is a part of the Treaty and constitutes an obligation by which the Parties to the Treaty are bound to one another.

The obligation is, that the persons nominated should have been chosen in agreement with the organisations most representative of employers or workpeople, as the case may be. There is no definition of the word "representative" in the Treaty. The most representative organisations for this purpose are, of course, those organisations which best represent the employers and the workers respectively. What these organisations are, is a question to be decided in the particular case, having regard to the circumstances in each particular country at the time when the choice falls to be made. Numbers are not the only test of the representative character of the organisations, but they are an important factor; other things being equal, the most numerous will be the most representative. The article throws upon the Government of the State the duty of deciding, on the data at its disposal, what organisations are, in point of fact, the most representative. . . .

The only object of the intervention of industrial organisations, in connection with the selection of delegates and technical advisers, is to ensure, as far as possible, that the Governments should nominate persons whose opinions are in harmony with the opinions of employers and workers respectively. If, therefore, in a particular
country there exist several industrial organisations representing the working classes, the Government must take all of them into consideration when it is proceeding to the nomination of the Workers' delegate and his technical advisers. Only by acting in this way can the Government succeed in choosing persons who, having regard to the particular circumstances, will be able to represent at the Conference the views of the working classes concerned.

The aim of each Government must, of course, be an agreement with all the most representative organisations of employers and workers, as the case may be; that, however, is only an ideal which is extremely difficult to attain.

What is required of the Governments is that they should do their best to effect an agreement, which, in the circumstances, may be regarded as the best for the purpose of ensuring the representation of the workers of the country.

The Credentials Committee feels bound to appeal very strongly... to all the governments of the States Members of the Organisation to conform strictly to the Constitution when appointing non-government delegates to the International Labour Conference. Arbitrary choice of such delegates by the government from lists submitted by organisations of greatly varying sizes, without any effort at genuine consultation to reach an agreement with the most representative organisations, constitutes an abuse which, if it is not remedied, could lead the International Labour Conference into a situation which would be dangerous for the entire Organisation.

Governments will no doubt take the necessary steps to ensure that the delegations attending the Conference are appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, that they are complete and that they include the advisers necessary for dealing adequately with the technical questions on the agenda.

Women Delegates and Advisers.

It will be noted that the items on the agenda of the 47th Session concern women as much as men. The attention of governments is therefore drawn to the fact that women are equally eligible with men for appointment as delegates or advisers to the Conference, irrespective of the nature of the items on the agenda, and that article 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution of the Organisation provides that, when questions specially affecting women are on the agenda, one at least of the advisers should be a woman.

E. CREDENTIALS

The credentials of delegates to the Conference and their advisers should, in conformity with the provisions of article 26, paragraph 1, of the Standing Orders of the Conference, be deposited with the International Labour Office at least 15 days before the date fixed for the opening of the session of the Conference. As the Governing Body has decided that the session should open on 5 June 1963, the final date for the deposit of credentials will therefore be 21 May 1963.

For the convenience of governments, a suggested form for the credentials of delegates is appended to the present memorandum.

F. RESOLUTIONS

As indicated above, the Report of the Director-General to the 47th Session of the Conference will be devoted to a broad review of the major programme questions which call for attention by the I.L.O. and to various questions of I.L.O. structure and procedure. If the Conference thus undertakes a thorough examination covering the whole range of I.L.O. action it might be unwise to upset the balance by giving prominence to a few aspects only for the reason that they were the subject of resolutions. In his reply to the discussion of his Report to the 46th Session of the Conference, on 26 June 1962, the Director-General therefore appealed to members of the Conference for a one-year moratorium on resolutions so that the discussion on these really important questions could be concentrated in a single debate, the necessary conclusions be drawn and the necessary translation made of these conclusions into action to be taken by the Conference, the Governing Body, the member States and the Director-General.

If the Director-General's appeal meets with a general response there will be no need to apply the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1 (1), of the Standing Orders relating to the depositing of resolutions, which provide that the text of resolutions submitted to the Conference, other than those dealing with items on the agenda, must be deposited with the Director-General of the International Labour Office at least 15 days before the date fixed for the opening of the Conference session, and under which the final date for the deposit of such resolutions would thus be 21 May 1963.

G. ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY AND RECONSTITUTION OF THE ASIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE AFRICAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In accordance with article 7, paragraph 5, of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, the period of office of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office expires during the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. Elections will
therefore be held to select the Governments which have elective seats and the Employers' and Workers' representatives on the Governing Body.

Information designed to facilitate the procedure of the electoral colleges during the 47th Session is given hereafter.

Composition of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

The composition of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office is determined by the provisions of article 7 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation which, as amended by the Instrument for the Amendment of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, 1953, is in the following terms:

**ARTICLE 7**

1. The Governing Body shall consist of forty persons:
   Twenty representing governments,
   Ten representing the employers, and
   Ten representing the workers.

2. Of the twenty persons representing governments ten shall be appointed by the Members of chief industrial importance, and ten shall be appointed by the Members selected for that purpose by the Government delegates to the Conference, excluding the delegates of the ten Members mentioned above.

3. The persons representing the employers and the persons representing the workers shall be elected respectively by the Employers' delegates and the Workers' delegates to the Conference. Two Employers' representatives and two Workers' representatives shall belong to non-European States.

4. The period of office of the Governing Body shall be three years.

In addition, the Standing Orders of the Conference and of the Governing Body include provisions for the appointment of deputy members.

**Method of Election.**

The method of electing Government members and deputy members of the Governing Body is laid down in article 49 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, which runs as follows:

**ARTICLE 49**

**Government Electoral College**

1. Subject to the provisions of article 13, paragraph 4, of the Constitution and of Section D of the Standing Orders of the Conference, the Government electoral college shall consist of the government delegates of all Members of the Organisation excepting those of the ten Members of chief industrial importance.

2. Each member of the electoral college shall be entitled to cast one vote.

3. The Government electoral college shall select ten Members of the Organisation, the governments of which shall be entitled to appoint Government members of the Governing Body.

4. The Government electoral college shall also select ten other Members of the Organisation, the governments of which shall be entitled to appoint deputy Government members of the Governing Body.

The method of electing Employers' and Workers' members and deputy members of the Governing Body is laid down in the Standing Orders of the Governing Body and in article 50 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, which runs as follows:

**ARTICLE 50**

**Employers' and Workers' Electoral Colleges**

1. The Employers' and Workers' electoral colleges shall consist of the Employers' and Workers' delegates to the Conference respectively, excluding the Employers' and Workers' delegates of States disqualified from voting in pursuance of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 4, of the Constitution and of Section D of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

2. The Employers' and Workers' electoral colleges shall each elect by name ten persons as regular members of the Governing Body and ten persons as deputy members of the Governing Body.

**Procedure of the Electoral Colleges.**

The voting procedure in the electoral colleges is laid down in article 52 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, which runs as follows:

**ARTICLE 52**

**Procedure of Voting**

1. Each electoral college shall vote by secret ballot.

2. The Chairman of each electoral college shall ask the representative of the President of the Conference to read the list of delegates who have the right to vote. Each delegate shall come forward as his name is called and place his voting paper in the ballot box.

3. The counting of the votes shall be carried out under the direction of the representative of the President of the Conference assisted by two returning officers appointed by the electoral college from among its members.

4. No State or person shall be considered to be elected unless it or he has obtained more than half of the votes cast by the members of the electoral college present at the meeting. If after the first vote one or more seats remain to be filled, one or more further votes shall be taken as may be necessary, each member of the electoral college being entitled to vote for a number of candidates equal to the number of seats which still remain to be filled.

In regard to the composition of the Governing Body it should also be recalled that the International Labour Conference at its 46th Session (June 1962) adopted an Instrument for the Amendment of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation. Should this Instrument of Amendment come into force in accordance with the provisions of article 36 of the Constitution before the elections are held in the course of the 47th Session, the government electoral college as defined in article 49 quoted above will be called upon to select 14 Members of the Organisation, the governments of which shall be entitled to appoint Government members of the Governing Body. In the same circumstances the Employers' and Workers' electoral colleges will be called upon to elect by name 12 persons as regular members of the Governing Body. There will be no change in regard to Government deputy members or to Employers' and Workers' deputy members.

Reconstitution of the Asian Advisory Committee and the African Advisory Committee.

In accordance with the decisions taken by the Governing Body at its 112th Session (June 1950) concerning the establishment of the Asian Advisory Committee, this Committee will be reconstituted at the time of the elections for the Governing Body.

In accordance with the decisions taken by the Governing Body at its 149th Session (June 1961) concerning the reconstitution of the African Advisory Committee, elections for membership of this Committee are likewise to be held during the session of the Conference at which the elections for membership of the Governing Body are held.

H. Entertainment during the International Labour Conference

I. Accommodation for Delegations in Geneva

* * *

This Record of Proceedings of the Forty-seventh Session of the Conference is arranged as follows:

FIRST PART

List of members of delegations, etc., comprising the names of all persons who took part in the Conference, classified according to the functions they performed.

SECOND PART

A verbatim report of the proceedings in plenary sitting, including stenographic reports of the original speeches in the case of speeches delivered in English, and translations based on the simultaneous telephonic interpretations into English given by the official interpreters to the Conference in the case of speeches delivered in other languages.

THIRD PART

Appendices, including the reports and documents submitted by the committees to the Conference and the texts (Convention, Recommendations, resolutions, etc.) adopted by the Conference.

In addition, the volume contains a table of contents, which precedes this Introduction, and, at the end, an index to the Second and Third Parts.

---

1 Not reproduced here.
FIRST PART

LIST OF MEMBERS OF DELEGATIONS, ETC.
LIST OF MEMBERS OF DELEGATIONS, ETC.

Delegations

AFGHANISTAN

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. HAFIZULLAH, Acting General Director of Labour, Ministry of Mines and Industries.
Mr. Mohammed Aref GHOUSY, Professor of Economics.

ALBANIA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATE
Mr. Delo BALILI, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Thoma SALLABANDA, Director-General, Central Undertaking of the Clothing Industry.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Qimo KOCANI, Secretary, Central Council of Albanian Trade Unions.

ALGERIA

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Bachir BOUMAZA, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Chouaïb TALEB, Director, International Organisations Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Daoud AKEOUF, Adviser, Cabinet of the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

Advisers
Mr. Abdelhakim MISSOUM, Commissioner for Vocational Training.
Mr. Mohamed BOUZID, Adviser, Office of the Council of Ministers.
Mr. Abderrahmane RAHMANI, Director of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. Smail TAMZALI, Assistant Director of Labour Regulations.
Mr. Mebarek DJILANI, Deputy; Member of the Labour and Social Affairs Committee of the Constituent Assembly.
Mr. Abdelmadjid Ben KEDADRA, Deputy; Member of the Labour and Social Affairs Committee of the Constituent Assembly.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Jean PERETTI.

Advisers
Mr. Said TALANTIKTI, General Confederation of Algerian Employers.
Mr. Abdelkader TAQUG, Member of the Bureau of the General Union of Algerian Merchants.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Rabah DJERMANE, First National Secretary, General Union of Algerian Workers (U.G.T.A.)

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Mohamed FLISSI, National Secretary, General Union of Algerian Workers (U.G.T.A.).

Advisers
Mr. Youssef BRIKI, Member of the Executive Committee, Algeria Regional Union of the U.G.T.A.
Mr. Mohamed HABIB, in charge of the E.G.A. Federation of the U.G.T.A.
Mr. Brahim BENDRIS, Member of the Bureau, Civil Servants' Union.

ARGENTINA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Héctor F. VILLAVEIRAN, Under-Secretary for Social Security.
Mr. Mario Raúl PICO, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary; Director, International Organisations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Public Worship.

Advisers
Mr. Mario Alberto CAMPORA, Secretary of Embassy; Member of the Permanent Mission of the Argentine Republic accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.
Mr. Juan José ETALA, President, National Welfare Fund for Public Services Personnel.
Mr. A. David KAPLAN, Cabinet Assistant to the Minister of Labour; Ministerial Adviser.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Francisco MURO de NADAL, Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Juan M. ONETO GAONA.

Advisers
Mr. Raúl Guillermo Antonio DECKER.
Mr. Héctor VALVERDE, Engineer.
Mr. Severo BARTOMEO.
Mr. Jorge L. RODEYRO.
Mr. Orlando d'ADAMO, Engineer.
Mr. Antonio VITAIC o JAKASA.
Mr. Mario MARINELLI.
Mr. José KESTELMAN.
WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. José ALONSO.

Advisers
Mr. Marocs ALMOZNY.
Mr. Avelino FERNÁNDEZ.
Mr. Luis ANGELEBI.
Mr. Juan RACHINI.

AUSTRALIA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Henry Armand BLAND, C.B.E., Secretary, Department of Labour and National Service.
Mr. Robert William FURLONGER, Consul-General; Permanent Representative of Australia to the European Office of the United Nations.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Miss Alison Mary STEPHEN, Principal Research Officer, Planning and Research Branch, Department of Labour and National Service.

Advisers
Mr. Arthur Frederick BUNKER, Principal Executive Officer (Technical), Industrial Services Division, Department of Labour and National Service.
Mr. Keiran DESMOND, First Secretary, Australian Embassy, Brussels.
Mr. Michael WALSH, Secretary, Victoria Department of Labour and Industry.
Mr. Nicholas Leicester WEBB, Project Officer, International Relations and General Section, Department of Labour and National Service.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Harold Grant FERRIER, Member of the Executive, Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia; Vice-President, Chamber of Manufactures of New South Wales; Past President, Australian Metal Industries Association; Past President, Metal Trades Employers' Association.

Advisers
Mr. Cyril John McDougall, President, Australian Council of Employers' Federations; President, Victorian Employers' Federation.
Mr. Robert William Charles ANDERSON, O.B.E., Federal Director, Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia.
Mr. George POLITES, Executive Director, Australian Council of Employers' Federations.

WEEKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Albert Ernest MONK, President, Australian Council of Trade Unions; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. William Walter Charles BROWN, State Secretary, Furnishing Trades Society of Victoria.
Mr. Henry Joseph McLOUGHLIN, Senior Vice-President, Hobart Trades Hall Council.
Mr. Joseph Clarke PEREIRA, Secretary, Western Australian Police Association.

Mr. Hans KRENN, Director, Federal Ministry of Social Administration.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Emanuel TREU, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of Austria accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.
Mr. Heinrich GLEISSNER, Counsellor; Deputy Permanent Representative of Austria accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.

AUSTRALIA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Ferdinand SCHENLENBACHER, Director, Federal Ministry of Social Administration.
Mr. Franz STOCKEL, Director, Central Labour Inspectorate, Federal Ministry of Social Administration.
Mr. Josef BENISCHK, Engineer; Director, Federal Ministry of Trade and Reconstruction.
Mrs. Edméé CARMINE, First Secretary, Federal Ministry of Trade and Reconstruction.
Mr. Josef SCHUH, Secretary, Federal Ministry of Social Administration.
Mrs. Martha FRÖHLICH, Federal Ministry of Social Administration.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Gustav MAUTNER-MARSHOF, Co-owner of the Mautner-Markhof Yeast Factories; Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Herbert KINZEL, Chief of Section, Federal Economic Chamber of Austria.
Mr. Martin MECHE, Secretary, Trade Section, Federal Economic Chamber of Austria.
Mr. Walter TUTSCHKA, Chief of Section, Federation of Austrian Industrialists.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Erwin ALTENBURGER, former Minister; Member of Parliament; Vice-President, Austrian Federation of Trade Unions.

Advisers
Mr. Gerhard WEISSENBERG, Counsellor for Social Policy, Austrian Federation of Trade Unions; Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Mr. Otto SKRITEK, Member of Parliament; Representative, Union of Employees in Private Undertakings.
Mr. Otto SCHEER, Chief of the Social Policy Section, Austrian Chamber of Labour.
Mr. Anton SKODA, First Secretary, Union of Employees in Private Undertakings.

BELGIUM
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. L. SERVAIS, Minister of Employment and Labour.
Mr. L.-E. TROCLET, Senator.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. P. DE PAEPE, Vice-Chairman, House of Representatives.
Mr. J. DECONINCK, Member of the House of Representatives.
Mr. G. SCHYNS, Member of the House of Representatives.
Advisers

Mr. J. CEUTERICK, Secretary-General, Ministry of Employment and Labour.

Mr. E. LOTZ, Minister Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of Belgium accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.

Mr. A. FRANCHIMONT, Director, Cabinet of the Minister of Employment and Labour.

Mr. F. DE WAELE, Honorary Director-General, Ministry of Employment and Labour.

Mr. A. UYTDENHOEFF, Director-General, Ministry of Employment and Labour.

Mr. J. DENYS, Counsellor, Ministry of Employment and Labour.

Mr. F. VAN BLADEL, Detached to the Office of the Minister of Employment and Labour.

Mr. HOULLEZ, Deputy Permanent Representative of Belgium accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. A. VERSCHUEREN, Director for Social Questions, Federation of Belgian Industries; Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. L. BERNAERT, Chairman of the Social Questions Committee, Federation of Belgian Industries.

Mr. J. DE BRUYN, General Secretary, Federation of Non-Industrial Undertakings of Belgium.

Mr. J. PIRON, Adviser, Federation of Belgian Industries.

Mr. L. LEPAGE, Director, Association of Industrialists of Belgium.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. N. DE BOCK, National Secretary, Belgian General Federation of Labour (F.G.T.B.); Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. P. A. COOL, President, Confederation of Christian Trade Unions.

Mr. K. VAN BOMPARY, General Secretary, National Central Branch (Employees), Confederation of Christian Trade Unions.

Mr. R. JAYAUX, General Secretary, Christian Metallurgical Workers' Union.

Mr. Roger VERDONCK, National Secretary, Employees', Technicians' and Administrative Staffs' Trade Union.

BRAZIL

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Almino Monteiro ALVARES AFFONSO, Minister of Labour and Social Welfare.

Mr. Josué de CASTRO, Ambassador; Head of the Permanent Delegation of Brazil in Geneva.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Júlio Augusto BARBOZA-CARNEIRO, Ambassador; Representative of the Government of Brazil to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. Geraldo Augusto de Faria BATISTA.

Mr. José Luciano da Nóbrega FILHO.

Mr. Raúl Francisco RYFF.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Diego GONZALES BLANCO.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Brasílio MACHADO NETO, Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. Paulo da SILVA.

Mr. Américo BUCAZZ.

Mr. Jesus PINTO FREIRE.

Mr. Fernando Cavalcanti MARTINS ABELHEIRA, Lawyer.

Mr. Nélio Siegfrid WAGNER BATTENDIERI.

Mr. Benedito BROTHERHOOD.

Mr. Renato MACHADO.

Mr. Ranulfo TORRES RAPOSO.

Mr. Francisco de Moura BRANDÃO FILHO.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. L. Osmilso STAFFORD da SILVA.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Ubaldino SANTOS.

Advisers

Mr. Avelino GOMES de CASTRO.

Mr. Alvaro SOARES TELLES.

Mr. Clodsmith RIANI.

Mr. Vicente de OLIVEIRA e SILVA.

BULGARIA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Micho MICHEV, Chairman, Labour and Work Remuneration Committee.

Mr. Emile TOMOV, Secretary of Legation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Advisers


Mr. Pepo COHEN, Labour and Work Remuneration Committee.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mrs. Lida TZARVOULANOVA, Director, "Ernst Thälmann" Textile Factory, Sofia.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Mladen IVANOV, Secretary, Central Council of Trade Unions.

Adviser

Mr. Nikolai DESSEV, Central Council of Trade Unions.

BURMA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Lt.-Col. Thui-a Tun TIN, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Labour; Director-General of Labour Affairs.

Captain Thong ETAIHK, Officer on Special Duty, Office of the Director-General of Labour Affairs.

Adviser

Mr. Khint MAUNG, Director of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Maung MAUNG, Director and General Manager, Burma Beverages Ltd., Burma Economic Development Corporation.
List of Members of Delegations, etc.

WORKERS’ DELEGATE
Mr. Maung Maung Tin, Organiser, All-Burma Transport Workers’ Federation.

BURUNDI
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Sévrin Mandevu, Director of Labour.
Mr. Jaak De Boe, Adviser, Department of Labour.

EMPLOYERS’ DELEGATES
Mr. Henri Stainiée, Director, Brarudi Company; Engineer; Representative of the Association of Undertakings of Burundi.

WORKERS’ DELEGATE
Mr. Nicodème Naahuvye, Agent, Hatton and Cookson.

BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Anatolii Emelyanovich Gurovitch, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Gerodot Gavrilovich Chenushchenko, Member of the Collegium, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Anatolii Nikitich Shel'dov, First Secretary, Permanent Delegation to the European Office of the United Nations.
Mr. Vassili Ivanovich Peshkov, Second Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Eduard Isafitovich Borchchevskii, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

EMPLOYERS’ DELEGATE
Mr. Alexandr Petrovich Koloshin, Director, Minsk Machine-Building Plant.

WORKERS’ DELEGATE
Mr. Anatolii Petrovich Obukhovitch, Secretary, Byelorussian Council of Trade Unions.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Gennadii Vassilievich Kalinin, Chief of the Labour Protection Department, Byelorussian Council of Trade Unions.

CAMEROON
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Henri Richard Manga-Mado, Secretary of State for Labour and Social Laws.
Mr. Peter Efange, Permanent Secretary to the Federated Government of Western Cameroon.

Advisers
Dr. Joseph Bowen, Chief, Medical Inspection Service for Labour and Manpower.
Mr. Georges-Henri Connilliére, Senior Counselor for Labour and Social Legislation.
Mrs. Constance Doó Kingue, Director of Social Security.
Mr. Paul Fokam Kamga, Director of Labour.
Mr. E. K. Lottin, Labour Officer.

EMPLOYERS’ DELEGATE
Mr. Louis Bekombo, Manager of the Cameroon Automobile Company.

WORKERS’ DELEGATE
Mr. Raphael M. Namby, General Secretary, Federation of Trade Unions of Cameroon.

Adviser
Mr. John S. Mbangue, President, Cameroon Development Corporation Workers’ Union.

CANADA
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
The Hon. Allan MacEachen, Federal Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. G. V. Haythorne, Deputy Minister, Federal Department of Labour; Representative of the Government of Canada on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Mr. John Mainwaring, Labour Attaché, Canadian Embassy, Brussels.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Saul Rae, Permanent Representative and Ambassador of Canada to the European Office of the United Nations.

Advisers
Mr. R. M. Adams, Chief, Labour Management Division, Economics and Research Branch, Federal Department of Labour.
Mr. L. A. Atken, Safety Adviser, Accident Prevention and Compensation Branch, Federal Department of Labour.
Mr. W. E. Baüer, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Canada to the European Office of the United Nations.
Miss E. Lorentsen, Director, Legislation Branch, Federal Department of Labour.
Mr. Joseph Marineau, Judge; President, Quebec Workmen’s Compensation Board.
Mr. H. T. Pammett, Executive Assistant, International Labour Organisation Branch, Federal Department of Labour.
Mr. J. P. Windish, Industrial Hygiene Engineer, Occupational Health Division, Department of National Health and Welfare.

Representatives of Provincial Governments Accompanying the Government Delegates
The Hon. C. H. Ballam, Minister of Labour, Province of Newfoundland.
The Hon. N. L. Fergusson, Minister of Labour, Province of Nova Scotia.

EMPLOYERS’ DELEGATE
Mr. T. H. Robinson, Manager, Industrial Relations Department, Canadian International Paper Company; Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. W. D. H. Fréchette, Manager, Commercial Intelligence Department, Canadian Manufacturers’ Association.
Mr. George Lach, Assistant Vice-President (Personnel), Canadian National Railways.
Mr. Peter Stevens, Director of Labour Relations and Training, Canadian Construction Association.
Mr. Armand Trottiére, President, Philippe Trottiére Inc.; President, Building Industry Federation of the Province of Quebec.
Mr. A. C. Watt, Manager, Employee Relations Department, Imperial Oil Limited.
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WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. J. MORRIS, Executive Vice-President, Canadian Labour Congress.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Kalmen KAPLANSKY, Director, International Affairs Department, Canadian Labour Congress; Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. F. C. BODIE, Secretary-Treasurer, Alberta Federation of Labour.
Mr. Jean-Paul GEOFFROY, Director, Technical Service, Confederation of National Trade Unions.
Mr. J. F. SIMONDS, Regional Vice-President, Canadian Labour Congress; Representative, Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union of America.
Mr. J. F. WALTER, Assistant Grand Chief Engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Emmanuel DINDY, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. Nestor KOMBOT-NAGUEMON, Director of Labour, Manpower and Social Security.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Marcel FOLLOT.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Henri PICARD, President, Association of Public Works and Allied Industries; Vice-President of G.I.R.C.A.; Vice-Chairman of the Managing Committee, Public Office for Family Allowances and Workmen's Compensation.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Antoine FALL TÉLÉMAQUE, President, Federation of Trade Unions of the Central African Republic.

CEYLON
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. M. P. de Z. SIRIWARDENA, Minister of Public Works and Posts.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. T. R. R. WIJEWICKEREMA, Deputy Commissioner of Labour.
Mr. W. T. KUNASINGHAM, Assistant Commissioner of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Douglas Hugh GREVE, Additional Secretary, Ceylon Estates Employers' Federation.

Advisor
Mr. E. RANAWAKE, Additional Assistant Secretary, Employers' Federation of Ceylon.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. S. THONDAMAN, M.P.; President, Ceylon Workers' Congress.

Advisor
Mr. U. B. WEERASEKERA, M.P., Legal Adviser to the Independent, Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union.

CHAD
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Thomas KEIRO, Minister of Social Affairs and Labour.
Mr. Abdoulaye TOURE, Justice of the Supreme Court.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Jacques BOUJISSOU, Director of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Roger REBOUL.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Pierre SEMOKO YAMARA.

CHILE
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Isauro TORRES CERECEDA.
Mr. Ramón HUIDOBRO DOMÍNGUEZ.

Advisor and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Moisés POBLETE TRONCOSO, Professor at the University of Chile.

Advisers
Mr. Luis ORLANDINI.
Mr. Fernando CONTRERAS.
Mr. Carlos FRANZ NÚÑEZ.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Manuel MONTT BALMACEDA.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Ernesto LENNON.

Advisers
Mr. Jorge VALDIVIA.
Mr. Luis ARACENA AGUAYO.

CHINA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. CHENG Pao-nan, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of the Republic of China to the European Office of the United Nations; Representative of the Chinese Government on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Mr. LEE Yen-ping, Ministry of the Interior; Substitute Representative of the Chinese Government on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. CHANG Bei-teh, Deputy Director, Treaty Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. HU Fu-gen, Chief, International Labour Affairs Division, Ministry of the Interior.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. CHANG Ching-yu, Chairman, Board of Directors, Taiwan Aluminium Corporation.

Advisor
Mr. KUO Tok, Assistant General Director, Ma-Chia District Sugar Refinery, Taiwan.
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WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. LIANG Yung-chang, Member, Board of Directors, Chinese Federation of Labour; Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Adviser
Mr. KOU Ching-ju, Member, Standing Committee of the Board of Directors, Chinese Federation of Labour.

COLOMBIA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Castor JARAMILLO AREILUBLA, Minister of Labour; former Magistrate of the former Supreme Labour Tribunal; former Dean of the Faculty of Law and Economic Science, Javeriana University; University Professor; Senator of the Republic.

Mr. Eliseo ARANGO, Permanent Representative of Colombia accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.

Adviser
Mr. Vicente GONZÁLEZ, Colombian Consul-General, Geneva.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Eduardo ARANGO RESTREPO, National Association of Industrialists.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Justiniano ESPINOSA S., General Secretary, Union of Colombian Workers (U.T.C.); Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Adviser
Mr. José Raquel MERCADO, President, Confederation of Colombian Workers (C.T.C.).

CONGO (Brazzaville)

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Pierre Simon KIKHOUNGA N'GOT, Minister of Labour and Social Welfare.

Mr. Agathon NOTE, Labour Administrator; Interregional Inspector of Labour.

Adviser
Mr. Jean REVEL, Director of Labour and Social Welfare.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. A. MABOUNGOU M'BIMBA, Director of the S.H.O.C.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Gilbert PONGAULT, General Secretary, Pan-African Confederation of Believing Workers; Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Adviser
Mr. Gregorio Manuel ORTEGA SUÁREZ, First Vice-Minister, Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Enrique CAMEJO ARGUDÍN, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Permanent Delegate of Cuba accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mrs. Candelaria RODRIGUEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Chief, Directorate of International Affairs, Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Pedro GONZÁLEZ PIÑEIRO, Member of the Permanent Mission of Cuba in Geneva.

Mr. Alberto BETANCOURT BOA, Member of the Permanent Mission of Cuba in Geneva.

CUBA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. David KOKO.

Mr. Victor HODY.

Mr. Albert MAISSE.

Miss Odile KABASUBABO.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Jean P. M. J. Gh, JONCKHEERE, Federation of Provincial Associations of Congolese Undertakings (F.E.C.).

Advisers
Mr. Victor N'GABA, National Union of Congolese Employers (U.N.E.C.).

Mr. Gérard BIYELA, National President, Association of the African Middle Classes (ACMAF).

Mr. Joseph-François LOMBOTO, Federation of Provincial Associations of Congolese Undertakings (F.E.C.).

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Thomas BOOKA, Confederation of Free Trade Unions of the Congo.

Advisers
Mr. André BO-BOLIKO, Union of Congolese Workers (U.T.C.).

Mr. Rémy SIWA, General Labour Federation of the Congo (F.G.T.K.).

COSTA RICA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Hermann RODRÍGUEZ ARCE, Chief, Legal, Information and International Relations Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.

Mr. Claudio GONZÁLEZ QUIRÓS, Secretary, Costa Rican Social Security Fund.

Advisers
Mr. Antonio HERNÁNDEZ BRENES, Chief of the Labour Inspectorate, Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Gastón GUARDIA URIBE, Chief, Legal Department, Costa Rican Social Security Fund.

Mr. Aristide P. DONNADIEU, Minister Plenipotentiary; Deputy Permanent Delegate of Costa Rica accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and the International Organisations in Geneva.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. J. Abundio GUTIÉEREZ MATAÉITA, Member of the Executive Board, National Chamber of Agriculture.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Rafael Ángel GONZÁLEZ CUBERO, General Secretary, Costa Rican Confederation of Workers —Rerum Novarum.
EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. César GACIO FUERTE, Director, Amalgamated Hardware and Allied Stores.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Héctor CARBONELL BORRUTINER, Deputy Secretary, Executive Committee, Cuban Workers' Union.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. José SOBRAZO CID, General Secretary, National Union of Workers in Commerce.

CYPRUS
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Tassos PAPADOPOULOS, Minister of Labour and Social Insurance.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Mikis D. SPARISIS, Senior Industrial Relations Officer.
Mr. Alper SHEVKET, Senior Inspector of Factories.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Stelios THEOCHARIDES, Secretary-Director, Cyprus Employers' Consultative Association.

Advisers
Mr. George ALEXANDROU, Personnel Manager, Shell Company.
Mr. Leandros ZACHARIADES, Vice-Chairman, Cyprus Employers' Consultative Association.
Mr. Donald W. BULLOCK, Director of Personnel and Industrial Relations, Cyprus Mines Corporation.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Andreas ZIARTIDES, General Secretary, Paucyprian Federation of Labour.

Advisers
Mr. Nicos ZIVANAS, General Secretary, Cyprus Workers' Confederation.
Mr. Alexandros TSANGARIDES, President, Cyprus Civil Servants' Association.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Vjém PITHART, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Milan KLUSÁK, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the European Office of the United Nations.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Jaroslav DOSTAL, State Planning Commission.

Advisers
Mr. Jaromír SEIDLÁK, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Miroslav SOUKUP, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Miroslav KLECAN, Deputy Director, National Enterprise "Medium Lorries".

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Václav PÁSEK, Secretary, Central Council of Trade Unions.

Advisers
Mr. Petr SVÁTEK, Central Council of Trade Unions.
Mr. Zdeněk GREGOR, Central Council of Trade Unions.

DAHOMEY
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Bertin BORNA, Minister of Finance and Labour.
Mr. Gérard AGBOTON, Director-General of Labour and Manpower.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Odon HOUNCANRIN, Director of the Compensation Fund for Family Allowances and Occupational Injuries.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Pierre FOURN, Chairman, Special Delegation of the Consular Assembly of Dahomey.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Théophile BEHANZIN PAOLETTI, General Secretary, General Union of Workers of Dahomey (U.G.T.D.).

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Damien Victor ANGO, Secretary (Claims and Jurisdiction), General Union of Workers of Dahomey (U.G.T.D.).

DENMARK
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Erik DREYER, former Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Social Affairs; Representative of the Government of Denmark on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Mr. Gunnar COLN, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. P. JUHL-CHRISTENSEN, Director, International Relations Department, Ministries of Labour and Social Affairs.

Advisers
Mr. G. DRACHMANN, Director, State Labour Inspection Service.
Mrs. Nina ANDERSEN, Secretary; M.P.
Mr. Gregers FRANDSEN, Deputy Chief of Division, Ministry of Social Affairs.
Mr. Per LOFT, Assistant Chief of Division, Ministry of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Arne LUND, Director, Danish Employers' Confederation.

Advisers
Mr. P. Schade POULSEN, Assistant Director, Danish Employers' Confederation.
Mr. Jens DEGERBØL, Assistant Director, Danish Employers' Confederation.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Einar NIELSEN, Vice-President of the National Confederation of Danish Trade Unions; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Advisers
Mr. Svend Bache VOGNBÆRG, Secretary, National Confederation of Danish Trade Unions.
Mr. E. Pemann JENSEN, President of the National Union of Slaughterhouse Workers.

ECUADOR
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Luis PALLARES ZALDUMBIDE, Minister of Social Welfare and Labour.
Mr. Teodoro ALVARADO GARAICOA, Permanent Representative of Ecuador accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.

Advisers
Mr. Hugo VALENCIA.
Mr. Miguel VARÉA.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Pablo GEAB.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Victor Manuel ZÚÑIGA GARZÓN.

ETHIOPIA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Getahun TESSEMA, Minister of National Community Development.
Mr. Yosief MEKURIA, Director-General, Ministry of National Community Development.

Adviser
Mr. Teferra HAILÉ SELASSIE.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Seyoum GEBREGIABHER.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Abraham MAKONNEN.

FINLAND
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Miss Kylliikki POHJALA, Minister of Social Affairs.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Rafael RINNE, Director of the General Department, Ministry for Social Affairs; Representative of the Government of Finland on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (Deputy Member).
Mr. Veikko KANERVA, Cabinet Secretary, Ministry for Social Affairs.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Jacques CHAZELLE, Director, Office of the Minister of Labour.
Mr. Pierre LAURENT, maître des requêtes, Council of State; Director-General of Labour and manpower, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Alain BARJOT, Counsellor of State; Director-General of Social Security, Ministry of Labour.

Advisers
Mr. Bernard de CHALVRON, Minister Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of France accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.
Miss Betty PIGUET, Assistant Director, Social Status of Workers and Labour Regulations Branch, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Pierre PELISSON, Senior Labour and Social Legislation Counsellor.
Mr. Pierre REVOL, Counsellor, Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Roger JEANNEL, Counsellor, Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Pierre LAFARGE, Chief, Occupational Safety and Health Branch, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Maurice MEUNIER, Chief, Office of Labour Contracts, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Robert JODELET, Civil Administrator, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Jean BOUDARD, Civil Administrator, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Gilbert CONSTANT, Inspector-General of Social Security, Ministry of Agriculture.
Mr. Jean BARTHELEMY, Engineer, National Research and Experimental Centre for the Mechanisation of Agriculture.

**Employers' Delegate**

Mr. Pierre WALLINE, Member of the Governing Board, National Council of French Employers (C.N.P.F.); Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

**Advisers**

Mr. BOUVIER, Consultant Engineer, Federation of Metal Industries.

Mr. Jacques LEBLANC, Director, Federation of Metallurgical and Mining Industries.

Mr. Louis MERILLOD, Chief, Liaison Service of the National Council of French Employers (C.N.P.F.) with the International Labour Organisation.

Mr. André PEEZ, Director-General, National Federation of General Commercial Undertakings.

Mr. Gabriel SAINTIGNY, Administrator, Chemical Industries Association; Member of the Paris Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Jules SALLENAVE, President, National Federation of Dye-Works; President, Inter-Federal Committee for Liaison between the Laundry and Dye-Works Industries; Member of the Directorate of the General Confederation of Small and Medium-Sized Undertakings.

Mrs. Geneviève SEEUVS, Director, Federation of Metallurgical and Mining Industries.

**Workers' Delegate**

Mr. Maurice BOULDOUX, Honorary President, French Confederation of Christian Workers (C.F.T.C.); Member of the Confederate Bureau of the C.F.T.C.; Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

**Advisers**

Mr. Robert BOTHEREAU, General Secretary, General Confederation of Labour (Forç ouvrièr) (C.G.T.-F.O.).

Mr. Roger MARIO, Secretary, Confederate Committee on Social Security, General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.).

Mr. René DUHAMEL, Secretary, General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.).

Mr. Georges de MEYEMBOURG, National Union of Management and Supervisory Staffs, General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.).

Mr. Charles FARINE, Member of the Confederate Council of the C.F.T.C.

Mr. Roger LOUET, Secretary, General Confederation of Labour (Forç ouvrièr) (C.G.T.-F.O.).

Mr. René MONNEROT, International Envoy, General Confederation of Supervisors (C.G.C.).

**GABON**

**Government Delegates**

Mr. François MEYE, Minister of Labour.

Mr. Augustin BOUMAH, Director of Labour and Manpower.

**Advisers**

Mr. Pierre AMAURY.

Mr. Jean Christian DENDÉ, Deputy Director, Compensation Fund for Family Allowances and Industrial Accidents.

**Employers' Delegate**

Mr. André KIEFFER.

**Workers' Delegate**

Mr. Auguste WALKER-ANGUILLET, General Secretary, African Confederation of Believing Workers (C.A.T.C.).

**FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY**

**Government Delegates**

Mr. Otto MÖNNIG, Chief of Division, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Hermann ERNST, Ministerial Counsellor, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

**Advisers and Substitute Delegates**

Count Hans von HARDENBERG, Ambassador; Permanent Delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.

Mr. Fritz THOMAS, Governmental Director, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

**Advisers**

Mr. Hans-Herbert RÖHM, Ministerial Counsellor, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Wilhelm KRÄMER, Ministerial Counsellor, Federal Ministry of Economy.

Mr. Wolfgang GREINERT, Senior Counsellor, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Alfred SCHWARZ, Ministerial Counsellor, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Johannes ZSCHÖCHER, Senior Counsellor, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Theodor SCHMITZ, Counsellor of Legation, Permanent Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.

**Employers' Delegate**

Mr. Fritz FAUBEL, Director of the Bayer Chemical Works; Member of the Executive Committee, German Confederation of Employers' Associations.

**Adviser and Substitute Delegate**

Mr. Ernst-Gerhard ERDMANN, Director, German Confederation of Employers' Associations; Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

**Advisers**

Mr. Werner DOETSCH, Lawyer; Deputy Chief of the Social Insurance and Social Welfare Division, German Confederation of Employers' Associations.

Mr. Edgar DORSCHEL, Lawyer; Chief of Section, Allianz Insurance Company.

Mr. Rolf HERMICHEN, Director, Rudolf Karstadt Company.

Mr. Kurt KAULEN, General Secretary, Association of Clothing Industry Employers.

Mr. Franz MÜLLER, General Secretary, South Baden Association of Industrialists.

Mr. Fritz SCHENK, Lawyer; Member of the Secretariat, Confederation of Bavarian Employers' Associations.

Mr. Walter SCHLOTFELDT, Lawyer; Deputy Chief, International Social Policy Division, German Confederation of Employers' Associations.

**Workers' Delegate**

Mr. Herman BEERMANN, Vice-President, German Confederation of Trade Unions (D.G.B.); Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mrs. Maria WEBER, Member of the Managing Executive Board, German Confederation of Trade Unions (D.G.B.)

Advisers

Mr. Ferdinand EICHHORN, Member of the Committee, Union of Workers in the Chemical, Paper and Ceramic Industries.

Mr. Werner HANSEN, Member of the Managing Executive Board, German Confederation of Trade Unions (D.G.B.).

Mr. Bert HEISE, Adviser, Social Policy Division of the Executive Board, German Confederation of Trade Unions (D.G.B.).

Mr. Albert HOLLER, Adviser, Social Policy Division of the Executive Board, German Confederation of Trade Unions (D.G.B.).

Mr. Hans KATZBACH, Vice-President, German Union of Salaried Employees; Chief of the Social Policy Division of the Executive Board.

Mr. Josef KUNTSCHER, Member of the Committee, German Union of Salaried Employees; Chief of the Commercial Employees’ Branch.

Mr. Helmut SCHÜSSLER, Adviser, Social Policy Division, German Confederation of Trade Unions (D.G.B.).

Mr. Werner ZIEMANN, President, Union of Commerce, Bank and Insurance Employees.

GHANA

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

Mr. Imoru EGALA, Minister of Industries.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. A. S. A. ABBAN, Deputy Minister of Industries.

Mr. Samuel Tetteh NETTEY, Commissioner of Labour; Substitute Representative of the Government of Ghana on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers


Mr. E. B. A. ESSUMAN, Assistant Commissioner of Labour.


EMPLOYERS’ DELEGATE

Mr. Frank BANNERMAN-MENSON, Assistant Chief Executive, Ghana Employers’ Association.

Advisers

Mr. George Akumoa BOATENG, Personnel Manager, Mobil Oil (Ghana) Limited.

Mr. A. R. HAWKINS, Personnel Manager, The Shell Company of Ghana Limited.

WORKERS’ DELEGATE

Mr. John TETTEGAH, Secretary-General, Ghana Trades Union Congress.

Advisers

Mr. Daniel Karl FOEVIE, Chairman of the Executive Board, Ghana Trades Union Congress.

GREECE

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Christos STAMBELOS, Director-General, Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Angelos VLACHOS, Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary; Permanent Delegate of the Greek Government accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Panagiotis PANARETOS, Director, Ministry of Labour.

Advisers

Mr. Simon GIORGAS, Chief of Section, Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Pantazis PAXINOS, Chief of Section, Ministry of Labour.

Mr. A. PETROPOULOS, Deputy Permanent Delegate of the Government of Greece accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.

EMPLOYERS’ DELEGATE

Mr. Alexandre BARDAS, Legal Adviser, Federation of Greek Industrialists.

Adviser

Mr. Georgios ANGELOU.

WORKERS’ DELEGATE

Mr. Constantinos LASCARIS, Director of International Relations, Greek General Confederation of Labour.

Adviser

Mr. Jean PATSANTZIS, Substitute General Secretary, Greek General Confederation of Labour.

GUATEMALA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Alberto DUPONT-WILLEMIN, Consul-General; Permanent Representative of Guatemala accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and the International Labour Organisation.

Mr. Federico VILLELA JIMÉNEZ, Acting Chargé d’affaires, Embassy of Guatemala, Berne.

WORKERS’ DELEGATE

Mr. Luis LARA ROCHE.

GUINEA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Sikhé CAMARA, Ambassador of the Republic of Guinea to Yugoslavia.

Mr. Boubének FOUD, Inspector of Labour and Social Laws.

EMPLOYERS’ DELEGATE

Mr. Pierre CASTERES, Director, Guinea Breweries’ Association; President, Federation of Associations of Undertakings and Industries of Guinea (UNIGUI).

WORKERS’ DELEGATE

Mr. Habibou BAH, Teacher; Lecturer, Trade Union University of Conakry.

HONDURAS

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Amado H. NÚÑEZ V., Minister of Labour and Social Welfare.

Mr. Rogelio MARTÍNEZ AUGUSTINUS.
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EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Miguel R. ORTEGA.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Francisco A. BENÍTEZ BENÍTEZ.

HUNGARY

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. József MEKIS, Deputy Minister of Labour.
Mr. István BARTOS, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of the Hungarian People's Republic to the European Office of the United Nations.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Pál TOPALOVICH, Head of the I.L.O. Group, Ministry of Labour.
Mrs. Edit KONRÁD, First Secretary, Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. József BÉNYI, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Hungarian People's Republic to the European Office of the United Nations.
Mr. Imre URANOVICZ, Third Secretary, Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. László HERMAN, Technical Director, Hungarian Radio and Television Company.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Gabor SOMOSKI, Member of the Presidium, National Council of Trade Unions; General Secretary of the Building, Timber and Building Materials Workers' Union.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. János LÁZÁR, Head of Subdivision, Department of International Relations, National Council of Trade Unions.

INDIA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. R. L. MEHTA, Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. S. W. ZAMAN, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India to the International Organisations in Geneva.
Mr. M. DUBE, First Secretary (Commercial), Indian Embassy, Berne.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Naval H. TATA, Director, Tata Industries Ltd.; President, Employers' Federation of India; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. T. S. SWAMINATHAN, Secretary, Employers' Federation of India.
Mr. N. KRISHNAMURTHI, Deputy Secretary, Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. ABID ALI, Member of Parliament; Vice-President, Indian National Trade Union Congress.

Advisers
Mr. T. V. ANANDAN, General Secretary, Southern Railway Employees' Sangh.
Mr. D. DURGAWAR, General Secretary, Indian National Trade Union Congress (Rajasthan Branch).

INDONESIA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. GODJALI, Chief of Cabinet, Department of Labour.
Mr. Agani SAMIL, Deputy Chief, Foreign Relations Division, Department of Labour.

Adviser
Mr. R. SUNARIO-DJOYOKUSUMO, First Secretary, Indonesian Embassy, Berne.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Harlan BEKTI, President-Director, "Teknik Umum" P.T.; Vice-Chairman, Federation of Employers' Associations; Vice-Chairman, Association of Indonesian Industries; Member, Indonesian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. I. J. SUDARWOO, National Trade Unions.

IRAN

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Ata-ollah KHOSROVANY, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Abolghasem Partow AZAM, Director-General of Research, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Mohsen ACHETY, Director-General of Social Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. Abdol Hossein Mohammad KARY, Director of International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Adviser
Mr. Mehdi BEHNAM, Director-General of Labour Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Massoud GHAYOUR, Vice-President, Association of Industrial Employers of Iran; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Javad MALEKNIA, Chief of Personnel, National Iranian Oil Company.
Mr. Mohammad NASSER FAILI, Head of the Personnel Division, National Iranian Oil Company (Abadan).
Mr. Arfa ZANGASEH JAHANBAKHSH, Industrial Relations Development Adviser, National Iranian Oil Company.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Amir Ali SEYFI, Representative of the Silo Trade Unions; Workers' Representative on the Arbitration Council of Teheran; Workers' Representative on the Higher Council of the Workers' Social Insurance Organisation (O.A.S.T.).

Advisers
Mr. Hassan HACHEMY, Representative of the Teheran Workers' Unions.
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IRAQ

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Abdulla Saloom AL-SAMARRAI, Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. Kadhim AL-KHALAF, Director-General, United Nations and International Conferences Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Advisers

Mr. Abdul Razzak AL-WAKIL, Assistant Director of Labour.
Mr. Subhi KHALIL, Director of Industrial Supervision.
Mr. Ismat KITTANI, Permanent Representative of Iraq accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.

EMPLOYEES' DELEGATE

Mr. Adib AL-JADIB, President of the Board of Directors, Iraqi Federation of Industries.

Advisers

Mr. Khair El-Din HASEEB, Director-General, Iraqi Federation of Industries.
Mr. Hassan AL-DUJAILI, Member of the Board of Directors, Iraqi Federation of Industries.
Mr. Amer AL-PADHLY.
Mr. K. A. AL-SHERIFI, Personnel Manager, Baarar Petroleum Company Ltd.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Sami Hamid YASSEEN, Secretary-General, General Federation of Labour Unions.

Advisers

Mr. Yasseen AL-TAII, Secretary of Economic Affairs, General Federation of Labour Unions.
Miss Suha TURAJIHI, Third Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Iraq accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.

IRELAND

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

Mr. John LYNCH, B.L., T.D., Minister for Industry and Commerce.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. James Charles Brendan MACARTHY, Secretary-General, Department of Industry and Commerce.
Mr. John Kevin O' LEARY, Higher Executive Officer, Department of Industry and Commerce.

Adviser

Mr. Brendan O' GORMAN, Executive Officer, Department of Industry and Commerce.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Charles R. CUFFE, Director-General, Federated Union of Employers.

Adviser

Mr. Christopher O' REGAN, Secretary, Federated Union of Employers.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. William J. FITZPATRICK, Member of the Executive Council, Irish Congress of Trade Unions; General Secretary, Irish Union of Distributive Workers and Clerks.

ISRAEL

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

Mr. Y. ALLON, Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Oded MESSER, Director-General, Ministry of Labour; Representative of the Government of Israel on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (Deputy Member).
Mr. H. RADAY, Chief Labour Relations Officer, Ministry of Labour.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Moshe BARTUR, Ambassador; Permanent Delegate to the European Office of the United Nations.

Advisers

Mr. S. H. MORATT, Counsellor (Labour), Embassy of Israel, Washington.
Mr. M. HARNIV, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Ephraim F. Haran, Counsellor; Deputy Permanent Delegate to the European Office of the United Nations; Substitute Representative of the Government of Israel on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (Deputy Member).

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Joseph HAUSMAN, Director of the Labour Department, Manufacturers' Association of Israel.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Aaron BEKKEN, M.P., General Secretary, General Federation of Labour (Histadruth); Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Yeshayahu KEBEN-ZVI, Legal Adviser, General Federation of Labour (Histadruth).

Advisers

Mr. J. VOSHZINA, Member of the Executive Board, General Federation of Labour (Histadruth).
Mr. Gideon M. NEUMANN, Representative in Europe of the Executive Board of the General Federation of Labour (Histadruth).
Mr. Abraham HEZRONI, Trade Union Department, General Federation of Labour (Histadruth).

ITALY

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

Mr. Virgilio BERTINELLI, Minister of Labour and Social Welfare.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Roberto AGO, Professor of International Law, Rome University; Representative of the Government of Italy on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Mr. Rosario PURPURA, Director-General of Industrial Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare; Substitute Representative of the Government of Italy on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Antonio G. NATALE, Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Gianni PERAZZO, Chief Inspector, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare; Chief, International Labour Questions Division, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.
Mr. Gildo CAVALARIN, Chief Inspector, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.
Mr. Danilo GUERRIERI, Chief Inspector, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.
Mr. Carlo BESSERO, Chief Inspector, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.
Mr. Giovanni CAPORASO, Chief Inspector, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.
Mr. Emanuele PELLICCIONI, Counsellor, First Class, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Pietro CAMPANELLA, General Confederation of Italian Industry; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Eneo BOCCAEDI, General Confederation of Italian Industry.
Mr. Eldo CHIENDIC, Representative of the Associations of Undertakings with State Participation.
Mr. Nicola GIOVE, Economic and Legal Adviser, General Confederation of Italian Commerce and Tourism.
Mr. Giuseppe MISSEVELLE, Chief of the Trade Union Service, General Confederation of Italian Agriculture.
Mr. Manuzio MOCHI-ONOI, Chief, Bureau IV of the Vocational Training and General Labour Questions Department, General Confederation of Italian Industry.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Achille MARIATZA, former Minister of Labour and Social Welfare; President, Institute for Labour Studies.

Advisers
Mr. Dionigi COPPO, Senator; Deputy General Secretary, Italian Confederation of Workers' Unions (C.I.S.L.).
Mr. Appio Claudio ROCCHI, Vice-Confederal-Secretary, Italian Confederation of Workers' Unions (C.I.S.L.).
Mr. Giovanni GATTI, Vice-Confederal-Secretary, Italian Workers' Union (U.I.L.).
Mr. Giorgio PECCI, Trade Union Delegate, Italian Workers' Union (U.I.L.).
Mr. Giuseppe MARTUCCI, Confidential Secretary, Chief of the Public Relations Service, Italian Confederation of Workers' National Unions (C.I.S.N.A.L.).

IVORY COAST
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Camille GRIS, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. Jean PORQUET, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Ivory Coast, Bern.

Adviser
Mr. Léon KOFFI KOUASSI, Director of Social Welfare, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. KONIAN KOJO, Chairman, Ivory Coast Agricultural Credit Fund.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Joseph COFFIE, Assistant General Secretary, General Union of Workers of Ivory Coast.

JAMAICA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
The Hon. Lynden Gladstone NEWLAND, Minister of Labour.
Mr. Sewell Wilson MOWATT, Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. John Robert MARSHALL, Director, Jamaica Employers' Federation.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Joseph Edward McPHEESON, Senator, Assistant Island Supervisor, Bustamante Industrial Trade Union.

Adviser
Mr. Thosy Augustus KELLY, President, National Workers' Union of Jamaica.

JAPAN
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Hajime TAMURA, Parliamentary Vice-Minister of Labour.
Mr. Morio AOKI, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Permanent Delegate of Japan to the International Organisations in Geneva; Representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Seiiji KUDO, Counsellor, Ministry of Labour; Substitute Representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Mr. Kenjiro CHIKARAISHI, Counsellor, Permanent Delegation of Japan to the International Organisations in Geneva.

Advisers
Mr. Kusuo KITAMURA, Counsellor, Permanent Delegation of Japan to the International Organisations in Geneva.
Mr. Yukiyoshi KUNOGI, Chief, Labour Policy Section, Labour Policy Bureau, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Kunihiko DOSHO, First Secretary, Embassy of Japan in the Federal Republic of Germany.
Mr. Nobuo TAKIZAWA, First Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Japan to the International Organisations in Geneva.
Mr. Kazuo ADACHI, Second Secretary, Embassy of Japan in the United Kingdom.
Mr. Shuichi NOMIYAMA, Secretary, Administration Section, United Nations Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Tatsuo YOSHIOKA, Second Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Japan to the International Organisations in Geneva.

Mr. Yoshiro KABITA, Attaché, Permanent Delegation of Japan to the International Organisations in Geneva.

Mr. Zen-shiro TACHIBANA, Director, International Co-operation Division, Central Institute for Vocational Training.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Akio MISHIRO, Chairman of the I.L.O. Committee, Japan Federation of Employers' Associations; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. Toshizo WATANABE, Managing Director, Tobu Railway Co., Limited.

Mr. Masao OKAMURA, Managing Director, Hitachi Shipbuilding and Engineering Co., Limited.

Mr. Koji KONDO, Correspondent in Europe, Japan Federation of Employers' Associations.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Yukitaka HARA-GUCHI, President, All-Japan Federation of Metal Mining Workers' Unions.

Advisers

Mr. Yukichi TAKKENA, Chairman, Federation of Independent Unions.

Mr. Masao UENISHI, Vice-Secretary-General, Japanese Federation of Trade Unions.

Mr. Hajime AMADA, General Secretary, National Railway Workers' Union.

JORDAN

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Adham HAJJAWI, Director of the Department of Labour.

Mr. Naji ABDUL- AZIZ, Assistant Director of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Malek AL-MASRI, General Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.

Adviser

Mr. Ali DAJANI, Executive Secretary, Chamber of Industry, Amman.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Ramzi SALEM, Secretary, Tiles and Mosaic Workers' Trade Union.

KUWAIT

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Abdul Aziz SARAVI, Deputy Under-Secretary, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour.

Mr. Issa YASSIN, Supervisor of the Welfare, Vocational and Rehabilitation Hostel.

Advisers

Mr. Abdullmuntasalib AL-BIKA'A'I, Head of the International Relations and Conference Division.

Mr. Taha MADKOUR, Labour Expert.

Mr. Rashid IDRIS, Supervisor of Labour and Labourers' Affairs.

Mr. Ahmad Mahmoud Aboul NAJA, Head of the Registration Division.

Mr. Mufid MALHAS, Head of the Translation Division.

LEBANON

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Rida WAHID, Director-General, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Fouad Nasr ABI RAAD, Chief, Labour Inspectorate.

Advisers

Father André LE GENISEL, Expert, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Joseph DONATO, Director-General, Office of Social Development.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Marwan NASR, Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. George MINA, Administrative Manager, Trans-Mediterranean Airways, S.A.L.

Mr. Walid AHDBAB.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Aatif ZEFNATI, of the Esso Standard Company; Lecturer in Political Economy; Secretary, Federation of United Trade Unions of Employees and Workers of Lebanon (S.U.L.)

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Gabriel KHOURY, President, Lebanon Confederation of Labour (C.T.L.); President, United Trade Unions of Employees and Workers of Lebanon (S.U.L.).

Advisers

Mr. Midhat COUSSA, President, Delegate Council, Northern Lebanon Federation of Trade Unions.

Mr. Nachaa MISSAYKE.

LIBERIA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

The Hon. Stephen TOLBERT, Secretary of Agriculture and Commerce.

Mr. A. Dashward WILSON, Chairman, Labour Practices Review Board.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Lamark COX, Director, Bureau of Labour and Social Statistics.

Adviser

Mr. James B. FREEMAN, Research Assistant, Department of State.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Momolu S. COOPER, Deputy Chairman, Liberia Chamber of Commerce.

Advisers

Mr. Fred RYAN, of the LAMCO.

Mr. Joseph RICHARDS, Liberian Businessmen's Association.
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WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. William V. S. TUBMAN, Jr., President-General, Congress of Industrial Organisations of Liberia.

Advisers
Mr. Lawrence SAWYERR, Secretary-General, Congress of Industrial Organisations of Liberia.
Mr. J. B. McGUIll, Executive Vice-President, Congress of Industrial Organisations of Liberia.
Mr. Joseph K. JUMAH, Chairman, Grievance Committee, Congress of Industrial Organisations of Liberia.

LIBYA
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Mahdi BUZU, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Mohamed Ali El MARIAMI, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. Mohamed MEIR.

Advisers
Mr. Senusi TARGHI.
Mr. Ibrahim F. HASSAN.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Mohamed DAKHIL, Managing Director, National Development Company.

Adviser
Mr. Zubeir LANGHI.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Abdussalam ben OMRAN.

Adviser
Mr. Rejab ANNAIHUM.

LUXEMBOURG
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Emile COLLING, Minister of Labour and Social Security.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Armand KAYSER, President, Social Insurance Office.
Mr. Paul WILWEBTZ, Counsellor of State; former Minister.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Ignace BESSLING, Honorary Consul; Permanent Delegate of Luxembourg accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and the International Labour Office.
Mr. Marcel NOSBUSCH, Governmental Counsellor, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr. Charles REIFFERS, Deputy Governmental Counsellor, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr. Fernand EWEN, Administration Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr. Arthur SCHUSTER, Engineer-Director of Labour and Mines.
Mr. Paul MERTZ, Administration Attaché, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Jules HAYOT, Director, Federation of Luxembourg Manufacturers.

Advisers
Mr. Egide BEISSEL, Adviser, Federation of Luxembourg Manufacturers.
Mr. Jules PAULY, Adviser, Federation of Luxembourg Manufacturers.
Mr. Raymond ROLLINGER, General Secretary, Craftsmen's Federation.
Mr. Eugène MULLER, Deputy General Secretary, Craftsmen's Federation.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Antoine KRIER, President, General Confederation of Labour; Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Antoine WEISS, General Secretary, National Federation of Workers of Luxembourg.
Mr. Joseph MARSON, General Secretary, Luxembourg Federation of Transport Workers.
Mr. Léon WAGNER, President, Confederation of Luxembourg Christian Trade Unions.
Mr. Pierre SCHOCKMEL, General Secretary, Confederation of Luxembourg Christian Trade Unions.
Mr. Roger THEISEN, Vice-President, Federation of Private Employees.

MALAGASY REPUBLIC
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Jean-François JARISON, Minister of Labour and Social Laws.
Mr. Pierre RANJEYA, Director-General of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Daniel ANDRIANTSITOHAINA.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Edmond RAFALIMANANA, General Secretary, National Civil Servants' Federation (F.M.M.); Member of the Bureau and of the Publicity Committee, "Fivondronambo'ny Mpiaga Malagasy ".

Adviser
Mr. Charles RAKOTOBE.

MALAYA
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
The Hon. BAHAMAN bin Samsudin, Minister of Labour and Social Welfare.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Francis TAMBOU, Commissioner for Industrial Relations.
Mr. WONG Siew Wai, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Labour and Industrial Relations.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. FOO Teck Yen, State Commissioner for Labour, Selangor, Department of Labour and Industrial Relations.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. S. O. K. UBAIDULLA, Senator, J.M.N.; President, Malayan Employers' Consultative Association.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. J. A. T. PERERA, M.B.E., E.D., Executive Vice-President, Malayan Planting Industries Employers' Federation; Honorary General Secretary, Malayan Council of Employers' Organisations.
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Mr. S. M. RATNAM. 

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. V. DAVID, Member of the House of Representatives; General Secretary, Transport Workers' Union; Member, General Council and Executive Committee, Malayan Trades Union Congress.

Adviser
Mr. YEOH Teck Chye, President, Malayan Trades Union Congress; General Secretary, National Union of Bank Employees.

MALI
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Oumar Baba DIARRA, Secretary of State for the Civil Service and Labour.
Mr. Namory KEITA, National Director of Labour.

Adviser
Mr. Armand SANGARÉ, Counsellor of Embassy, Embassy of Mali, Paris.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Balla DEMBELE, Deputy Director, "Office du Niger".

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Boubakar DIALLO, Mali National Union of Workers.

MAURITANIA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Ba Bocar ALPHA, Minister of Labour and Health.
Mr. Ba ALASSANE, Director, Family Allowances Fund of Mauritania.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Brahim OSUVOYD AHMED, Director of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Albert Henri LÉFEVRE, Director (Africa), Transport Company of Mauritania (SOTRAM).

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Malick FALL.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Elimane KANE.

MEXICO
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Julio SANTOS COY PEREA, Under-Secretary for Labour and Social Welfare.
Mr. Emilio CALDERÓN PUIG, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of Mexico accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva; Representative of the Government of Mexico on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (Deputy Member).

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Delfín SANCHEZ JUÁREZ, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia.

Advisers
Mr. Ernesto de SANTIAGO LÓPEZ, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary; Substitute Permanent Representative to the International Organisations in Geneva.

Mr. Francisco E. GARCÍA, Counsellor, Mexican Foreign Service.
Mr. Donaciano GONZÁLEZ GÓMEZ, Secretary, Mexican Foreign Service.
Mr. Antonio de ICAZA, Secretary, Mexican Foreign Service.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Fernando YLLANES RAMOS, Mexican Confederation of Chambers of Industry; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Carlos CAMPUZANO OÑATE, Mexican Confederation of Chambers of Industry.
Mr. Tomás GABRA FELÁN, Mexican Confederation of Chambers of Industry.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Alfonso SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA, Mexican Confederation of Workers; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Rafael CAMACHO GUZMÁN, Mexican Confederation of Workers.
Mr. Enrique MAYORGÁ MENDOZA, Mexican Confederation of Workers.
Mr. Bulmaro ANTONIO RUEDA, Mexican Confederation of Workers.

KINGDOM OF MOROCCO
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Abdelkader BENJELLOUN, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Ali SKALLI, Minister Plenipotentiary, Chief of the European Affairs Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Jamil BENJELLOUN, Director, Cabinet of the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Hassan KAGHAD, Chief of the Employment Service, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Mohammed GOURJA, Chief of the Employment Injuries Service, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. Mohammed BENNIS, Chief of the Inspectorate of Social Legislation in Agriculture, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. Hamza ben RAHMOUN, attached to the Office of the Minister, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Moulay Ali KETTANI, Member of the Casablanca Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Mohammed KERMAUDI, Treasurer, National Federation; Member, Chamber of Commerce of Safi.

Advisers
Mr. Mehdi SLIMANI, President, Rabat Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
Mr. Abdesslam BERRADA, General Secretary, National Federation; Member, Marrakech Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
Mr. Hassan ZENNOURI, General Secretary, Moroccan Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry.
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Mr. Mahjoub ben SEDDIK, General Secretary, Moroccan Federation of Labour (U.M.T.); Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. 

Advisers

Mr. Thami AMOR.
Mr. Abdelhak ALIOUA.
Mr. Abdallah HAMAN.

NETHERLANDS

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

Mr. G. M. J. VELDKAMP, Minister of Social Affairs and Public Health.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES


Mr. Th. J. A. BEUMER, Director, International Social Affairs and Public Health Division, Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates

Miss A. F. W. LUNSINGH MEIJER, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Netherlands accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and the International Organisations.

Mr. T. M. PELLINKHOF, Deputy Director of the International Social Affairs and Public Health Division, Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health.

Advisers

Dr. F. BEZEMER, Medical Adviser to the Labour Inspectorate.

Mr. H. B. ELDERING, Deputy Chief, Legislative Policy Division, Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health.

Mr. H. L. FAGEL, Deputy Director-General of Social Insurance and Industrial Relations, Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health.

Mr. A. C. M. van de VEN, Director-General of Social Insurance and Industrial Relations, Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health.

Mr. H. DORPEMA, International Social Affairs and Public Health Division, Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. A. G. FENNEMA, Director, Employers' Federation for International Social Affairs; Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. A. J. R. MAURITZ, General Secretary, Central Social Federation of Employers.

Mr. R. NOLEN, Personnel Manager, Unilever (Holland).

Mr. M. W. J. M. PEYENBURG, Secretary, Federation of Catholic Employers' Associations.

Mr. F. PORTHEINE, Director, Royal Netherlands Central Organisation of Small and Middle Size Enterprises.

Mr. W. L. RENAUD, Central Social Federation of Employers.

Mr. C. C. M. GEERKENS, Deputy Secretary, Federation of Catholic Employers' Associations.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. W. F. van TILBURG, Secretary, Netherlands Federation of Trade Unions.

Advisers

Mr. W. ALBEDA, Secretary, Netherlands Federation of Protestant Christian Trade Unions.

Mr. J. A. G. ALDERS, Vice-President, Netherlands Catholic Workers' Movement.

Mr. A. HORDIJK, Secretary, Netherlands Federation of Protestant Christian Trade Unions.

Mr. F. J. WILLEMS, Secretary of the General Union "Mercurius".

NEW ZEALAND

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. L. A. ATKINSON, C.M.G., Chairman, State Services Commission.

Mr. N. S. WOODS, Registrar of Industrial Unions and Chief Research Officer, Department of Labour.

Advisers

Mr. Balfour Douglas ZOHRAB, Permanent Representative to the European Office of the United Nations.

Miss Alison Vale STOKES, Third Secretary, New Zealand Permanent Mission to the European Office of the United Nations.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE


Adviser

Mr. S. I. McKENZIE, Secretary, Manawatu-Wairarapa Employers' Association.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. J. E. NAPIER, Secretary, North Island Waterfront Workers' Industrial Association of Workers.

Adviser

Mr. J. DALZIEL, Secretary, Otago and Southland Wholesale Storermen and Packers' Industrial Union of Workers.

NICARAGUA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATE

Mr. Antonio A. MULLHAUPT, Consul of Nicaragua, Geneva.

NIGER

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. IBRA KABO, Minister of the Civil Service.

Mr. DIALLO ABDOUAYE, Director, Cabinet of the Minister of National Education.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Pierre GILBERT, President, Employers' Association for Undertakings and Industries of the Niger.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. René DELANNE, General Secretary, National Union of Workers of the Niger (U.N.T.N.).

NIGERIA

MINISTERS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

The Hon. I. U. AKPABIO, Minister of Internal Affairs, Eastern Nigeria.


GOVERNMENT DELEGATES


Mallam Mohamadu GUJBAWU, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Social Welfare and Co-operatives, Northern Nigeria.

Advisers

Mr. M. A. TOKUNBOH, Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of Labour.

Mr. O. A. YOUNG, Acting Chief Inspector of Factories, Federal Ministry of Labour.

Mr. G. C. OKOGWU, Senior Labour Officer, Federal Ministry of Labour.

Mr. G. A. IGBO, Senior Labour Officer, Federal Ministry of Labour.

Mr. L. C. N. OBI, External Affairs Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Relations.

Miss M. A. EKPIKEN, Labour Officer, Federal Ministry of Labour.

Mr. J. A. LABINJO, Labour Officer, Federal Ministry of Labour.

Mr. P. N. OBI, Labour Officer, Federal Ministry of Labour.

Mr. F. O. OPE-AGBE, Acting Publicity Officer, Federal Ministry of Information.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. H. M. OFURUM, Shell B.P. Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Ltd.

Advisers

Mr. C. E. ABEBE, United Africa Company of Nigeria Ltd.

Mr. Victor NANNA, Director, Pamol (Nigeria) Ltd.

Mr. J. E. H. KEYLOCK, M.B.E., E.D., A.M.I.M.M.; Deputy Chairman, Nigerian Mining Employers' Association; Chief Industrial Relations Officer, Amalgamated Tin Mines of Nigeria, Ltd.

Mr. T. B. HUGHES, Union Trading Company Ltd.

Mr. Albert M. UDOKPOEO, General Secretary, Eastern Nigeria Development Corporation Workers' Union.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. L. Lawrence BOEHA, General Secretary, United Labour Congress; Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. Olujimi Ayodele FAGBENRO BEYIYOKU, Senator, United Labour Congress.

Mallam Audu DANLADI, General Secretary, Northern Mineworkers' Union.

Mr. Bernard M. UDOKPOEO, General Secretary, Eastern Nigeria Development Corporation Workers' Union.

NORWAY

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

Mr. Olav GJAEREVOY, Minister of Social Affairs.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Brynjulf BULL, President, Norwegian Labour Court.

Mr. Berger ULSAKER, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Local Government and Labour.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Bjorn SKAU, Under-Secretary, Ministry of Social Affairs.

Advisers

Mr. Hans JOHNSEN, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Social Affairs.

Mr. Olav LYDVO, Counsellor of Embassy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Karl NANDRUP DAHL, Secretary, Ministry of Social Affairs.

Mr. Bül OTNAESS.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Kaare SELVIK, Legal Adviser, Norwegian Employers' Confederation.

Advisers

Mr. Lars ARVIG, Director, Norwegian Employers' Confederation.

Mr. Gerd Kroedelien MEYER, Lawyer, Chief of Division, Norwegian Employers' Confederation.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Odd HOJDAHL, Secretary, General Confederation of Trade Unions in Norway.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Kåre HALEN, Legal Adviser, General Confederation of Trade Unions in Norway.

Advisers

Mr. Arne LI, Manager, National Union of Lithographers and Chemicographers in Norway.

Miss Mirjam NORDHAHL, Secretary, General Confederation of Trade Unions in Norway.

PAKISTAN

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Habibur RAHMAN, Ambassador of Pakistan, Berne.

Mr. Ali ASHRAF, Deputy Secretary, Labour and Social Welfare Division.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate


Adviser

Mr. M. Mujibul HUQ, C.S.P., Director of Labour, East Pakistan.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Syed WAJID ALI, President, Employers' Association of West Pakistan.

Adviser

Mr. T. A. T. LODHI, Employers' Association of West Pakistan.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Faiz AHMAD, Secretary-General, All-Pakistan Confederation of Labour; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Adviser

Mr. Rahmatulian CHOUDHURY, General Secretary, West Pakistan Federation of Labour.

PANAMA

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Rafael RIVERA, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Mr. Humberto CALAMARI G., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Permanent Delegate of Panama accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and to the International Labour Organisation; Representative of the Government of Panama on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
List of Members of Delegations, etc.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**
Mr. Virgilio R. AIZPÚRAA.

**WORKERS' DELEGATE**
Mr. Juan URRIOLA B.

**PERU**

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**
Mr. Edwin LETTS, Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Peru accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.
Mr. Guillermo GONZÁLEZ ROSALES, Director-General, Technical Advisory Service, Ministry of Labour and Indigenous Affairs.

**Advisers**
Mr. Guillermo SCHOOF GUTIÉRREZ, Director-General of Labour.
Mr. Luis GALLIANI WINDER, Chief of the Divisional Planning Office, Ministry of Labour and Indigenous Affairs.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**
Mr. Luis APARICIO VALDEZ.

**Adviser**
Mr. Alfredo de COSSÍO.

**WORKERS' DELEGATE**
Mr. Tomás AGUILAR LADEÓN de GUEVARA, Peruvian Workers' Confederation.

**Advisers**
Mr. Víctor FERRO SÁNCHEZ, General Union of Private Employees of Peru.
Mr. Carlos RENZO GREGO, Director, Peruvian Association of Travelling Salesmen.

**PHILIPPINES**

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**
Mr. Felicisimo OCAMPO, Chairman, Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations, House of Representatives.
Mr. Luciano JOSON, Member, House of Representatives.

**Advisers and Substitute Delegates**
Mr. Esmeraldo ECO, Deputy Minister of Labor; Chairman, Board of Directors, People's Homesites and Housing Corporation.
Mr. Arsenio MARTINEZ, Associate Judge, Court of Industrial Relations.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**
Mr. Jerzy OLSZEWSKI, Member of Parliament; Director, Chemical Works of Oswiecim.

**Advisers**
Mr. Gregorio IMPERIAL, Jr., President, Personnel Management Association of the Philippines.

**WORKERS' DELEGATE**
Mr. José J. HERNANDEZ, Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

**Advisor and Substitute Delegate**
Mr. Juan C. TAN.

**Advisers**
Mr. Democrito MENDOZA.
Mr. Pedro FERNANDEZ.

**POLAND**

**MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE**
Mr. Aleksander BURSKI, President, Labour and Wages Committee.

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**
Mr. Leon CHAJN, Member of Parliament; Member of the Council of State; former Vice-Minister of Labour and Social Welfare.
Mr. Jerzy LIOKI, Director, Labour and Wages Committee.

**Advisers and Substitute Delegates**
Mrs. Maria RUSINOWA, Chief of Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Wacław FRONCZAK, Chief of Division, Labour and Wages Committee.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**
Mr. Jan WISZKIELIS, Chief, International Relations Division, Central Council of Polish Trade Unions.

**Advisor and Substitute Delegate**
Mr. Arwid HANSEN, Chief of Section, Office of the Inspector-General of Labour Protection, Central Council of Polish Trade Unions.

**PORTUGAL**

**MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE**
Mr. José João GONÇALVES de PROENÇA, Minister of Corporations and Social Welfare.

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**
Mr. António Jorge da MOTA VEIGA, former Under-Secretary of State for Corporations and Social Welfare; Counsellor, Supreme Administrative Court; Member of the Corporate Chamber.
Mr. Alexandre RIBEIRO da CUNHA, Senior Inspector for Political Affairs, Ministry of Overseas Territories.

**Advisor and Substitute Delegate**
Mr. António Luís de NOVAIS MACHADO, Minister Plenipotentiary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

**Advisers**
Mr. António Maria da COSTA LEÃO, Chief Actuary, Directorate-General of Welfare and Low-Cost Housing; Chairman of the Organising Committee, National Employment Injury and Occupational Illness Insurance Fund.
Mr. João RAIOUNDO, Chief of the Occupational Safety and Health Section, Ministry of Corporations and Social Welfare.
Mr. António da SILVA LEAL, Assistant, Social and Corporative Research Centre.
Mr. Manuel Sebastião de ALMEIDA de CARVALHO DAUN e LORENA, Chief, International Relations Service, Ministry of Corporations and Social Welfare.
Mr. José Gregório de FARIÀ, Legation Attaché, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Hernani MORAIS e CASTRO, Assistant Inspector of Labour, Ministry of Corporations and Social Welfare.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. António MORALES de los RÍOS LEITÂO, Union of Resin Manufacturers' and Exporters' Associations; former Member of the Corporative Chamber.

**Adviser and Substitute Delegate**

Mr. Antonio MORALES de los RÍOS LEITÂO, Union of Resin Manufacturers' and Exporters' Associations; former Member of the Corporative Chamber.

**Advisers**

Mr. Eduardo Benedite A. FERREIRINHA, Engineer; Association of Metallurgical and Engineering Industries of the North.
Mr. Alberto SENA DA SILVA, National Association of Wholesalers and Distributors of Food Products.
Mr. Isaias GOMES GAUTIER, Association of Lisbon Bakers.
Mr. Gustavo NETO de MIRANDA, Employers' Associations of Angola.
Mr. Luís VAZ de ALMADA, Incomati Land Company, Mozambique.
Mr. Henrique SALGADO, Insurers' Association.

**WORKERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. Antonio LOPES RIBEIRO, President, National Union of Cinema Technicians; Member of the Corporative Chamber.

**Adviser and Substitute Delegate**

Mr. Pedro António MONTEIRO MAURY, Federation of Commerce Employees' Associations.

**Advisers**

Mr. Alberto SOBRAL, National Union of Insurance Agents, Lisbon District; Member of the Corporative Chamber.
Mr. João HENRIQUES DIAS, Regional Federation of Unions of Office Employees of the North.
Mr. José Gomes dos SANTOS CALISTO, President, National Federation of Unions of Printers, Lithographers and Allied Trades, Coimbra District.
Mr. Armando PEDROSO LIMA, National Union of Employees in Commerce and Industry of Mozambique.

**RUMANIA**

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**

Mr. Vasile DUMITRESCU, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of Romania, Berne.
Mr. Iacob IONASCO, Acting Representative of the People's Republic of Romania accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies.

**Advisers**

Mr. Nicolae ALEXE, Deputy Director, State Committee for Labour and Wages Questions.
Mr. Constantin FLITAN, Chief of Service, Directorate of International Organisations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Valeriu TUDOR, Third Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. Mireo GEORGHIU, Director, The Electrical Machinery Factory, Bucharest.

**WORKERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. Mihail ROB, Chief Deputy to the Head of the International Relations Division, Central Council of Trade Unions.

**Advisers**

Mr. Ion TICARAU, Chief of Service, International Relations Division, Central Council of Trade Unions.
Mr. Ion MUSA, Central Council of Trade Unions.

**RWANDA**

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**

Mr. Damien SEYOROKA, Inspector of Labour.
Mr. James MBONYIMANA, Adviser, Embassy of Rwanda in Brussels.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. DEGILAGE.

**WORKERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. Antoine NYANJWENGE.

**EL SALVADOR**

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**

Mr. Gustavo Adolfo GUERRERO, Ambassador, accredited to the European Office of the United Nations.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. Hamed GAYE, Chief of Personnel, Shell (Senegal) Company.

**WORKERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. Alioune CISSE.

**SIERRA LEONE**

**MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE**

Mr. Aloysius Joseph DEMBY, M.P., Minister responsible for the administration of Labour and Industrial Relations.

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**

Mr. M. A. E. DAVIES, Commissioner of Labour.
Mr. W. B. G. FAUX, Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Lands, Mines and Labour.
List of Members of Delegations, etc.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. J. C. D. SOLOMON, Director of the United Africa Company and of Messrs. Taylor Woodrow (Sierra Leone) Limited.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. H. N. GEORGESTONE, General Secretary, Sierra Leone Council of Labour.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Daniel Johannes GEYSER, Deputy Secretary for Labour, Labour Relations and Occupational Safety.
Mr. Isaac Johannes de VILLIERS, Under-Secretary for Labour (Work Security).

Advisers
Mr. Lukas Casparus LOOCK, Administrative Control Officer, International Labour Affairs Division, Department of Labour.
Mr. Alan John OXLEY, Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of South Africa, London.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. William Pindlay HAMILTON, Past President, National Federation of Building Trade Employers in South Africa.

Adviser
Mr. Roeland Gysbert DU PLESSIS, General Secretary, South African Motor Industry Employers' Association.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Johan Hauptfleisch LIEBENBERG, President, Artisan Staff Association.

Adviser
Mr. Richard Maxwell HALDANE, General Secretary, South African Society of Bank Officials; Senior Vice-President, Trade Union Council of South Africa.

SPAIN
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Ricardo GÓMEZ ACEBO y SANTOS, Under-Secretary of Labour.
Mr. José Manuel ANTELQUIROGA REDONDO, Permanent Delegate of Spain accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Victor FERNÁNDEZ GONZÁLEZ, Secretary-General, General Directorate of Labour Planning.

Advisers
Mr. Alfredo SANTOS BLANCO, General Technical Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Manuel ALONSO OLEA, Director-General of Employment.
Mr. José María GUERRA ZUNZUNEGUI, General Secretary, Labour Protection Fund.
Mr. Luis ARROYO AZNAR, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Spain accredited to the International Organisations in Geneva.
Mr. Fernando BENITO MESTRE, Director, Specialised Agencies.
Mr. Manuel TROYANO de los RÍOS, Chief, International Relations Section, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Félix de LEÓN GARCÍA de la BARGA, Chief of Section, General Technical Secretariat, Ministry of Labour.

By record vote on 21 June 1963 the Conference refused to admit the Workers' delegation to the 47th Session of the Conference.

Mr. José Ramón de CÁRDENAS RODRÍGUEZ, Chief, Central Section of the Labour Inspectorate.
Mr. José Maria ESTEBAN VARGAS, Chief, Vocational Counselling Section, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Alejandro HARGUNDEY SALMONTE, Labour Magistrate.
Mr. Victor de la SERNÁ, Information Officer, Permanent Delegation of Spain accredited to the International Organisations.
Mr. Manuel del VALLE PANDO, Labour Attaché, Spanish Embassy, Berne.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Luis GALDÓS GARCÍA, President, Central Economic Section, Chemical Industries Association.

Adviser
Mr. Pio Miguel IRURZÚN GOIOOA, Chief, Services Sector, Vice-Secretariat of Economic Planning.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Guillermo BLANCO CIPITRIA, Member of the Cortes, representing miners; President, Asturias Miners' Pension Fund.

SUDAN
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Major-General Mohamed Nasr OSMAN, Minister of Information and Labour.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Lt.-Col. Mohamed ABDEL-HALIM, Commissioner of Labour.
Mr. Mohamed Abdel Halim MAHGOUB, Assistant Director of Establishments, Ministry of Finance and Economics.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Ahmad Izz El-ARAB YOUSIF, Factory Inspector.
Mr. Abdel Monseim OMER, Vocational Training Centre.
Mr. Osman Mohamed AHMED, Manpower Office.
Mr. Ahmed Mohamed MOHAMED AHMED, Assistant Director of Establishments, Ministry of Finance and Economics.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Kamal ABDELMONEIM, Managing Director, Kamal Abdelmoneim International.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Ali Mukhtar AWADALLA, Workers' Trade Union of the Land Use and Rural Waters Department.

Adviser
Mr. Babikir KARRAR, Ministry of Local Government.

SWEDEN
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Sven ASPLING, Minister for Social Affairs, Labour and Housing.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Ernst MICHANEK, Secretary of State, Ministry of Social Affairs, Labour and Housing.
Mr. Ingemund BENGTTSSON, M.P., Special Adviser to the Ministry of Social Affairs, Labour and Housing.
Advisers

Mr. Sten-Eric HEINRICI, International Relations Division, Ministry of Social Affairs, Labour and Housing.

Mrs. Ingrid HILDING, Legal Adviser to the Ministry of Social Affairs, Labour and Housing.

Mr. Jan LAGERGREN, First Secretary, Ministry of Social Affairs, Labour and Housing.

Mr. Carl LIDBOM, Legal Adviser to the Ministry of Social Affairs, Labour and Housing.

Mr. Gunnar OLOFSSON, Chief of Division, Ministry of the Interior.

Mr. Yngve SAMUELSSON, Director-General, Labour Accidents Insurance Court.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Gullmar BERGENSTRÖM, Director, Swedish Employers' Confederation; Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. Erik FOESTADIUS, Director, Swedish Employers' Confederation.

Mr. Gideon GERHARDSSON, Graduate Engineer, Swedish Employers' Confederation.

Mr. Sven HYDÉN, Director, Pension Guarantee Insurance Company.

Mr. Lennart RUGFELT, Director, Swedish Commercial Employers' Association.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Bertil BOLIN, Director for International Affairs and Legal Adviser, Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Karl-Gustav KARLSSON, Engineer, Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions.

Advisers

Mr. Bert AHLGREN, Legal Adviser, Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions.

Mr. Lennart GEIJER, M.P.; Legal Adviser, Swedish Central Organisation of Salaried Employees.

Mr. Eric MAGNUSSON, President, Swedish Commercial Workers' Union.

SWITZERLAND

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Max HOLZER, Director, Federal Office of Industry, Arts and Crafts, and Labour; Honorary Professor, University of Berne.

Mr. Arnold SAXER, Director, in charge of Social Insurance Agreements.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate

Mr. Bernardo ZANETTI, Assistant Director, Federal Office of Industry, Arts and Crafts, and Labour; Lecturer, University of Fribourg.

Advisers

Mr. Cristoforo MOTTA, Assistant Director, Federal Office of Social Insurance.

Mr. Robert SCHAETTI, General Secretary, Swiss National Accident Insurance Fund.

Mr. Philippe de WEISSE, Federal Inspector of Factories, District No. 1.

Mr. Charles SCHLUCHTER, Assistant, Federal Office of Industry, Arts and Crafts, and Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Charles Kuntschen, Honorary Secretary, Central Federation of Swiss Employers' Associations; Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. Charles-A. DUBOIS, Secretary, Swiss Engineering Employers' Association.

Mr. Manfred FINK, Secretary, Swiss Federation of Arts and Crafts.

Mr. Hans RUDIN, Secretary, Swiss Textile Employers' Association.

Mr. Hans WEIERSMÜLLER, General Secretary, Swiss Association of Entrepreneurs.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Jean MÖR, Secretary, Swiss Federation of Trade Unions; Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers

Mr. Paul-Henri GAGNERIN, Vice-President, Swiss Federation of Trade Unions; Vice-President, Swiss Wood and Building Workers' Federation.

Mr. André GHELFI, Central Secretary, Swiss Federation of Metalworkers and Watchmakers.

Mr. Arnold MEIER-RAGG, General Secretary, Swiss Commercial Employers' Association; Member, Governing Board, Federation of Swiss Societies of Salaried Employees; Deputy, Zurich Grand Council.

Mr. Josef VONABURG, Secretary, Swiss Federation of National Christian Unions.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

Mr. Mansour ATTACHE, Minister of Social Affairs and Labour.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

Mr. Moussa CHAHOUD, Inspector-General, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour.

Mr. Rafic TEYLOUNI, Director-General of Social Insurance.

Advisers

Mr. Badi HAKKI, Counsellor, Embassy of the Syrian Arab Republic, Berne.

Mr. Khaled BARAZI, Third Secretary, Embassy of the Syrian Arab Republic, Berne.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Charif CHARABATI, President, General Federation of Employers' Associations.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Fozi BALI, President, General Federation of Workers' Unions.

TANGANYIKA

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE


GOVERNMENT DELEGATES

The Hon. K. R. BAGHDELLEH, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour.

Mr. J. B. MWENDA, Assistant Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE

Mr. Barclay LEECHMAN, C.M.G., O.B.E., Executive Director of the Tanganyika Sisal Growers' Association.

WORKERS' DELEGATE

Mr. A. C. TANDAU, Acting General Secretary, Tanganyika Federation of Labour.
THAILAND
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Thien ASHIKUL, Deputy Director-General, Public Welfare Department, Ministry of the Interior.
Mr. Porn UDOMPONG, Acting Chief of Labour Research and Statistics Division, Labour Bureau, Public Welfare Department, Ministry of the Interior.

TOGO
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Ombri PANA, Minister of Labour, Social Affairs and the Civil Service.
Mr. Joseph FLACCA.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Fausto SERMISONI.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. A. BARBEN.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
The Hon. Robert E. WALLACE, Minister of Labour.
Mr. J. E. M. ADAMS, Commissioner of Labour.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. W. E. NUNEZ, Employers' Consultative Association of Trinidad.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. S. ALEXANDER, Trinidad and Tobago National Trades Union Congress.

TUNISIA
GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Zouhir CHELLY, Tunisian Ambassador, Berne.
Mr. Mohamed ENNACEUR, Director of the Cabinet, Secretariat of State for Public Health and Social Affairs.

Advisers
Mr. Mohamed MEMMI, Deputy Permanent Representative of Tunisia accredited to the European Office of the United Nations; Representative of the Government of Tunisia on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Mr. Habib CHERIF, Chief of the Labour and Social Welfare Service.
Mr. Amor ABDELJAOUAD, Divisional Inspector of Labour; Substitute Representative of the Government of Tunisia on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Abdessalem ACHOUR, Deputy; Vice-President, Tunisian Association of Industry and Commerce (U.T.I.C.); Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Mohamed Ali DARGHOUTH, Member of the Administrative Committee, Tunisian Association of Industry and Commerce (U.T.I.C.) and of the Regional Committee for Tunis.
Mr. Mohamed el GHALI, Member of the Regional Committee for Tunis (U.T.I.C.).
Mr. Mohamed LETAIEF, Member of the Administrative Committee, National Union of Tunisian Agriculturists (U.N.A.T.).

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Habib ACHOUR, Deputy; General Secretary, Tunisian General Labour Union (U.G.T.T.).

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Mahmoud ben EZZEDDINE, Deputy General Secretary in charge of External Relations and Social Legislation, Tunisian General Labour Union (U.G.T.T.); Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Abdalaziz BOUJLAOUI, Deputy; Deputy General Secretary in charge of Finance and Internal Organisation, Tunisian General Labour Union (U.G.T.T.).
Mr. Salah GALAAOUI, Member of the Committee, Tunisian General Labour Union (U.G.T.T.).

TURKEY
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Bülent ECEVIT, Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Halit ÜNAL, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Ekmele ONBULAK, Director-General of Labour, Ministry of Labour.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Adnan TOYGAR, Member of the Research Department, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. H. Fahir ALAŞAM, Permanent Delegate of Turkey accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and to the International Labour Office.

Mr. Mustafa ERTEM, Director of Sickness Insurance, Directorate-General of Workers' Insurance.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Muhittin ALAM, Secretary-General, Izmir Chamber of Industry; Substitute Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Adviser
Mr. Haldun KIP, General Secretary, Confederation of Turkish Employers' Associations.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Melih DÖLEN, General Secretary, Turkish Tobacco, Drink, Food and Allied Workers' Federation; Representative of the Turkish Confederation of Trade Unions (TÜRK-IS).

Adviser
Mr. Mehmet INHANLI, President, Motor Vehicle, Electrical and Gas Industry Workers' Union.

UGANDA
MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
The Hon. A. A. OJERA, M.P., Minister of Community Development and Labour.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Eldad John BASAZA-MPYISI, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Community Development and Labour.
Mr. Martin Poyning BYERS, O.B.E., Labour Commissioner.
EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. James Mackay WALKER, Executive Officer, Federation of the Uganda Employers.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Eriabu KIBUKA, Vice-President, Uganda Trades Union Congress.

UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Sergei Aleksandrovich SLIPCHENKO, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Galii Efimovich BUVAILIK, Counsellor; Chief of the Social Questions Group, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. Mikhail Zakharovich GETMANETS, Chief of Section, Economic Research Institute, State Planning Authority.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Yuri Mikhailovich KHILCHEVSKII, First Secretary, Permanent Delegation to the European Office of the United Nations.
Mr. Viktor Gavrilovich BATYUK, Second Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Ivan Mitrofanovich PEIKHODKO, Director, Kremen chug Automobile Works.

WORKERS' DELEGATE
Mr. Eugene Ilarionovich EFBEMENKO, Secretary, Ukrainian Trade Union Council.

Adviser
Mr. Vladimir Ivanovich FILIPPOV, Lecturer; Master of Economic Science.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Aleksandr Petrovich VOLKOV, Chairman, State Labour and Wages Committee, Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Vasiliy Leonidovich EFBEMENKO, Secretary, Ukrainian Trade Union Council.

Adviser
Mr. Vladimir Ivanovich FILIPPOV, Lecturer; Master of Economic Science.

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

MINISTER ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE
Mr. Anwar SALAMA, Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT DELEGATES
Mr. Ibrahim EL-GHATRIFY, Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Hussein KAMEL, Director-General, Foreign Labour Relations Administration, Ministry of Labour.

Advisers and Substitute Delegates
Mr. Raouf ABOU-ALAM, Counsellor, Foreign Labour Relations Administration, Ministry of Labour.

Advisers
Mr. Mohammad Mohammad ABDEL-1ATIF, Director-General, Occupational Safety and Health Department, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Abdel-Haleem Ismail El-KADY, Consultant, Social Insurance Organisation.
Mr. El-Sayyed Salaheldin AYOUB, Consultant, Foreign Labour Relations Administration, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Mohammad El-SAID Mohammad KHAIRY, Secretary to the Minister of Labour.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. Mohammad Ali RIFAAAT, Member of the Board of Directors, Federation of Industries; Deputy Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

Advisers
Mr. Hussein Aly ORPHY, Chairman and Managing Director, El Nasr Tobacco and Cigarette Company.
Mr. Zaki BADAWI, Counsellor, Industrial Companies.

**WORKERS' DELEGATE**

Mr. Ahmad FAHEEM, President, U.A.R. General Federation of Trade Unions.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Ali Sayyd ALI, Vice-President, U.A.R. General Federation of Trade Unions.

Mr. Abdel-Raheem EZZELDIN, Vice-President, U.A.R. General Federation of Trade Unions.

**UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

Minister Attending the Conference
Mr. William WHITELAW, M.C., M.P., Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Labour.

**GOVERNMENT DELEGATES**

Mr. Gordon Charles Henry SLATER, C.B.E., Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour; United Kingdom Government Representative on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.
Mr. Ernest Alexander FERGUSON, Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Labour.

Advisers
Mr. Godfrey David CALDWELL, Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance.
Miss Winefred Evelyn COOMBES, Grade 4 Officer, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Ian Stewart DEWAR, Principal, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. George FOGGON, C.M.G., O.B.E., Labour Adviser to the Secretary for Technical Co-operation.
Mr. Charles Peter SCOTT, O.B.E., Permanent United Kingdom Representative to the European Office of the United Nations.
Mr. Patrick Cardinall Mason SEDGWICK, Commissioner of Labour, Hong Kong.
Mr. William SLINGER, Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Labour and National Insurance, Northern Ireland.
Mr. Michael William SMART, Principal, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. Anthony Frederick Arthur SUTHERLAND, Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. William Arthur TREGANOWAN, Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. John WATSON, O.B.E., Principal, Colonial Office.

Mr. Kenneth Arthur Frederick WOOLVERTON, Higher Executive Officer, Commonwealth Relations Office.

**EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE**

Sir George POLLOCK, Q.C., Director, British Employers' Confederation.

Adviser and Substitute Delegate
Mr. Douglas TAYLOR, C.M.G., International Secretary, British Employers' Confederation.

Advisers
Mr. Derek Vivian GAULTER, General Secretary, Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors.
Mr. Ernest Meredith HYDE-CLARKE, C.B.E., Director, Overseas Employers' Federation.
Mr. John Patrick LOWRY, Deputy Secretary, Engineering Employers' Federation.
Mr. Cecil Charles Dudley MILLER, Principal Assistant, International, British Employers' Confederation.
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1 Mr. Dreyer was elected President of the Conference on 18 June, following the resignation of Mr. Johnson.
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Mr. MÖBI (Switzerland).
Mr. BOB (Rumania).
Mr. SEIDMAN (United States).

Deputy Members
Mr. AMOE (Morocco).
Mr. BEERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. BOLIN (Sweden).
Mr. GREGOR (Czechoslovakia).
Mr. HEISE (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. KANE (Mauritania).
Mr. ROCCHI (Italy).
Mr. van TILBURG (Netherlands).
Mr. TURMAN (Liberia).

CHAIRMAN
Mr. VLACHOS.
VICE-CHAIRMEN
Mr. KUNTSCHEF.
Mr. KAPLAN.

Finance Committee of Government Representatives

Afghanistan : Mr. HAFIZULLAH.
Albania :
Algeria :
Argentina : Mr. CAMPORA.
Australia : Mr. FURLONGER.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegation Member(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Mr. HEMPEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Mr. SCHYNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Mr. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Mr. GAVILEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Mr. SHELDOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Mr. EFANGÉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Mr. BAUER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Mr. KUNASINGHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Mr. HUIDOBO DOMÍGUEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mr. LEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Mr. BAEBOZA-CABNEIEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Mr. KOMBOT-NAGUEMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Mr. SEDLÁK, PLEVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Mr. DREYER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Mr. RINNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Mr. HAUCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Mr. MÖNNIG, THOMAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Mr. BÉNYI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Mr. MEHTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Mr. MESSER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Mr. NATALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Mr. NEWLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Mr. CHIKARASHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>Mr. WONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Mr. PELINKHOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Mr. ZOHRAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Mr. BULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Mr. ASHRAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Mrs. RUSINOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Mr. RIBEIRO da CUNHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Mr. TUDOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Mr. LOOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Mr. BENITO MESTRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mr. OLOFSSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Mr. SAXBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>TANGANYIKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Mr. ASHAKUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>WALLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Mr. BUVAIIJK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>Mr. POZHARSKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Mr. SLATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Mr. GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Mr. BOSCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Mr. AGUILAR, LUIJÁN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet-Nam</td>
<td>Mr. NGUYÊN-Lê-Giang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen and Reporter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Mr. LOOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Mr. BENITO MESTRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mr. OLOFSSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Mr. SAXBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>TANGANYIKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Mr. ASHAKUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>WALLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Mr. BUVAIIJK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>Mr. POZHARSKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Mr. SLATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Mr. GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Mr. BOSCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Mr. AGUILAR, LUIJÁN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet-Nam</td>
<td>Mr. NGUYÊN-Lê-Giang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman and Reporter</td>
<td>Mr. MEHTA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman</td>
<td>Mr. NEWLAND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations**

**Government Members**

- **Algeria** : Mr. MISSOUM.
- **Australia** : Mr. DESMOND.
- **Belgium** : Mr. DENYS.
- **Brazil** : Mr. de FÁRIA BATISTA.
- **Bulgaria** : Mr. COHEN ; substitute : Mr. TOMOV.
- **Byelorussia** : Mr. CHERNUSHCHENKO ; substitute : Mr. PÉSHKOV.
- **Canada** : Miss LOEENTSEN.
- **Central African Republic** : Mr. KOMBOT-NAGUEMON.
- **Chad** : Mr. BOUSSOU.
- **Colombia** : Mr. JARAMILLO ARUBLA ; substitute : Mr. ARANGO.
- **Congo (Brazzaville)** : Mr. NOTE.
- **Congo (Leopoldville)** : Mr. MAISSE.
- **Costa Rica** : Mr. RODRÍGUEZ ARCE.
- **Cuba** : Mrs. RODRÍGUEZ HERNÁNDEZ ; substitute : Mr. ORTEGA SUÁREZ.
- **Cyprus** : Mr. DOSTÁL ; substitute : Mr. PLEVA.
- **Dahomey** : Mr. BORNA ; substitute : Mr. AGBOTON.
- **Ecuador** : Mr. RODRIGUEZ HERNÁNDEZ ; substitute : Mr. ORTEGA SUÁREZ.
- **Egypt** : Mr. BOUSSOU.
- **El Salvador** : Mr. AGUERO.
- **England** : Mr. SLATER.
- **France** : Mr. PARODI ; substitute : Mr. BOUDARD.
- **Gabon** : Mr. BOUSSOU.
- **Ghana** : Mr. MAISSE.
- **Greece** : Mr. PANARETOS ; substitute : Mr. PAXINOS.
- **Guinea** : Mr. KUNASINGHAM.
- **Honduras** : Mr. NELSON.
- **Italy** : Mr. NATALE.
- **Ireland** : Mr. MESSER.
- **Ivory Coast** : Mr. KOMBOT-NAGUEMON.
- **Jamaica** : Mr. NEWLAND.
- **Japan** : Mr. CHIKARASHI.
- **Jordan** : Mr. NATALE.
- **Kenya** : Mr. WONG.
- **Korea** : Mr. HAM.
- **Liberia** : Mr. BÖHMLER.
- **Libya** : Mr. BELHADJ.
- **Luxembourg** : Mr. DE WEVER.
- **Malaysia** : Mr. WONG.
- **Malawi** : Mr. KAMBARA.
- **Mali** : Mr. KAMBARA.
- **Mauritania** : Mr. OUMAR.
- **Mozambique** : Mr. ASSIS.
- **Namibia** : Mr. HAM.
- **Nepal** : Mr. RAI.
- **Netherlands** : Mr. DE GROOT.
- **New Zealand** : Mr. ZOHRAB.
- **Nicaragua** : Mr. BÉNITEZ.
- **Niger** : Mr. BOUH.
- **Nigeria** : Mr. BUMA.
- **Norway** : Mr. BULL.
- **Pakistan** : Mr. ASHRAF.
- **Panama** : Mr. BÉNITEZ.
- **Peru** : Mr. BÉNITEZ.
- **Philippines** : Mr. PADEO.
- **Poland** : Mr. WOJCIK.
- **Portugal** : Mr. RIBEIRO da CUNHA.
- **Romania** : Mr. TUDOR.
- **Rwanda** : Mr. RUGA.
- **Senegal** : Mr. MEHTA.
- **Sierra Leone** : Mr. OLOFSSON.
- **Spain** : Mr. BENITO MESTRE.
- **Sweden** : Mr. OLOFSSON.
- **Switzerland** : Mr. SAXBER.
- **Syrian Arab Republic** : Mr. CHIKAEISHI.
- **Tanzania** : Mr. NEWLAND.
- **Thailand** : Mr. ASHAKUL.
- **Tunisia** : Mr. NEWLAND.
- **Turkey** : Mr. KAYA.
- **Uganda** : Mr. BÉNITEZ.
- **Ukraine** : Mr. BÓLFI.
- **United Arab Republic** : Mr. BÖLFI.
- **United Kingdom** : Mr. SLATER.
- **United States** : Mr. GOOD.
- **Upper Volta** : Mr. BOUSSOU.
- **Uruguay** : Mr. BÓLFI.
- **Venezuela** : Mr. AGUILAR, LUIJÁN.
- **Viet-Nam** : Mr. NGUYÊN-Lê-Giang.
- **Yugoslavia** : Mr. MEHTA.
List of Members of Delegations, etc.

Iraq: Mr. AL-SAMARRAI; substitute: Mrs. AFNAN.

Israel: Mr. HARNIV.

Italy: Mr. PERAZZO; substitute: Mr. PELIOCIONI.

Ivory Coast: Mr. GRIS.

Liberia: Mr. COX.

Mali: Mr. KEITA.

Mauritania: Mr. OSUVOY AHMED.

Mexico: Mr. GARCIA.

Morocco: Mr. KAGHAD.

Nigeria: Mr. IGBO.

Norway: Mr. NANDRUP DAHL; substitute: Mr. ULSAKER.

Pakistan: Mr. ASHEAF.

Peru: Mr. GONZALEZ EOSALES.

Philippines: Miss EEYES.

Poland: Mr. LICE!; substitute: Mrs. BUSILOWA.

Portugal: Mr. da MOTTA VEIGA; substitutes: Mr. DAUN e LOEENA, Mr. de PABIA.

Rumania: Mr. FLITAN.

Senegal: Mr. DIOUF.

Spain: Mr. FEENÁNDEZ GONZÁLEZ; substitute: Mr. CÁBDENAS BODEÍGUEZ.

Sweden: Mr. LAGEEGEEN.

Switzerland: Mr. SCHLUCHTEE; substitute: Mr. MOTTA.

Tanganyika:

Togo: Mr. PANA.

Trinidad and Tobago: Mr. ADAMS.

Tunisia: Mr. CHELLY; substitute: Mr. MEMMI.

Turkey: Mr. UNAL.

Uganda: Mr. BASAZA-MPYISI.

Ukraine: Mr. GETMANETS.

U.S.R.: Mr. IVANOV; substitute: Mr. ASLAN.

United Kingdom: Mr. DEWAR; substitutes: Mr. SEDGWICK, Mr. WOOLERTON.

Upper Volta: Mr. BALIMA.

Venezuela: Mr. LEVEL OSUNA; substitute: Mr. GUZMÁN.

Yugoslavia: Mr. POPOVIĆ; substitute: Mrs. RADICANIN.

Deputy Members

Cameroon: Mr. EFANGE.

Chile: Mr. CONTRERAS.

China: Mr. CHENG.

Ethiopia: Mr. MEKURIA.

Indonesia: Mr. SAMIL.

Japan: Mr. YOSHIOKA.

Kuwait: Mr. MADKOUR.

Luxembourg: Mr. EHEN.

Sudan: Mr. Osman Mohamed AHMED.

United Arab Republic:

Observers

Bermuda: Mr. CHUDLEIGH.

Malta: Mr. ROSSIGNAUD.

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland: Mr. KENWORTHY.

Singapore: Mr. PANG.

EMPLOYERS' MEMBERS

Mr. CAMPANELLA; substitutes: Mr. CHERICONI, Mr. MOCHI-ONOBI (Italy).

Mr. COOPER; substitute: Mr. RICHARDS (Liberia).

Mr. FOURN (Dahomey).

Mr. GACIO FUERTE (Cuba).

Mr. KLECAN (Czechoslovakia).

Mr. KUNTSCHEN; substitutes: Mr. RUDIN, Mr. FINK (Switzerland).

Mr. LEITÃO; substitutes: Mr. BUSTORFF SILVA, Mr. SENA DA SILVA (Portugal).

Mr. LUND; substitute: Mr. POULSEN (Denmark).

Sir George POLLOCK; substitute: Mr. HYDECLARKE (United Kingdom).

Mr. REYES; substitute: Mr. ISIP (Philippines).

Mr. ROBINSON; substitute: Mr. PRÉCHETTE (Canada).

Deputy Members

Mr. ABDELMONEIM (Sudan).

Mr. GONZALES BLANCO; substitute: Mr. RAPOSO (Brazil).

Mr. GREUV; substitute: Mr. RANAWAKE (Ceylon).

Mr. KETTANI; substitute: Mr. ZENNOURI (Morocco).

Mr. OFURUM; substitute: Mr. LEWIS (Nigeria).

Mr. REBOUL (Chad).

Mr. SELVIG (Norway).

Mr. THEOCHARIDES; substitute: Mr. BULOCK (Cyprus).

Mr. WAGNER; substitutes: Mr. DENISE, Mr. VAN METER, Mr. PANTOS (United States).

Mr. WALINE; substitutes: Mr. LEBLANC, Mr. MERMILLOD, Mr. SAINTIGNY (France).

Mr. YLLANES EAMOS; substitute: Mr. CAMPUZANO ONATE (Mexico).

Observer

Mr. RICHMOND (Kenya).

WORKERS' MEMBERS

Mr. ABID ALI (India).

Mr. ALDERBS (Netherlands).

Mr. BAH (Guinea).

Mr. BARBEN (Togo).

Mr. BO-BOLIKO (Congo (Leopoldville)).

Mr. BRESSO (Uruguay).

Mr. COOL (Belgium).

Mr. EFREMMENKO (Ukraine).

Mr. FLISSI (Algeria).

Mr. HEWITT (United Kingdom).

Mr. JUMAH (Libya).

Mr. KELLY (Jamaica).

Mr. KEREN-ZVI (Israel).

Mr. KOCANI (Albania).

Mr. LOUET (France).

Mr. MBANGE (Cameroon).

Mr. MEANY (United States).

Mr. MENDOZA (Philippines).

Mr. MORAIS (Canada).

Mr. MUSA (Rumania).

Mr. NILSSON (Finland).

Mr. OBUKHOVICH (Byelorussia).

Mr. PEDROSO LIMA (Portugal).

Mr. PONGAUT (Congo (Brazzaville)).

Mr. RAFALIMANANA (Malagasy Republic).

Mr. TAOZ (Yugoslavia).

Mr. VONARBURG (Switzerland).

Mr. WAGNER (Luxembourg).

Mrs. WEBER (Federal Republic of Germany).

Mr. WISZKIELIS (Poland).
Deputy Members
Mr. ALIOUA (Morocco).
Mr. ANNAIHUM (Libya).
Mr. DAVID (Malaya).
Mr. FAEINE (France).
Mr. FILIPPOV (Ukraine).
Mr. GONZÁLEZ ASCANIO (Venezuela).
Mr. HALDEN (Norway).
Mr. HEISE (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. KABORE (Upper Volta).
Mr. EAPLANSKY (Canada).
Mr. MAETUCCI (Italy).
Mr. SANTOS (Brazil).
Mr. SCHOCKMEL (Luxembourg).
Mr. SEIDMAN (United States).
Mr. SEMOKO YAMAEA (Tchad).
Mr. STAPFOED da SILVA (Brazil).
Mr. THONDAMAN (Ceylon).
Mr. UEEIOLA (Panama).
Mr. YAMADA (Japan).

Observers
Mr. DEVAN-NAIR, Mr. HO, Mr. HSU (Singapore).
Mr. SIMMONS (Bermuda).
Mr. WATSON (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).

Chairman
Mr. CHELLY.

Vice-Chairman and Acting Reporter
Mr. LAGERGREN.¹

Vice-Chairmen
Mr. POULSEN.
Mr. COOL.

Reporter
Mr. IGBO.

Committee on Guarding of Machinery

Government Members
Algeria: Mr. BUNKER.
Austria: Mr. BENISCHKE.
Belgium: Mr. DE WAEL.
Brazil: Mr. DEWY.
Cameroon: Mr. BOWEN.
Canada: Mr. AITKEN.
Cyprus: Mr. SHEKVET.
Denmark: Mr. DRACHMANN.
Ecuador: Mr. HAILE SEELASSIE.
France: Mr. LAFARGE; substitute: Mr. JODELET.
Federal Republic of Germany: Mr. BÖHM; substitute: Mr. KRÄMER.
Ghana: Mr. NETTEY.
Guinea: Mr. FOAUD.
India: Mr. DUBE.
Iran: Mr. AZIMI.
Ireland: Mr. O'GORMAN; substitute: Mr. O'LEARY.
Italy: Mr. CAVALARIN.
Jamaica: Mr. DOSHO; substitute: Mr. KITAMURA.
Kuwait: Mr. AL-BIKAA'T.
Lebanon: Father LE GENISI.
Luxembourg: Mr. SCHUETER.
Netherlands: Mr. ELDERING; substitute: Mr. BEZEMEL.
New Zealand: Mr. WOODS.
Nigeria: Mr. YOUNG.
Norway: Mr. OTNAESS.
Philippines: Mr. ULSAKER; substitute: Mr. KITAMURA.
Senegal: Mr. de LEÓN; substitute: Mr. HAR-GUINDEY.
Sweden: Mr. HILDING.
Switzerland: Mr. SCHAETTI; substitute: Mr. DE LAINE.
Turkey: Mr. TOYGAR.
Uganda: Mr. BYERS.
U.S.S.R.: Mr. BORODADINE; substitute: Mrs. PILIPCHUK.
United Arab Republic: Mr. NOUR.
United Kingdom: Mr. SUTHELAND.
United States: Mr. WALLACH.
Venezuela: Mrs. NOUEL.

Employers' Members
Mr. AL-JADIR (Iraq).
Mr. ALAM; substitute: Mr. KIP (Turkey).
Mr. BERGENSTROM; substitute: Mr. GERHARDSSON, Mr. RUGFELT, Mr. FORSTADUS, Mr. HYDEN (Sweden).
Mr. GONZALES BLANCO; substitute: Mr. MARTINS ABELHEIRA, Mr. BRANDAO FILHO (Brazil).
Mr. CAMPANELLA; substitute: Mr. CALVANO, Mr. CHERICONI (Italy).
Mr. CHANG; substitute: Mr. KUO (China).
Mr. FAUBEL; substitute: Mr. DOETSCH, Mr. GASDE, Mr. KAULEN, Mr. SCHLOTFELDT (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. FERRIER; substitute: Mr. ANDERSON (Australia).
Mr. MALA; substitute: Mr. IRURZUN (Spain).
Mr. GHEORGHIU (Romania).
Mr. MABOUNGOU M'BIMBA (Congo (Brazzaville)).
Sir George POLLOCK; substitute: Mr. MILLER, Mr. WATSON (United Kingdom).
Mr. RIPPAAT; substitute: Mr. ORPHE (United Arab Republic).
Mr. ROBINSON; substitute: Mr. WATT (Canada).
Mr. VUCO (Yugoslavia).
Mr. WAGNER; substitute: Mr. DENISE (United States).

¹ Mr. Lagergren was elected Vice-Chairman and Acting Reporter following the departure of Mr. Chelly and Mr. Igbo.
List of Members of Delegations, etc.

Deputy Members

Mr. FENNEMA; substitutes: Mr. MAURITZ, Mr. RENAUD (Netherlands).
Mr. KETTANI (Morocco).
Mr. KUNTSCHEN; substitutes: Mr. DUBOIS, Mr. WEIERSMÜLLER (Switzerland).
Mr. LEITÃO; substitute: Mr. FERREIRINHA (Portugal).
Mr. MARTÍNEZ ESPINO; substitutes: Mr. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CASAS RINOON (Venezuela).
Mr. OFUBUM; substitute: Mr. KEYLOCK (Nigeria).
Mr. BEYES; substitute: Mr. IMPEBAL (Philippines).
Mr. MABITNEZ ESPINO; substitutes: Mr. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CASAS KINCÓN (Venezuela).
Mr. SOLOMON (Sierra Leone).
Mr. PREBCHUEEEN; substitutes: Mr. LEPAGE, Mr. PIBON (Belgium).
Mr. WAJID ALI; substitute: Mr. LODHI (Pakistan).
Mr. WALINE; substitutes: Mr. BOUVIEE, Mr. MEEMILLOD (France).

WORKERS’ MEMBERS

Mr. DALZIEL (New Zealand).
Mr. DANLADI (Nigeria).
Mr. EZZELDIN (United Arab Republic).
Mr. GEOFFBOY (Canada).
Mr. HANSEN (Poland).
Mr. JAVAUX (Belgium).
Mr. KAELSSON (Sweden).
Mr. KEENAN (United States).
Mr. Kuukkanen (Finland).
Mr. de MEFEMBOUG (France).
Mr. O’HAGAN (United Kingdom).
Mr. Eachini (Argentina).
Mr. SCHÜSSLER (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. TAKEHANA (Japan).
Mr. Tsyganov (U.S.S.R.).

Deputy Members

Mr. ANTONIO RUEDA (Mexico).
Mr. BEARD (United Kingdom).
Mr. BERRADA (Morocco).
Mr. BROWN (Australia).
Mr. DURGAWAT (India).
Mr. FAUPL (United States).
Mr. GOMES de CASTRO (Brazil).
Mr. MCGILL (Liberia).
Mr. MONTAGNANI (Italy).
Mr. NILSSON (Finland).
Mr. dos SANTOS CALISTO (Portugal).

Observers

Mr. DUBE (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).
Mr. PACE (Malta).
Mr. WATSON (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).

Chairman

Mr. DRACHMANN.

Vice-Chairmen

Mr. MILLER.
Mr. O’HAGAN.

Committee on Termination of Employment

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

Afghanistan: Mr. GHOUSY.
Algeria: Mr. TAMZALI; substitute: Mr. DJILANI.
Argentina: Mr. VILLAVEIRAN.
Australia: Mr. BLAND; substitute: Miss STEPHEN.
Austria: Mr. SCHELLENBACHER.
Belgium: Mr. FRANCHIMONT.
Burma: Mr. HTAIK.
Cameroon: Mr. FOKAM KAMGA.
Canada: Mr. ADAMS.
Central African Republic:
Ceylon: Mr. WIJEWICKEREMA; substitute: Mr. KUNASINGHAM.
Colombia: Mr. JARAMILLO ARRUBLA; substitute: Mr. ARKANGO.
Congo (Brazzaville): Mr. NOTE.
Congo (Leopoldville): Mr. MUHONA; substitute: Mr. MAKWAMBALA.
Costa Rica: Mr. GUARDIA.
Cuba: Mr. ORTEGA SUÁREZ; substitute: Mr. RODRÍGUEZ.
Cyprus: Mr. SPARISI.
Czechoslovakia: Mr. SOUKUP; substitute: Mr. DOSTÁL.
Daromey:
Denmark: Mr. COLN; substitute: Mr. LOFT.
Ethiopia: Mr. HAILE SELASSIE; substitute: Mr. MERERIA.
France: Mr. MEUNIER.
Federal Republic of Germany: Mr. ZSCHOCHE.
Ghana: Mr. ESSUMAN.
Greece: Mr. GIORGAS.
Guinea: Mr. FOUAD.
Honduras: Mr. NUÑEZ; substitute: Mr. MARTÍNEZ.
India: Mr. MEHTA.
Indonesia:
Iran: Mr. AZAM.
Iraq: Mr. AL-WAKIL.
Ireland: Mr. MacCARTHY; substitute: Mr. O’LEARY.
Israel: Mr. RADAY.
Italy: Mr. PURPURA.
Ivory Coast:
Jamaica: Mr. MOWATT.
Japan: Mr. KUNOGI; substitute: Mr. YOSHIOKA.
Jordan: Mr. HAJJAWI.
Kuwait: Mr. SARAWI; substitute: Mr. IDRIS.
Lebanon: Mr. ABI RAAD.
Liberia: Mr. WILSON.
Luxembourg: Mr. MEUNIER.
Malagasy Republic: Mr. JARISON.
Malaya: Mr. TAMBOU.
Mali:
Mexico: Mr. SANTOS COY PEREA; substitute: Mr. GONZALEZ.
Netherlands: Mr. FAGEL.
New Zealand: Mr. ATKINSON.
Nigeria: Mr. LABINJO; substitute: Mr. GUBUWU.
Norway: Mr. BULL; substitute: Mr. ULALKER.
Pakistan: Mr. LATIF.
Panama:
Philippines: Mr. ECO.
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Poland: Mr. FRONCZAK.

Rumania: Mr. SIDIBE.

Sierra Leone: Mr. DAVIES.

Spain: Mr. HARGUINDEY; substitute: Mr. OLEA.

Sudan: Mr. MAHGOUB.

Sweden: Mr. SAMUELSSON.

Switzerland: Mr. ZANETTI.

Tanganyika: Mr. MWENDA.

Turkey: Mr. ONBULAK.

U.S.R.: Mr. ASLANYAN.

U.S.S.R.: Mr. DOUTY.

Uruguay: Mr. GUZMAN; substitute: Mr. PÉREZ (Chiriboga).

Viet-Nam: Mr. DOAN-Van-Doan.

Deputy Members

Brazil: Mr. da NÓBREGA FILHO; substitute: Mr. VALLE.

Ecuador: Mr. VALENCIA.

Finland: Mr. DENDÉ.

Gabon: Mr. DOUTY.

Honduras: Mr. MAHGOUB.

Kenya: Mr. AL-JADIR; substitutes: Mr. HASEEB, Mr. AL-SHERIF (Iraq).

Lebanon: Mr. HETEMÁKI; substitutes: Mr. MILDH, Mr. LAATUNEN, Mr. STRANDÉN, Mr. VIHMA (Finland).

Liberia: Mr. KOLOSHIN (Byelorussia).

Lithuania: Mr. LEECHMAN (Lithuania).

Mali: Mr. MAHGOUB.

Malta: Mr. ABI-JUNEJIA.

Mexico: Mr. AL-MASEI; substitute: Mr. DAJANI (Jordan).

Mongolia: Mr. MAUNG (Burma).

Morocco: Mr. HETEMÁKI; substitutes: Mr. HASEEB, Mr. AL-SHEEIFI (Iraq).

Netherlands: Mr. FENNEMA; substitutes: Mr. PEYNENBURG, Mr. GEERKENS (Netherlands).

Pakistan: Mr. AL-TUWAINI.

Peru: Mr. BANDEES; substitutes: Mr. ANGELOU (Greece), Mr. BEKTI (Indonesia).

Philippines: Mr. DAKHIL; substitute: Mr. LANGHI (Libya).

Poland: Mr. FRONCZAK.

Rumania: Mr. SIDIBE.

Sierra Leone: Mr. DAVIES.

Spain: Mr. HARGUINDEY; substitute: Mr. OLEA.

Sudan: Mr. MAHGOUB.

Sweden: Mr. SAMUELSSON.

Switzerland: Mr. ZANETTI.

Tanganyika: Mr. MWENDA.

Turkey: Mr. ONBULAK.

U.S.R.: Mr. ASLANYAN.

U.S.S.R.: Mr. DOUTY.

Uruguay: Mr. GUZMAN; substitute: Mr. PÉREZ (Chiriboga).

Viet-Nam: Mr. DOAN-Van-Doan.

Deputy Members

Brazil: Mr. da NÓBREGA FILHO; substitute: Mr. VALLE.

Ecuador: Mr. VALENCIA.

Finland: Mr. DENDÉ.

Gabon: Mr. DOUTY.

Honduras: Mr. MAHGOUB.

Kenya: Mr. AL-JADIR; substitutes: Mr. HASEEB, Mr. AL-SHERIF (Iraq).

Lebanon: Mr. HETEMÁKI; substitutes: Mr. MILDH, Mr. LAATUNEN, Mr. STRANDÉN, Mr. VIHMA (Finland).

Liberia: Mr. KOLOSHIN (Byelorussia).

Lithuania: Mr. LEECHMAN (Lithuania).

Mali: Mr. MAHGOUB.

Malta: Mr. ABI-JUNEJIA.

Mexico: Mr. AL-MASEI; substitute: Mr. DAJANI (Jordan).

Mongolia: Mr. MAUNG (Burma).

Morocco: Mr. HETEMÁKI; substitutes: Mr. HASEEB, Mr. AL-SHEEIFI (Iraq).

Netherlands: Mr. FENNEMA; substitutes: Mr. PEYNENBURG, Mr. GEERKENS (Netherlands).

Pakistan: Mr. AL-TUWAINI.

Peru: Mr. BANDEES; substitutes: Mr. ANGELOU (Greece), Mr. BEKTI (Indonesia).

Philippines: Mr. DAKHIL; substitute: Mr. LANGHI (Libya).

Poland: Mr. FRONCZAK.

Rumania: Mr. SIDIBE.

Sierra Leone: Mr. DAVIES.

Spain: Mr. HARGUINDEY; substitute: Mr. OLEA.

Sudan: Mr. MAHGOUB.

Sweden: Mr. SAMUELSSON.

Switzerland: Mr. ZANETTI.

Tanganyika: Mr. MWENDA.

Turkey: Mr. ONBULAK.

U.S.R.: Mr. ASLANYAN.

U.S.S.R.: Mr. DOUTY.

Uruguay: Mr. GUZMAN; substitute: Mr. PÉREZ (Chiriboga).

Viet-Nam: Mr. DOAN-Van-Doan.
Mr. JONCKHEERE; substitute: Mr. LOMBOTO
(Congo (Leopoldville)).
Mr. KETTANI; substitute: Mr. KERMAUDI
(Morocco).
Mr. KUNTSCHEN; substitutes: Mr. FINK,
Mr. BUDIN (Switzerland).
Mr. MAESHALL (Jamaica).
Mr. MAUTNER-MARKHOF; substitute: Mr.
TUTSCHKA (Austria).
Mr. MONT BALMACEDA (Chile).
Mr. PICABD (Central African Republic).
Mr. EIPAAT; substitute: Mr. BADAWI
(United Arab Republic).
Mr. GEBBEGZIABHEB (Ethiopia).
Mr. TEAN-Van-Lôc (Viet-Nam).
Observers
Mr. PLOWMAN (Bermuda).
Mr. POETELLI (Malta).
Mr. CAMEBON (Federation of Rhodesia and
Nyasaland).
Mr. THIO (Singapore).
WORKERS' MEMBERS
Mr. ALBEDA (Netherlands).
Mr. ALEXANDEE (Trinidad and Tobago).
Mr. ALI (United Arab Republic).
Mr. BEHANZIN PAOLETTI (Dahomey).
Mr. BLANCO CIPITEIA (Spain).
Mr. DAM-Sy-Hien (Viet-Nam).
Mr. DIALLO (Mali).
Mr. DJEEMANE (Algeria).
Mr. DÖLEN (Turkey).
Mr. DUGAWAT (India).
Mr. FAGBENBO BEYIOKU (Nigeria).
Mr. FALL (Mauritania).
Mr. FALL TÉLÉMAQUE (Central African Re-
public).
Mr. FERNANDEZ (Philippines).
Mr. FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina).
Mr. FERRO SÁNCHEZ (Peru).
Mr. FILIPPOV (Ukraine).
Mr. FOEVIE (Ghana).
Mr. GAGNEBIN (Switzerland).
Mr. GALAAOUI (Tunisia).
Mr. GEIJEE (Sweden).
Mr. GEORGESTONE (Sierra Leone).
Mr. GRIGORIEV (U.S.S.R.).
Mr. HALDANE (Republic of South Africa).
Mr. HALEN (Norway).
Mr. HANKE (Poland).
Mr. HILL (United Kingdom).
Mr. IVANOV (Bulgaria).
Mr. JAAFAR (Kuwait).
Mr. KABORE (Upper Volta).
Mr. KHOURY (Lebanon).
Mr. KIBUKA (Uganda).
Mr. KOFFI (Ivory Coast).
Mr. LIANG (China).
Mr. MAURY (Portugal).
Mr. McPHERSON (Jamaica).
Mr. MERCADO (Colombia).
Mr. MONNEROT (France).
Mr. NAPIER (New Zealand).
Mr. NYANJWENGE (Rwanda).
Mr. PEREIRA (Australia).
Mr. PINTHER (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mrs. POPOVIĆ (Yugoslavia).
Mr. POTOPFSKY (United States).
Mr. SALEH (Jordan).
Mr. SANGUINO (Uruguay).
Mr. SCHEER (Austria).
Mr. SIWA (Congo (Leopoldville)).
Mr. THONDAMAN (Ceylon).
Mr. TICÁRAU (Romania).
Mr. VÁLIKANGAS (Finland).
Mr. VAN ROMPAEY (Belgium).
Mr. VOSHZINA (Israel).
Mr. WALKER-ANGUILLET (Gabon).
Mr. WALTER (Canada).
Mr. WEISS (Luxembourg).
Mr. YASSEEN (Iraq).
Mr. YEOH (Malaysia).
Mr. ZIVANAS (Cyprus).
Deputy Members
Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan).
Mr. ARACENA (Chile).
Mr. BOLIN (Sweden).
Mr. CHOUHURY (Pakistan).
Mr. DESSEY (Bulgaria).
Mr. GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica).
Mr. GREGOR (Czechoslovakia).
Mr. HACHEMY (Iran).
Mr. HANNES (Poland).
Mr. HARAGUCHI (Japan).
Mr. INHANLI (Turkey).
Mr. JUMAH (Libera).
Mr. KATZBACH (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. LASCARES (Greece).
Mr. LENNON (Chile).
Mr. MACGOUGAN (Ireland).
Mr. MAYORGA (Mexico).
Mr. NILSSON (Finland).
Mr. SEYFI (Iran).
Mr. SOARES TELLES (Brazil).
Mr. TABARRI (Italy).
Mr. URRIGA (Venezuela).
Mr. WEERASEKERA (Ceylon).
Deputy Members
Mr. DUBE (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).
Mr. HO, Mr. HSU (Singapore).
Mr. PACE (Malta).
Mr. CARTER (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasa-
land).
Mr. BAND.
Mr. YLLANES RAMOS.
Mr. GEIJEE.
Mr. DOUTY.
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GOVERNMENT MEMBERS
Argentina:
Australia: Mr. WALSH.
Austria: Mr. STOCKER; substitute: Mrs. CAR-
MINE.
Belgium: Mr. UYTDENHOEF; substitute: Mr.
BLADEL.
Brazil: Mr. da NÓBREGA FILHO.
Burma: Mr. Khint MAUNG.
Byelorussia: Mr. GURINOVICH; substitute:
Mr. BORSHOEVSKII.
Cameroon: Mr. BOWEN.
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Canada: Mr. WINDISH.
Central African Republic: Mr. KUNASINGHAM.
Chile: Congoland: Miss KABASUBABO; substitute: Mr. KOKO.
Costa Rica: Mr. HERNÁNDEZ BRENES.
Finland: Mr. KANKRYVA.
France: Mr. LAFARGE; substitute: Mr. JODELET.
Federal Republic of Germany: Mr. GREINERT; substitute: Mr. BÖHM.
Guinea: Mr. FOUAD.
India: Mr. ZAMAN.
Iran: Mr. BEHNAM.
Ireland: Mr. O'LEAEY.
Italy: Mr. BESSENO; substitute: Mr. PEEAZZO.
Ivory Coast: Mr. HERNÁNDEZ BRENES.
Jamaica: Mr. TAKIZAWA.
Japan: Mr. YASSIN.
Liberia: Mr. ABI RAAD.
Lebanon: Mr. ABI RAAD.
Luxembourg: Mr. FAUBEL; substitutes: Mr. DOESCHEL, Mr. HEEMICHEN, Mr. DOETSCH (Federal Republic of Germany).
Malaysia: Mr. WONG.
Mexico: Mr. de SANTIAGO LÓPEZ.
Netherlands: Dr. BEZEMEE; substitute: Mr. ELDERING.
New Zealand: Miss STOKES.
Nigeria: Miss EKPIKEN.
Netherlands: Mr. OTNAESS; substitute: Mr. UL-SAKEE.
Philippines: Mr. MARTINEZ.
Portugal: Mr. MOEAIS e CASTELO.
Sierra Leone: Mr. FAUX.
Sudan: Mr. EL-AEAB YOUSIF.
Syrian Arab Republic: Mr. GATTI (Italy).
U.S.S.R.: Mr. APARICIO VALDEZ; substitute: Mr. de COSSIÓ (Peru).
Upper Volta: Mr. APAEICIO VALDEZ; substitute: Mr. de COSSIÓ (Peru).

Deputy Members

Mr. APAEICIO VALDEZ; substitute: Mr. de COSSIÓ (Peru).
Mr. DESCHEMIN (Upper Volta).
Mr. GONZALES BLANCO; substitutes: Mr. BIBERON, Mr. da SILVA (Brazil).
Mr. LEITÁO; substitute: Mr. GOMES GAUTIER (Portugal).
Mr. MARTINEZ ESPINO; substitutes: Mr. CASAS RONCÓN, Mr. VILLALOBOS (Venezuela).
Mr. OFUEUM; substitute: Mr. HUGHES (U.S.S.R.).
Mr. POLLOCK; substitute: Mr. GALLER (United Kingdom).
Mr. REYNOLDS (Canada).

Workers' Members

Mr. ALMOZNY (Argentina).
Mr. BENITZ BENITEZ (Honduras).
Mr. FITZPATRICK (Ireland).
Mr. GATTI (Italy).
Dame Anne GODWIN (Ireland).
Mr. HENRIQUES DIAS (Portugal).
Mr. HEZRONI (Israel).
Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia).
Mr. MEIEB-BAGG (Switzerland).
Mr. SEZNOU (Cyprus).
Mr. SIMMONS (Canada).
Mr. SKRITZEK (Austria).
Mrs. SPTALIEVA (U.S.S.R.).
Mr. SULLIVAN (United States).
Mr. TSANGABIDES (Cyprus).
Mr. UDOKPOBO (Nigeria).
Mr. VERDONCK (Belgium).
Mr. VOGNJERG (Denmark).
Mr. WILLEMS (Netherlands).
Mr. ZEINATI (Lebanon).
Mr. ZIEMANN (Federal Republic of Germany).

Deputy Members
Mr. ALI (United Arab Republic).
Mr. ANANDAN (India).
Mr. FALL (Mauritania).
Mr. HANSEN (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. LAZÁR (Hungary).
Mr. LENNON (Chile).
Mr. HANSEN (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. LAZAE (Hungary).
Mr. LENNON (Chile).
Mr. PECCI (Italy).
Mr. SARR (Senegal).
Mr. SKODA (Austria).
Mr. Theisen (Luxembourg).
Mr. VAN ROMPAEY (Belgium).

Observer
Mr. PACE (Malta).

Chairman
Mr. Gurinovich.

Vice-Chairmen
Mr. Viegh-Garzón.
Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Reporter
Mr. Uytdenhoeof.

Committee on Social Security

Government Members
Algeria : Mr. AKROUF.
Argentina : Mr. ETALA.
Australia : Mr. WEBB.
Austria : Mr. SCHUH ; substitute : Mr. STOCKER.
Belgium : Mr. PETIT.
Burma : Mr. Tin.
Cameroon : Mrs. DOO KINGUE ; substitutes : Dr. BOYEN, Mr. LOTTIN.
Canada : Mr. MARINEAU ; substitute : Mr. PAMMET.
Central African Republic : Mr. FOLLOW.
Chile : Mr. TORRES CERECEDA ; substitute : Mr. ORLANDINI.
China : Mr. Hu.
Congo (Brazzaville) : Mr. REVEL.
Congo (Leopoldville) : Mr. MAKWAMBALA.
Costa Rica : Mr. GONZÁLES QUIRÓS ; substitute : Mr. GUARDIA URIBE.
Cuba : Mr. DHOANZI.
Denmark : Mr. JUHL-CHRISTENSEN ; substitute : Mr. FRANSDEN.
Equador : Mr. VALENCIA ; substitute : Mr. VAREA.
France : Mrs. NETTER.
Gabon : Mr. DENDE ; substitutes : Mr. BOUMAH, Mr. AMAURY.
Federal Republic of Germany : Mr. SCHWARZ.
Greece : Mr. PAXINOS.
Guinea : Mr. FOUDA.
Honduras : Mr. MARTÍNEZ AUGUSTINUS.
Hungary : Mr. TOPALOVICH.
Iran : Mr. Achety.
Iraq : Mr. KHALIL.
Italy : Mr. CAPORASO ; substitute : Mr. PELLICIONI.
Ivory Coast : Mr. KOFFI KOUASSI.
Jamaica : Mr. NEWLAND.
Japan : Mr. ADACHI ; substitute : Mr. NOMICYAMA.
Jordan : Mr. ABDEL-MAIZ.
Kuwait : Mr. MADKOUR.
Lebanon : Father LE GENESE.
Libya : Mr. FREEMAN.
Luxembourg : Mr. NOSBUSCH ; substitutes : Mr. EYEN, Mr. MERTZ, Mr. REIFFERS.
Malaya : Mr.Foo.
Malagasy Republic : Mr. RANJEVA.
Mali : Mauritania : Mr. Alassane.
Mexico : Mr. SÁNCHEZ JUÁREZ.
Morocco : Mr. GOURJA.
Netherlands : Mr. van de VEN ; substitute : Mr. DORPMA.
Nigeria : Mr. OBI.
Norway : Mr. JOHNSEN.
Pakistan : Mr. HUQ.
Panama : Mr. RIVERA.
Philippines : Mr. MARTIN.
Portugal : Mr. da COSTA LEÃO.
Rumania : Mr. ALEXE ; substitute : Mr. TUDOR.
Senegal : Mr. LÖ.
Sierra Leone : Mr. DAVIES.
Spain : Mr. ESTEBAN VARGAS ; substitute : Mr. ALONSO OLEA.
Sweden : Mr. LIDBOM.
Switzerland : Mr. SAXER ; substitute : Mr. MOTT.
Togo : Mr. PIACCA.
Tunisia : Mr. CHERIF.
Turkey : Mr. ERTEM.
Uganda : Mr. U.S.S.R : Mr. LANTSEV.
United Arab Republic : Mr. EL-KADY ; substitute : Mr. ABDEL-LATIF.
United Kingdom : Mr. CALDWELL.
United States : Mr. REAM.
Uruguay : Mr. BRUNI ; substitutes : Mr. BLANCO GONZÁLEZ, Mr. GONZÁLEZ BOGEN.
Viet-Nam : Mr. PHAN-Trong-Nhiem.
Yugoslavia : Mrs. RADIČANIN.

Deputy Members
Chad : Mr. ACHOUR ; substitute : Mr. el GHALI (Tunisia).
Colombia : Mr. GONZÁLEZ.
India : Mr. MEHTA ; substitute : Mr. DUBE.
Israel : Mr. HARNIV.
Peru : Mr. GALLIANI.
Sudan : Mr. Ahmed MOHAMED AHMED.
Syrian Arab Republic : Mr. Al-JABIR ; substitutes : Mr. AL-DJAJIL, Mr. AL-FADHLI (Iraq).

Employers' Members
Mr. HANNERMAN-MENSON ; substitute : Mr. BOATENG (Ghana).
Mr. BERGENSTRÖM ; substitutes : Mr. HYDÉN, Mr. RUGFELT, Mr. FORSTADIUS, Mr. GERMARSSON (Sweden).
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Mr. CAMPANELLA; substitutes: Mr. MISSERVILLE, Mr. GIOVE, Mr. BOCCARDI (Italy).
Mr. COOPER; substitute: Mr. RYAN (Liberia).
Mr. DEMBELE (Mali).
Mr. FAUBEL; substitutes: Mr. DOETSCH, Mr. SCHENK, Mr. SCHLOTFELDT (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. FENNEMA; substitute: Mr. NOLEN (Netherlands).
Mr. FEEIEE; substitute: Mr. McDOUGALL (Australia).
Mr. GHAYOUB; substitutes: Mr. MALEKNIA, Mr. ZANGANEH JAHANBAKHSH (Iran).
Mr. GONZALES BLANCO; substitute: Mr. WAGNEE BATTENDIEEI (Brazil).
Mr. GUTIÉBBEZ MATABEITA (Costa Rica).
Mr. HETEMAKI; substitutes: Mr. MILDH, Mr. STRANDEN, Mr. LAATUNEN, Mr. VIHMA (Finland).
Mr. KETTANI; substitute: Mr. SLIMANI (Morocco).
Mr. KONIAN KODJO (Ivory Coast).
Mr. MABTÍNEZ-ESPINO; substitutes: Mr. AECAY, Mr. OYAEZÁBAL (Venezuela).
Mr. MAUTNEB-MAEKHOF; substitute: Mr. KINZEL (Austria).
Mr. MISHIEO; substitutes: Mr. OKAMUEA, Mr. KONDO (Japan).
Mr. MÜBO de NADAL; substitutes: Mr. EODEYBO, Mr. VITAIC o JAKASA (Argentina).
Mr. OLSZEWSKI (Poland).
Mr. PICAED (Central African Republic).
Mr. PEIKHODKO (Ukraine).
Mr. EEYES; substitutes: Mr. AECINAS, Mr. SINGSON (Philippines).
Mr. EIPAAT; substitute: Mr. BADAWI (United Arab Republic).
Mr. EOBINSON; substitute: Mr. TEOTTIEE (Canada).
Mr. SELVIG; substitutes: Mr. AARVIG, Mr. MEYER (Norway).
Mr. THEOCHARIDES; substitute: Mr. ALEXANDROU (Cyprus).
Mr. VERSCHUEREN; substitutes: Mr. BERNAERT, Mr. DE BRUYN (Belgium).
Mr. WAGNER; substitute: Mr. DOHERTY (United States).
Mr. WALINE; substitutes: Mrs. SEEUWS, Mr. SALLENVAE, Mr. SAINTIGNY (France).
Mr. YLLANES EAMOS; substitute: Mr. GAEZA FELÁN (Mexico).

Deputy Members
Mr. AIZPURÚA (Panama).
Mr. BEKTI (Indonesia).
Mr. DAHKIL; substitute: Mr. LANGHI (Libya).
Mr. GREVE (Ceylon).
Mr. GAYE; substitute: Mr. THIAM (Senegal).
Mr. HAYOT; substitutes: Mr. PAULY, Mr. MÜLLER (Luxembourg).
Mr. JONCKHEERE; substitute: Mr. BIYELA (Congo (Leopoldville)).
Mr. KUNTSCHEP; substitutes: Mr. WEIERSMÜLLER, Mr. DUBOIS (Switzerland).
Mr. LEITÃO; substitutes: Mr. SALGADO; Mr. SENA DA SILVA (Portugal).
Mr. MABOUNGOU M'BIMBA (Congo (Leopoldville)).
Mr. NASS; substitute: Mr. MINA (Lebanon).
Mr. OFURUM; substitute: Mr. NANNA (Nigeria).
Sir George POLLOCK (United Kingdom).
Mr. GEBREGZIABHER (Ethiopia).
Mr. UBAIDULLA; substitutes: Mr. PERERA, Mr. RATNAM (Malaya).
Mr. VÉGH-GARZÖN; substitute: Mr. MONTERO ZORRILLA (Uruguay).
Mr. WAJID ALI (Pakistan).

Observers
Mr. ALDRIDGE (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).
Mr. ASBURY (Bermuda).

Workers' Members
Mr. AGUILAR (Peru).
Mr. ANANDAN (India).
Mr. ANGELERI (Argentina).
Mr. ANGO (Dahomey).
Mr. ABEZINÁ (Yugoslavia).
Mr. AWADALLA (Sudan).
Mr. BODIE (Canada).
Mr. BOOKA (Congo (Leopoldville)).
Mr. BORHA (Nigeria).
Mr. BOUROUI (Tunisia).
Mr. BRIKI (Algeria).
Mr. DAVID (Malaya).
Mr. DELANNE (Niger).
Mr. EICHHORN (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. ESPINOSA (Colombia).
Mr. FAMHEEM (United Arab Republic).
Mr. FUGARDO SANZ (Spain).
Mr. GHEFLI (Switzerland).
Mr. GONZÁLEZ CUBERO (Costa Rica).
Mr. GREEN (United Kingdom).
Mr. HEYMANN (Ghana).
Mr. HORDJU (Netherlands).
Mr. KALININ (Belorussia).
Mr. KANE (Mauritania).
Mr. LI (Norway).
Mr. LOPES RIBEIRO (Portugal).
Mr. MARO (France).
Mr. MARSON (Luxembourg).
Mr. McDOUGHLIN (Australia).
Mr. MISSAAYKE (Lebanon).
Mr. NGAMEY (Cameroon).
Mr. PACHELER (United States).
Mr. RAKOTOBE (Malagasy Republic).
Mr. RANTANEN (Finland).
Mr. DMAAN (Kuwait).
Mr. SOBRADO CID (Cuba).
Mr. SUDARWO (Indonesia).
Mr. SVÁTEK (Czechoslovakia).
Mr. TAN (Philippines).
Mr. TANDAU (Tanganyika).
Mr. TRUBNIKOV (U.S.S.R.).
Mr. TURMAN (Liberia).
Mr. UENISHI (Japan).
Mr. WEISSENBERG (Austria).
Mr. ZIARTIDES (Cyprus).

Deputy Members
Mr. AHLGREN (Sweden).
Mr. AL-TAI (Iraq).
Mr. CAMACHO GUZMÁN (Mexico).
Mr. CISSE (Senegal).
Mr. DEHGHANY (Iran).
Mr. FARINE (France).
Mr. GONZÁLEZ NAVARRO (Venezuela).
Mr. HAGGERTY (United States).
List of Members of Delegations, etc.
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SECOND PART
VERBATIM REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OPENING OF THE SESSION

Interpretation from French: Mr. PARODI (Chairman of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office)—I declare open the 47th Session of the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation.

It is a privilege of the Chairman of the Governing Body to act as provisional President at the opening sitting of the Conference and to welcome participants. I therefore wish you the warmest possible welcome—all of you, representing the member States, the employers and the workers, and through you I would like to greet your respective countries.

I would like particularly to welcome the countries which are represented here for the first time, countries whose entry into the Organisation has brought the number of Members to 108.

Five of these—Burundi, Jamaica, Rwanda, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uganda, already had observers at previous sessions and were thus ready to co-operate fully in the work of the Conference. I am very glad to be able to note that one of their first acts as independent States was to adhere to the International Labour Organisation, thus reflecting the importance which they attach to social development and international co-operation.

I will say the same of the sixth newly admitted State, which is new among us and I address a particular message of cordial welcome to the representative of Algeria and the members of his delegation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE POPE JOHN XXIII

Interpretation from French: Mr. PARODI—I know that you will consider it right that in speaking to you here, just after the very great loss which has been suffered, I should say a few words to express the grief we feel at the death of Pope John XXIII. I am not speaking in the name of a religion but, I am sure, in the name of all the spiritual families represented here. The work of this most eminent man has had a profound effect on religious life during the last few years and has opened up new possibilities for the coming together of the peoples. In the two great texts which he left behind him, he underlined the part which the International Labour Organisation should play in promoting and ensuring social peace. Profoundly attached to the cause of peace among men, he stated his conviction that the world ought to enter without delay on the path of a real international community. Because that ideal is our own, it is my duty to pay a tribute to his memory. I suggest that we observe a few moments of silence.

(The Conference stood for a few moments in silence.)

OPENING OF THE SESSION (concl.)

Interpretation from French: Mr. PARODI—The Conference opening today has before it a great task which distinguishes it from previous Conferences and which gives it an exceptional importance. Side by side with the technical work which your committees will carry out, as each year, continuing to work out the body of advice and rules which has been the uninterrupted achievement of the I.L.O. since its initiation, in an endeavour to lighten the hard lot of mankind, the Report of the Director-General, which each year guides your discussions towards some great subject, this year suggests that you consider the programme and structure of the I.L.O. and reforms which it might be advisable to introduce.

The I.L.O. is now over 40 years old. You know what that represents in the life of a man, but how are we to appreciate this period in the life of international organisations? Experience gives the impression it signifies vitality and vigour, even more in the case of our Organisation than in the case of a man's life. It has survived great troubles in the world and without its essential character being disturbed. In fact, that is what has given it its strength and enabled it to live on.

What better element of vitality could there be than its tripartite representation, what better element of solidarity than its two funda-
mental organs, the Conference and the Governing Body. Time has consecrated, instead of weakening, the original strong structure which was so well thought out by those who, just after the First World War, created the International Labour Organisation. Time has consecrated the I.L.O. not only by not causing it to disappear when powerful empires and so many other institutions fell, but also by enabling it to develop to the extent reflected by its membership, which I have mentioned.

More than the number of its Members, however, the task is which have widened and diversified. If it has happily passed so many storms, it was because it had the necessary flexibility to adjust itself to the new needs of a rapidly developing world. The only proof needed is this reconversion which, parallel with its old tasks, has given so much importance to technical assistance to the recently independent countries.

Let us thank the Director-General, who guides the vessel so well, for understanding that the time had come, after such a long course, to ask us to look around and see what adjustments are required before we start again with new faith and greater vigour on the long voyage which lies before us, towards peace and social justice.

With a view to preparing this work, the Director-General asked that no individual resolutions should be put forward this year and I am glad to say that his request has been complied with by all. Consequently, the field is clear and we can give all due reflection to the task of examination which he has asked us to perform.

We will have before us as a guide the remarkable Report which he lays before us. We must do fruitful work. During the coming three weeks we will all have the opportunity of expressing freely and fully our conception of what the I.L.O. ought to do and what we can make it. This debate should be extensive and serious, to help clear up fears, misunderstandings, rancours perhaps, which were present sometimes in the past. Therefore, we should not be too hurried or imprudent. Neither should the discussion be too academic. On the contrary, it is to guide the work of the I.L.O. in future years, and to draw up practical measures for our working methods.

Another opportunity will be offered to give a new impulse to the I.L.O., for a new Governing Body will be elected during this session of the Conference. Some time ago the Governing Body suggested, and the Conference agreed, that its members should be raised from 40 to 48. The Amendment to the Constitution came into force recently. It has received 79 ratifications—this is to say seven more than the two-thirds necessary for constitutional purposes. I should certainly express the thanks of the Governing Body to all those who have responded to the call and made this important result possible.

I am sure that once it has been elected the new Governing Body will enjoy the active participation in the resolutions of the new member States, who will bring to its discussions new experience and knowledge of the social problems facing the newly independent Members.

I have already mentioned the task to be performed by the technical committees. It will relate to questions which are of great interest to the world, namely stability of employment and safety in their work. The standards which your committees will thus prepare will subsequently be included in that imposing volume the International Labour Code. One of our committees, the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, ensures respect for the provisions of the Code with all due vigilance. In order to measure the extent of the responsibility of that Committee I would only remind you that the ratified Conventions the application of which it supervises number 2,750.

Finally, the representatives of the Governments will have to examine the budget of the Organisation, the draft of which has been prepared by the Governing Body. It amounts for 1964 to more than $16 million. That is a large sum. However, it is only part of the means employed by the Organisation, which also has resources, particularly those provided by the United Nations, in order to carry out the tasks of international co-operation which it began to assume some 15 years ago. The I.L.O.'s work is now carried on in all the regions of the world. It deals with all fields, including manpower, social security, labour administration, co-operation, workers' education, management development, improvement in labour relations and productivity.

You know that periodically we review, in each part of the world, the work done and to be done by the Organisation. I personally had the great honour and pleasure last year of opening the Asian Regional Conference in Australia at which the Asian countries came together, and I should like once more to express to the Australian Government our gratitude for the generous hospitality which it extended to the Conference and which was such a great factor in its success.

By the Melbourne Resolution the Regional Conference defined an over-all programme for the use of the human resources of Asia within a new development programme. I have no doubt that the General Conference, when it examines the programmes to be undertaken by the Office for the developing countries in the coming years, will draw its inspiration from the principles laid down in that important instrument.

I do not wish to hold up the rest of your work too long, and soon I shall be asking you to elect your President.

For the moment, however, may I please try to place the present session of the Conference in the wider framework of international relations as it seems to me they are developing around us. Is it too optimistic to think that old hostilities are diminishing and that there is now a notion of world well-being which exceeds the disputes of nations and of systems, and that the systems which seemed at one time the most sharply opposed are tending to come together with a greater sense of justice in some and of liberty in others? Is it not a favourable sign that the problems of the countries which we agree to call the developing countries are progressively coming to the forefront in the work of the international organisations, and particularly of our own? Although we still live...
in a dangerous world, may we not believe that it is a little less dangerous than it was yesterday? In any case it is for our Organisation, which relates par excellence to human relations, to give more substance to the hope which I have just, perhaps tentatively, expressed.

This is one of the places in the world where the spirit of understanding between classes, races and peoples must be strengthened as we go forward. That is the reason for the existence of the I.L.O. and it is in evoking that spirit that I wish the 47th Session of the Conference good luck in its proceedings.

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Interpretation from French: Mr. PARODI (Chairman of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office)—We shall now elect the President of the Conference. A number of speakers have asked for the floor.

Mr. TESSEMA (Government delegate, Ethiopia)—I have great pleasure in proposing the candidature of Mr. Joseph Johnson, Federal Minister of Labour of Nigeria. It is hardly necessary for me to give you a long introduction as to who Mr. Johnson is. You will know of his long years of experience in various fields of social activities and his ability to preside over a meeting of this stature is well known to all of us. I hope you will nominate him.

Mr. EL GHATIFY (Government delegate, United Arab Republic)—I have the pleasure and honour to second, on behalf of the United Arab Republic, the nomination of Mr. Johnson, Federal Minister of Labour of Nigeria, to be the President of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. We have all heard what was said about him and I can hardly find anything to add. However, I would ask your permission to say one word.

We knew Mr. Johnson as the President of the First African Regional Conference held in Lagos in December 1960, and it was due to his competence, capability and well-balanced qualities that we successfully accomplished our work there. I am confident that the high esteem and great affection we all had for him in Lagos will continue to be accorded him here in Geneva.

Mr. SLATER (Government delegate, United Kingdom)—On behalf of the United Kingdom Government it is my great pleasure to support the nomination of Mr. J. M. Johnson, the Federal Minister of Labour of Nigeria, as President of this Conference.

The Federation of Nigeria was first represented here in 1955, and since 1955 Mr. Johnson has represented his country, first as the leader of an observer delegation, and later as leader of the delegation of independent Nigeria. He is no stranger to taking the Chair at important I.L.O. meetings. Reference has already been made to his chairmanship at the Lagos Conference in 1960, the first of its kind ever to be held in Africa. Those who were present on that occasion will recall the dignity and impartiality with which Mr. Johnson presided over that meeting. You will recollect too that Mr. Johnson, in addressing this Conference from this rostrum in 1961, made this firm declaration: “My Government is fully dedicated to the principles of social justice and the promotion of human dignity which constitute the foundation of the I.L.O.”

Nigeria has given ample evidence of its determination to live up to this declaration by ratifying 24 Conventions of the I.L.O., including those concerned with human rights.

Mr. Johnson has proved himself in his own country to be an enlightened administrator and a genuine friend of labour both in work and sport. In commending him to the Conference, I do so with the certainty that the same qualities of experience, impartiality and good humour which he has demonstrated during the African Regional Conference and here in Geneva will make him an excellent President. The importance of the presidency this year is greater than ever before, and the election of Mr. Johnson would make this a proud day for Nigeria and for the Commonwealth of which both our countries are members.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. CHAJN (Government delegate, Poland)—It is with great pleasure that I have come to this rostrum in order, on behalf of the People's Republic of Poland, to support the nomination of Mr. Johnson to the high office of President of this Conference.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that for the first time in the history of this Organisation we are called upon to elect to this high post a representative of the African Continent. My Government attaches particular importance to this fact. We regard this as the beginning of an effective process of amending, inside the Organisation, certain situations. We see in this a desire on the part of the Organisation to adapt itself to the great changes that have occurred and are occurring throughout our world, and we are convinced that, if at this Conference we elect a representative of a region which has never as yet provided us with a President, other regions of the world which have not yet been represented here will in due course take their lawful place.

Much has already been said about the personal qualifications and qualities of Mr. Johnson. We representatives of the Polish Government are well acquainted with him because he came to Poland last year. We know him also because of the daily strengthening of mutual relations between Poland and Nigeria.

I would like to draw attention to the fact that Mr. Johnson completed his higher education in Africa, in Lagos. I would also like to draw attention to the fact that he is not only an eminent statesman in his own country but has often participated in the activities of many international organisations in his continent. He was a member of the allied forces during the Second World War.

I would also remind you that for many years Mr. Johnson has headed the Nigerian delegation to this Organisation, and more recently, and much better because of that. That is why we are very happy to support his nomination to this high post and we are convinced that we will have an excellent President.
I would like to regard this as a symbol, this fact that we are electing an African to the presidency of this Conference, which is such an important post. The distinguished Chairman of the Governing Body referred to the Conference about which the Director-General has said in his Report that we find ourselves at a moment when it is possible to leave the beaten track and embark upon a broader road, and I think that the election of Mr. Johnson to this function is the herald of success in this new endeavour.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BORNA (Government delegate, Dahomey)—It is with real joy that I bring to this rostrum the support of the Republic of Dahomey for the nomination of Mr. Johnson. It is with no less sincere a pleasure that I lend my personal support to the nomination of a friend of mine.

I shall not recall his outstanding qualities. He has for many years been attached to the cause of the International Labour Organisation. Mr. Johnson is an illustrious representative of Africa, and of his country, in course of development, which is so much spoken of and whose coming to independence not only has made a sure mark on the course of history but has also led to profound changes in the programmes and structure of most of the international organisations. The unanimous acceptance of this candidate will be an act of faith in the future of the developing countries. I am therefore sure that Mr. Johnson will, in the course of this session, in the presidential Chair, confirm his outstanding qualities.

Interpretation from French: Mr. WALINE (Employers' delegate, France)—I am sure that I am speaking for all Employers' representatives at this Conference in saying how happy we are to envisage the possibility of the election of an African representative to the Chair, the representative of a continent which we hold particularly close to our hearts, a continent which is playing such an important part in the concerns, present and future, of our Organisation.

Moreover, the man in question is the representative of Nigeria, and we do not forget that it is that great country of Africa which, in December 1900, offered hospitality to the First African Regional Conference of the I.L.O. I think that it is thanks to the qualities of its President that that Conference was so eminently successful and, since I had the honour of having participated in it, I can recall the opening and closing remarks of Mr. Johnson at that time. I believe that it is thanks to his counsels of wisdom that that Conference achieved the results it did and for which he could justly congratulate himself at the end of its work. I hope that the same will apply here, now that he is about to take the Chair at this International Labour Conference. I warmly support his nomination.

Interpretation from French: Mr. MÔRI (Workers' delegate, Switzerland)—It is with the greatest pleasure that I ask my fellow delegates, especially in the workers' group, to give a warm welcome to the nomination of Mr. Johnson, Minister of Labour of Nigeria, for the post of President of this Conference.

Among Mr. Johnson's qualities, two have not been mentioned here: his great discretion and also his distinction. I have myself been able to appreciate his masterly direction of the discussions at that unforgettable First African Regional Conference in Lagos and I am sure that at the end of this session, when you have all had an opportunity to appreciate Mr. Johnson's outstanding abilities, you will say: "We made a good choice; we elected a great President in every sense."

Mr. DREYER (Government delegate, Denmark)—On behalf of the Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, I have the honour wholeheartedly to support the nomination of Mr. Johnson, the distinguished Government delegate of Nigeria, as President of the 47th Session of the Conference.

We find it natural that the continent of Africa, from which so many new and independent States have become Members of the International Labour Organisation during the last few years, should have a representative in the presidential Chair of this International Labour Conference and we feel convinced that Mr. Johnson will be not only a true representative of the continent of Africa but also an impartial and effective President of this truly international conference.

Interpretation from French: Mr. PARODI (Chairman of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office)—I have no other speakers on my list and I now note that Mr. Johnson's nomination has been supported by the representatives of the three groups and by all the speakers who have spoken on this issue and that no objections have been raised. I therefore declare Mr. Johnson unanimously elected President of this session of the Conference and I ask him to come and take the Chair.

(Mr. Johnson, Government delegate, Nigeria, is elected President of the Conference and takes the Chair.)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT—I should like first of all to express my profound thanks for the decision which has been taken to elect me President of this august Conference. I have listened with amazement to the extremely kind and charitable speeches made by several speakers about me, and I am grateful to them for their expressions of good will towards me and my country. Their sentiments have touched me so deeply that I now find it difficult to express myself adequately in an effort to register my thanks and gratitude. In fact, I regard my election as a great honour, which I hardly deserve, considering the presence in this Conference of a large number of eminent personalities. And it is an honour which, I appreciate, you bestow for the first time not so much on my country, Nigeria, as on the whole of the emergent continent of Africa. I sincerely hope that I shall prove able to perform my task as President in a manner worthy of this distinguished gathering.
I am happy to welcome to this Conference our new Members which have been admitted to this Organisation since the last session. By joining the I.L.O. they have accepted the obligations which arise out of its Constitution. In point of fact, no nation can be said to be completely new to the ideals of the I.L.O. Those ideals have greatly influenced the activities of many countries the world over in their endeavour to promote social justice as the basis for securing permanent peace and the well-being of mankind. The delegates present here must have observed, as I have, the impact of I.L.O. standards in the provisions of labour laws and the influence of the valuable work of the large numbers of I.L.O. experts who have helped in the formulation and implementation of projects designed to raise the working and living standards of the masses. The studies, reports and other documents published by the I.L.O. have become increasingly an invaluable source of information for the preparation of new laws, benefit even before they are completed. This is a problem of great magnitude. The situation is not limited to this country; it is the great challenge of our Organisation to stir economic and social momentum. The old traditional world is dying, and in many cases a vacuum of inertia is created. This being so, the gap between the rich and the poor nations has inevitably become the most tragic and urgent problem of our day. The state in which the underdeveloped countries now find themselves results paradoxically from three particular and simultaneous revolutions bearing upon personal and national equality, material progress and scientific development. All these revolutions began and had time to mature in the developed countries, but in the underdeveloped countries today they are occurring fast and simultaneously.

For example, while grappling with the problem of improved communications by the use of methods accepted at present, they are confronted by the dawn of a new age of jet and space travel. A situation of this character, unless tackled with imagination and speed, may create an atmosphere of uncertainty affecting the positive content and direction of national development. There is a real danger of many projects becoming obsolete in terms of technical and space travel. A situation of this character, unless tackled with imagination and speed, may create an atmosphere of uncertainty affecting the positive content and direction of national development. There is a real danger of many projects becoming obsolete in terms of technical and scientific development. All these revolutions began and had time to mature in the developed countries, but in the underdeveloped countries today they are occurring fast and simultaneously.

For example, while grappling with the problem of improved communications by the use of methods accepted at present, they are confronted by the dawn of a new age of jet and space travel. A situation of this character, unless tackled with imagination and speed, may create an atmosphere of uncertainty affecting the positive content and direction of national development. There is a real danger of many projects becoming obsolete in terms of technical and space travel. A situation of this character, unless tackled with imagination and speed, may create an atmosphere of uncertainty affecting the positive content and direction of national development. There is a real danger of many projects becoming obsolete in terms of technical and scientific development. All these revolutions began and had time to mature in the developed countries, but in the underdeveloped countries today they are occurring fast and simultaneously.

For example, while grappling with the problem of improved communications by the use of methods accepted at present, they are confronted by the dawn of a new age of jet and space travel. A situation of this character, unless tackled with imagination and speed, may create an atmosphere of uncertainty affecting the positive content and direction of national development. There is a real danger of many projects becoming obsolete in terms of technical and scientific development. All these revolutions began and had time to mature in the developed countries, but in the underdeveloped countries today they are occurring fast and simultaneously.

For example, while grappling with the problem of improved communications by the use of methods accepted at present, they are confronted by the dawn of a new age of jet and space travel. A situation of this character, unless tackled with imagination and speed, may create an atmosphere of uncertainty affecting the positive content and direction of national development. There is a real danger of many projects becoming obsolete in terms of technical and scientific development. All these revolutions began and had time to mature in the developed countries, but in the underdeveloped countries today they are occurring fast and simultaneously.

For example, while grappling with the problem of improved communications by the use of methods accepted at present, they are confronted by the dawn of a new age of jet and space travel. A situation of this character, unless tackled with imagination and speed, may create an atmosphere of uncertainty affecting the positive content and direction of national development. There is a real danger of many projects becoming obsolete in terms of technical and scientific development. All these revolutions began and had time to mature in the developed countries, but in the underdeveloped countries today they are occurring fast and simultaneously.

For example, while grappling with the problem of improved communications by the use of methods accepted at present, they are confronted by the dawn of a new age of jet and space travel. A situation of this character, unless tackled with imagination and speed, may create an atmosphere of uncertainty affecting the positive content and direction of national development. There is a real danger of many projects becoming obsolete in terms of technical and scientific development. All these revolutions began and had time to mature in the developed countries, but in the underdeveloped countries today they are occurring fast and simultaneously.
creating social unrest which in its turn is a
danger to the peace of the world.

The I.L.O. is already helping most countries
to meet the problems of social as well as economic
development. In many fields the I.L.O.'s
attack upon the underlying causes of friction
contributes to the more orderly conduct of
international affairs. Thus its efforts to enhance
the dignity of man, to increase work pro-
ductivity and to raise standards of living are
already widely felt.

Our Organisation is known to be one of the
oldest international bodies working for peace.
It has survived the test of time. This is partly
because of the dynamic and changing character
of the matters with which it is concerned, and
partly because of its flexibility in adapting
itself to meet the new situations occasioned by
the changes. It is my belief that our Organisa-
tion will continue to survive the test of time
for so long as it continues to give practical
effect to its motto that "poverty anywhere is a
danger to prosperity everywhere".

Our Organisation is at this session celebrating
the forty-fourth year of its birth. World events
over the past few years have again dictated the
need for us to look back on our past activities,
and to draw on the experiences which they have
provided as a guide for future action. Happily,
the need for self-examination has been recog-
nised and well reflected in the Director-
General's Report, which will constitute the
main theme of this Conference. In the course
of the Conference, delegates will have the
opportunity to discuss the Report which is
entirely devoted to a discussion of our Organis-
lation's programme and structure. The deci-
sions following the discussion of the Report
will be vital to the continued effectiveness of
this Organisation.

In this regard I should like to make a special
appeal to distinguished delegates to bear in
mind in their contributions to the discussion of
the Report the basic aims for which our
Organisation stands. Any suggested changes
to the structure of the Organisation and the
priorities for its programmes should be directed
towards upholding the noble ideals of our
Organisation. As the Director-General has
remarked in his Report, the I.L.O. is at one of
the critical points of its history. We therefore
have a special responsibility to ensure that the
conclusions of this Conference represent a
positive step forward in the over-all process of
alleviating world tension and in the search for
social justice on which our work is based.

I need hardly remind you that in carrying
out our assignment we should do so with full
respect for the tradition which underlies the
work of this Organisation. At the 37th Session
of our Organisation's Conference in 1954, the
Director-General drew attention to the essential
nature of this tradition in replying to the
debate on his Report. He described it as a
body of law accepted by all member States;
an acquired habit which gives life to them, a
habit of objectivity in facing issues and of
willingness to compromise on things which are
not absolutely essential to the purposes of the
I.L.O. It is, he said, the rule of law tempered
by reason and equity representing the will of
the majority, and defending the existence of the
minority, which is the essence of the I.L.O.

tradition. To my mind, these features of our
tradition should not only be maintained in this
Conference, whether in plenary sittings or in
committees, but should be jealously guarded
at all times.

Our task is not an easy one. It demands
some of the finest qualities of man-controlled
eotions—patience, tolerance of others' view-
points, and a reasoned spirit of compromise.
These are the essence of international effort
and accomplishment; they are also the essence
of co-operation. Co-operation has been the
pillar of our Organisation, because of its unique
tripartite character which makes it the most
representative international organisation in
the world. This character tends to enlarge
the possible field of disagreement, which in any
case is inevitable in all human affairs. But
experience has shown that these disagreements
have yielded good results in the sense that they
have paved the way for a more general accept-
ance of our conclusions. It is not enough for us
here to make suggestions about proposals about the manner of establishing con-
ditions that would make our world a better
place for working men and women. We must
be prepared to work for it, to accept the
responsibility, and to see to it that our actions
and practices are geared to the fulfilment of
this noble objective.

I wish, if I may, to illustrate this point with
a story. Not long ago the leader of a young
State gathered together the flower of its youth
and informed them that he would soon be
sending a person to the moon. He therefore
asked for volunteers. There was a mad rush
to be the chosen one, and so the leader thought
that the best way of getting his recruit was to
blow up a feather and to honour any youth
on whom the feather landed with this honour-
able assignment. He was of course wildly
cheered for this suggestion. When, however,
the feather was blown up it failed to land on
any one, and after three hours of fruitless
expectation the meeting came to a close.
This was because everyone at the meeting was busily
engaged in blowing off the feather in a desper-
ate attempt to steer its course away from him.
It is, distinguished delegates, my hope that,
when our decisions in this great Conference
are adorned with feathers, we shall all be
prepared to accept the great honour of wearing
them.

You have before you a very important
agenda with which you are familiar. You will
be called upon to make decisions on the eternal
and far-reaching matter of termination of
employment at the initiative of the employer.
The question of the prohibition of the sale, hire
and use of inadequately guarded machinery
will also be discussed for the second time. The
subject of hygiene in shops and offices breaks
new ground. Conditions of workers in shops
and offices have become increasingly important
as a result of the growing numbers of the work
force engaged in these activities in both
industrialised and developing countries. This
neglected group of workers will no doubt
anxiously await the conclusions we shall reach
concerning their working conditions. The
question of benefits in the case of employment
accidents and occupational diseases will be
considered from a broader viewpoint with due
regard to existing conditions. This will be of special interest to developing countries, where employment injury schemes are frequently the first social security measures to be put into operation.

I take this opportunity to thank the Office of our Organisation, and on behalf of this Conference to express our sincere appreciation of the excellent work which the staff are doing, and of the useful and valuable reports which they have prepared on the different items on our agenda.

In bringing my address to a close, I would like to associate myself with one of the many wise statements that have been made on the floor of this assembly. I have in mind the advice in the opening speech of the Chairman of the Governing Body at the 40th Session of the International Labour Conference that if all who speak were made to read at the end of the year all that they had spoken during that year they would in future speak less. I believe in this myself. I commend this advice to this great assembly and hope that it will guide us too in the heavy tasks which lie ahead.

May I once again express my deep appreciation and gratitude for the honour done to myself, my country and the continent of Africa, on my election to the high office of President of this Conference. Thank you.

(The Conference adjourned at 11.15 a.m.)
SECOND SITTING

Wednesday, 5 June 1963, 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Johnson

ELECTION OF THE VICE-PRESIDENTS

The PRESIDENT—The first item on the agenda for this afternoon is the election of the Vice-Presidents. I call upon the Clerk of the Conference to read the nominations made by the groups.

The CLERK OF THE CONFERENCE—The nominations for the Vice-Presidents of the Conference are as follows:

Government group: Mr. Slipchenko (Ukraine).
Employers' group: Mr. Robinson (Canada).
Workers' group: Mr. Faupl (United States).

The PRESIDENT—If there are no objections, I take it that those proposals are adopted.
(The proposals are adopted.)

APPOINTMENT AND COMPOSITION OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT—Now we come to the appointment and composition of the Selection Committee. The Clerk will read the proposals.

The CLERK OF THE CONFERENCE—The proposals for membership of the Selection Committee are as follows:

Government members:
Argentina.
Canada.
Ceylon.
China.
Denmark.
France.
Federal Republic of Germany.
Ghana.
India.
Italy.
Japan.
Netherlands.
Panama.
Rumania.
Tunisia.
U.S.S.R.
United Kingdom.
United States.
Uruguay.
Venezuela.

Employers' members:
Mr. Bergenström (Sweden).
Mr. Erdmann (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Ferrier (Australia).
Mr. Muro de Nadal (Argentina).
Sir George Pollock (United Kingdom).
Mr. Eifaat (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Tata (India).
Mr. Wagner (United States).
Mr. Waline (France).
Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Mexico).

Employers' members:
Mr. Achour (Tunisia).
Mr. Alam (Turkey).
Mr. Bannerman-Menon (Ghana).
Mr. Campanella (Italy).
Mr. Fennema (Netherlands).
Mr. Mishiro (Japan).
Mr. Nasr (Lebanon).
Mr. Ofurum (Nigeria).
Mr. Végh-Garzón (Uruguay).
Mr. Verschueren (Belgium).

Workers' members:
Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan).
Mr. Borha (Nigeria).
Mr. Bouladoux (France).
Mr. Collison (United Kingdom).
Mr. Espinosa (Colombia).
Mr. Faupl (United States).
Mr. Hernandez (Philippines).
Mr. Kaplanisky (Canada).
Mr. Monk (Australia).
Mr. Möri (Switzerland).

The PRESIDENT—If there is no opposition, I declare these proposals adopted.
(The proposals are adopted.)

NOMINATION OF THE OFFICERS OF THE GROUPS

The PRESIDENT—I call upon the Clerk of the Conference to read the names of those who have been elected Officers of the various groups.

The CLERK OF THE CONFERENCE—The groups have elected their Officers as follows:

Government group:
Chairman: Mr. Gris (Ivory Coast).
Vice-Chairmen: Mr. Tomov (Bulgaria).
Mr. El Ghatrify (United Arab Republic).
Secretary: Mr. Benoît Mestre (Spain).
Employers' group:

Chairman: Mr. Waline (France).

Vice-Chairmen:
- Mr. Wagner (United States).
- Mr. Tata (India).
- Mr. Rifaaat (United Arab Republic).
- Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Mexico).

Secretary: Mr. Lagasse (International Organisation of Employers).

Workers' group:

Chairman: Mr. Mōri (Switzerland).

Vice-Chairman: Mr. Collison (United Kingdom).

Members of the Bureau:

- Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan).
- Mr. Borha (Nigeria).
- Mr. Bouladoux (France).
- Mr. Collison (United Kingdom).
- Mr. Espinosa (Colombia).
- Mr. Faupl (United States).
- Mr. Hernandez (Philippines).
- Mr. Kaplansky (Canada).
- Mr. Monk (Australia).
- Mr. Mōri (Switzerland).

Secretary:

Mr. Heyer (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions).

The PRESIDENT—The Conference takes note of these appointments.

(The Conference adjourned at 3.15 p.m.)
THIRD SITTING

Thursday, 6 June 1963, 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Johnson

FIRST REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE: SUBMISSION AND ADOPTION

The President—In opening the third sitting of the 47th Session of the Conference I have pleasure in calling upon Mr. Weaver, Chairman of the Selection Committee, to submit the first report of the Committee.

Mr. Weaver (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—I have the honour to present to the Conference the first report of the Selection Committee. The text of this report has already been circulated to delegates. I hope that members of the Conference will have had the opportunity of reading the report. It deals with the election of Officers of the Committee, proposals concerning the setting up of Conference committees, suggestions in regard to arrangements for the discussion of the Director-General's Report, suggestions concerning facilities for more negotiations, and suggestions concerning the Conference quorum and the timing of decisions in plenary sittings which will require a series of votes, as well as proposals concerning participation of non-governmental international organisations in the work of certain committees.

When the Committee was considering proposals for the setting up of Conference committees, one member of the Committee, the representative of the U.S.S.R., questioned the desirability of setting up the Standing Orders Committee before the Conference had discussed, in the debate on the Director-General's Report, matters which would be before that Committee. Members of the Selection Committee in general felt that the Standing Orders Committee should be set up at once.

The Committee also approved the appointment of a member of the Appeals Board Panel, the composition of the Credentials Committee and the appointment of the Drafting Committee of the Conference.

I ask the Conference to accept the first report of the Selection Committee.

The President—I take it that the report is adopted.

(The report is adopted.)

1 See Appendix I, p. 453.

SECOND REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE: SUBMISSION AND ADOPTION

The President—I have pleasure in calling again upon Mr. Weaver, the Chairman of the Selection Committee, to submit the second report of the Selection Committee orally.

Mr. Weaver (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—I have the honour to submit, orally, to the Conference the second report of the Selection Committee.

The Selection Committee this afternoon held its second meeting, devoted to determining the composition of the committees of the Conference. The Selection Committee proposes that the Conference committees which it decided at its first sitting should be established should be composed as follows.

Standing Orders Committee: 63 members: 48 Government members, 6 Employers' members and 9 Workers' members.

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations: 99 members: 60 Government members, 9 Employers' members and 30 Workers' members.

Committee on Guarding of Machinery: 70 members: 40 Government members, 15 Employers' members and 15 Workers' members.

Committee on Termination of Employment: 177 members: 72 Government members, 45 Employers' members and 60 Workers' members.

Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices: 90 members: 48 Government members, 18 Employers' members and 24 Workers' members.

Committee on Social Security: 141 members: 66 Government members, 30 Employers' members and 45 Workers' members.

In accordance with the usual practice, a system of weighting will be applied in all these Committees in order to maintain equali of voting as between the three groups.

The composition of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives, which accord-
ing to the Standing Orders should consist of one representative of each government represented at the Conference, will be determined at a later stage.

The names of the members of each of the Committees will be published as an annex to the second report of the Selection Committee. I ask the Conference to adopt these proposals, so that the Committees that have been set up and which are to meet this afternoon may be in a position to begin their discussions without delay.

The PRESIDENT—I take it that the report is adopted?

(The report is adopted.)

(The Conference adjourned at 4.15 p.m.)

1 See Appendix I, p. 455.
FOURTH SITTING

Friday, 7 June 1963, 10.15 a.m.

President : Mr. Johnson

APPEALS CONCERNING COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES

The PRESIDENT—Before coming to the first business on today's agenda I should like to inform the Conference that I have received a number of appeals concerning the composition of committees and that in accordance with the procedure established by the Conference on 8 June 1959 I have forwarded those appeals to the Chairman of the Appeals Board.1

TIME LIMIT FOR SPEECHES

The PRESIDENT—I should like also to draw attention to article 14, paragraph 6, of the Standing Orders. That is necessary because, as you all know, since these Standing Orders were drafted the time of the Conference has not been increased but there has been an increase in the membership. Paragraph 6 reads:

"Except with the special consent of the Conference no speech, whether by a delegate, a visiting minister, an observer or a representative of an international organisation, shall exceed 15 minutes exclusive of the time for translation."

As you know, time for translation will not be taken account of now, as it is simultaneous. I appeal to you to limit your speeches, please, to the maximum allowed by the Standing Orders—that is 15 minutes.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL : DISCUSSION

The PRESIDENT—We shall now begin the discussion of the Director-General's Report.

The Honourable M. M. KAMALIZA (Minister for Labour, Tanganyika)—I would like first of all to make a complaint because, as this is my first time to address this Conference, I had intended to make a speech for 30 minutes explaining the policies of my Government properly because we do not want them to be misunderstood. It is unfortunate, therefore, that I am only given 15 minutes. I will try to be as brief as possible but if you could allow me more time I shall be very grateful indeed, because I consider that, as this Conference is so important, member nations should know the policies of the new young nations, especially when they come here for the first time.

It gives me great pleasure to address this International Labour Conference for the first time as the Minister responsible for labour matters in Tanganyika. May I extend to you, Mr. President, the congratulations of the Government and people of Tanganyika on your election to preside over this great Conference. May I also extend a special word of welcome and congratulations to the representatives from Uganda, our sister State in East Africa, attending the Conference for the first time as representatives of an independent country which is now a full Member of this Organisation. I hope next year it will be possible to extend similar greetings to the delegation of a free and independent Kenya and Nyasaland.

I must also congratulate the Director-General on his stimulating and comprehensive Report, which is one more example of the great contribution which he and this Organisation have made to the economic and social progress of all mankind. His Report is a masterly analysis and presentation of the problems which now require to be examined and overcome by this Organisation in the light of changing conditions. The matters examined in the Report afford a very convenient opportunity to consider problems found in Tanganyika which, to a large extent, are also common to all emergent and developing countries. These problems make it very necessary to review the programmes and structure of the International Labour Organisation, which is the task before this Conference.

My country hopes that as a result of this review a programme will be agreed which will take account of the needs of newly independent countries and will give them an adequate voice in the councils of the I.L.O. On this last point, there is a need for African countries to be given adequate representation on the Governing Body of the Organisation and the nationals of those countries to be placed in responsible positions on the staff of the I.L.O. where, whilst maintaining the attitudes and impartialities appropriate to international civil servants, their special knowledge of the needs of developing countries would be of great value.

1 See Appendix XI, p. 632.
I believe this has proved to be the case in the United Nations Organisation. The underlying theme of the Director-General’s Report is, I feel, that the I.L.O. programme should be directed at economic and social advancement with special reference to the needs of poor countries such as Tanganyika. I thus find myself in agreement with the Director-General on the kind of problems which must be examined and solved if economic and social development is to take place at the rate which is necessary in Tanganyika. With many points in the Report I agree, both as to the nature of the problem and the methods suggested for solving it. For instance, Tanganyika is fully aware of the need for manpower planning and vocational training, and is currently examining the evolution of a comprehensive manpower programme. We also agree that it is necessary to adapt labour relations to changing conditions brought about by the need for economic development and the pace of development.

I would add that a system of industrial relations also requires to be geared to the changing political circumstances. It must reflect the political ideology of a country and advance its domestic and social policies. It must be essentially a product of that country and not based on ideas borrowed from others. Most important of all in newly independent territories, the system of industrial relations must aim at maintaining unity among all sections of a community, and must reflect the hopes and aspirations of the workers. It must therefore be directed, in Tanganyika, at improving their standards of living and achieving this by associating them with economic planning at the national level and securing for the workers on each estate or factory a greater responsibility in running the concerns in which they are employed.

Tanganyika is, in fact, evolving a system of industrial relations which is an integral and vital part of our Government’s policy of socialism and is designed to hasten the emergence of a socialist society. The Tanganyika Government is a government of all sections of the community, whether they be wage earners, peasant farmers or self-employed persons. It regards all its citizens as workers; and, having been elected by the overwhelming majority of those citizens, it can claim with every justification to be a government of the workers.

The first principle of socialism which is followed in Tanganyika is, therefore, that the workers can now achieve through their Government what, before independence, they could not have achieved except through strikes. The second principle is that government must exercise its law-making powers to provide immediate relief and benefits to those who direly need them. We are now considering social security measures and are hoping for the continued assistance of the I.L.O. in planning a national provident fund scheme and, possibly, a national health insurance scheme.

So much for our immediate short-term policies. In the long term, the socialist Government in Tanganyika must recognise as its main objective the need to increase the wealth of the country and to ensure that the fruits of increasing prosperity are shared fairly among those who have helped to produce it. In particular, those in the lower-income groups, be they wage earners or subsistence farmers, must be given better living standards or we shall forever remain on our consciences as evidence that we as a Government have failed our people.

To achieve success a socialist government in Tanganyika must defeat our national enemies of poverty, ignorance and disease. Tanganyika considers itself to be at war against these enemies and has called upon all our people to regard themselves as members of a national army dedicated to the defeat of our enemies. We regard anyone who refuses to take part in this war, or who hinders the efforts of his fellow men, as being just as much a traitor as would be a person who declines to fight an armed invader. Let me illustrate this point by indicating to you just what ignorance, poverty and disease mean to my country.

That ignorance is an enemy can be illustrated by reference to the fact that in spite of our recent efforts only 50 per cent. of our children can be given primary education at the lowest levels of standards one and two.

The poverty of our country is demonstrated by the fact that the annual per head income is still only in the region of £20. Compare this figure with that of £409 for the United Kingdom or £822 for the United States of America in 1961. The effects of poverty are therefore inescapable, and they contribute to a vicious circle of low standards of living, widespread malnutrition and a high mortality rate, a slow rate of capital growth, and an inability to increase government revenues by the amount necessary to provide the needed social services, especially in the fields of health and education.

Perhaps our most deadly enemy is disease. It is the foe we fear most in the triple alliance of ignorance, poverty and disease, as we know that, in spite of the advances made by medical science, it cannot be defeated until its allies of ignorance and poverty have been vanquished.

These hard facts outline our problems. These are the problems we inherited at independence. How do we plan to defeat them? We believe that victory can only be won through a centrally planned economy. We have made plans, therefore, to evolve as a matter of the greatest urgency a master development plan. This plan is not one which will be imposed against the wishes of the people. On the contrary, it is one which will be devised in the closest consultation with local authorities down to district and village level. It will depend largely for its implementation on the wholehearted efforts of the people and their local authorities: the scheme will, in fact, be largely based on what we have called our villagisation plan. We in Tanganyika recognise that our main assets are our land and our people. By developing our land we believe we can defeat our enemies of ignorance, poverty and disease. The immediate need is therefore to develop our rural areas and to make life more attractive and rewarding in order to stop the drift to the towns and consequent urban unemployment. There is no need for Tanganyika to suffer the problems of unemployment as they are known in industrialised countries, and yet the problem is appearing.
As a socialist Government, we are naturally concerned that there should be a fair distribution of the incomes resulting from our increased national prosperity. In solving this problem, we are confident that the I.L.O. can be of great assistance. I note that in Chapter III of his Report the Director-General defines the two main objectives of the I.L.O. in the matter of incomes as being, firstly, a distribution of incomes which is socially just, and secondly, participation by organisations of workers and employers in taking decisions affecting the distribution of incomes. We agree with these objectives. We support the case for the I.L.O. to undertake further research and study of such significant factors as taxation, land reform, investment policy, and special measures needed to develop poor countries, including the establishment of secondary industries.

There is one special aspect of our policy in Tanganyika to which I would draw the particular attention of this Conference. As I say, the Tanganyika Government, and is committed to the doctrine of central planning. That government must assume responsibility for planning, and execution of social development schemes is made inevitable by the fact that in a country such as ours the only capital available for large-scale development is that raised by central government or guaranteed by government. Nevertheless, in the socialist society of Tanganyika, there will be a continuing place for the private investor. We realise that there must be an influx of money from overseas if our economy is to expand. We need foreign capital from private investors. We assure them that they will receive a fair return on their investments in Tanganyika, and that those investments will be completely safe from expropriation. The need for private as well as public investment is a factor which I hope the I.L.O. will keep in mind in any inquiries on the problems of income growth and income distribution.

The concept of freedom of association is related to the existence of an effective trade union movement. Let me say at once that the Tanganyika Government welcomes the existence of the trade union movement, by whose efforts so many improvements have been won for the workers of Tanganyika in the shape of increases in wages and better working conditions. We, as a government of the workers, therefore welcome a strong trade union movement. We believe that if the movement is to be effective in the circumstances of Tanganyika there is a need for a strong central trade union organisation which, by utilising most effectively the services of the comparatively few trained officials available, can most effectively lead and guide the entire movement in discharging its duties and responsibilities. We are therefore enacting legislation which confirms the Tanganyika Federation of Labour in its accepted position as the central trade union organisation in my country. All trade unions are required to be affiliated to this Federation, which is recognised by the Government as the organisation that must be consulted on all policy matters affecting workers' interests.

The individual trade unions continue their essential work in conducting negotiations with employers on their wage and other claims. We intend that this system should continue and, in fact, we have acceded trade unions the legal status and privileges associated with their collective bargaining and daily activities. We wish those activities every success, and would hope that all issues between employers and workers could be settled by them, without government assistance or intervention.

We must recognise, however, that in Tanganyika circumstances exist which prevent a voluntary settlement of all matters in dispute between unions and employers. The Tanganyika Government accepts that it has a duty in such circumstances to provide statutory conciliation and arbitration procedures to resolve those issues. Our Government cannot accept that unions or employers, when their voluntary negotiations have failed, may undertake a more desperate struggle in which the weapons used are the strike or lockout. Consider our position in relation to the sisal industry. There are 130,000 workers, or roughly one-third of our country's wage-earning population. In 1961 the value of sisal exports amounted to over £14 million, or about 30 per cent. of our total exports. Can we afford to take the risk of a total strike or lockout in such a vital industry? We clearly cannot. It would cripple the economy of our country. We believe strikes and lockouts to be both disastrous in their effects and completely unnecessary. They are harmful because they result in a loss of wages to the workers, lasting bitterness between an employer and his workers, and a blow to the economy and financial stability of the country. We believe that, at a time when our country considers itself to be at war against ignorance, poverty and disease, they would be a blot on our national reputation. If it is proper and just to restrict strike action at a time of armed conflict, it is equally correct at a time when a great national effort is called for to defeat foes just as deadly as an armed invader. My country just cannot afford the bitter struggle which marked the development of trade unions in, for example, the Great Britain of the nineteenth century. Great Britain then possessed great natural resources which ensured the development of its national wealth in spite of such struggles. We do not.

Not only do we consider strikes and lockouts to be acts of treachery against our country; we also believe them to be completely unnecessary. If a trade union or an employers' organisation considers it has a just claim, why should there be any reluctance to submit that claim for settlement by arbitration? We consider that arbitration can produce a result which is fair to the worker and the employer. Within the past nine months, arbitration awards have resulted in wage increases of 30 per cent. in the sisal industry and 16 per cent. in the port industry, without a deterioration in the economic stability of these important industries which together comprise more than one-third of our wage-earning population. We note, therefore, at the restrictions placed on strikes or lockouts, even though these so-called "rights" are dear to those who believe in complete freedom to strike. We in Tanganyika
The PRESIDENT—Mr. Kamaliza, I see that you have tried to get time as your ally. You are very fast but you have not been able to read out the whole of your text.

As this is the first time that the delegate of Tanganyika has attended this Conference, I should like, delegates, to extend his time by five minutes. I would stress, however, that I have so on this special ground and I hope there will be no need for me to repeat this favour.

Mr. KAMALIZA—Thank you very much, Mr. President. As I have said, this meeting is very important and, even if I do not finish my speech, I would like it to go into the Record of Proceedings of the Conference, and I request my colleagues from various countries to read my speech very carefully, because it is easy to criticise when you do not know the policies of the countries you are criticising.

I would like to end with these few words. As a Minister coming from the independent State of Tanganyika, I must express in public the abhorrence felt by the Government and people of Tanganyika at the failure of certain alien governments in Africa to grant their peoples even the most simple human rights. In years gone by the representatives of other independent African States have indicated their disgust at the outrageous and discriminatory policies pursued by the Governments of South Africa and Portugal. Those policies have been condemned by the highest international tribunals. The representative of my Government at the United Nations is particularly vigilant in the task delegated to him of seeking redress in the councils of that Organisation for the unfortunate people living in the Republic of South Africa and the Portuguese territories in Africa. Both Governments practise the most repressive measures against their African populations. They deny them the most elementary political rights and freedom of expression, yet do not hesitate to exploit their labour, which is a vital factor in developing the economy of their countries. My country is firmly opposed to those Governments which practise or permit repressive racial measures. We are against racial discrimination and oppression wherever it may occur, from Sharpeville in the Transvaal to Birmingham, Alabama.

I am speaking today to an international body which has adopted various instruments on human rights and freedoms. Those instruments aim at safeguarding the dignity of the individual and improving his economic and social standards. These objectives lie at the heart of the ILO, and summarise its principal aims. This Organisation has recently adopted a Convention on the abolition of discrimination in all forms of employment. The discriminatory practices which that instrument aims to abolish are those based on religion, race, sex and political beliefs. How then can we justify the continued presence in this Organisation of the representatives of the Republic of South Africa and Portugal, whose policies aim at the complete subjugation, domination and exploitation of our African brothers? The time has come for this body to present an ultimatum to those two countries and to fix a definite time limit...

The PRESIDENT—Mr. Ribeiro da Cunha, Government delegate, Portugal, has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. RIBEIRO da CUNHA (Government delegate, Portugal)—Mr. President, I am sorry to interrupt the speaker, but I would ask you to restrict him to the matter under discussion—and to remind him that Portugal has ratified the Convention on discrimination.

The PRESIDENT—Mr. Kamaliza may now continue his speech.

Mr. KAMALIZA—I thought the honourable member was going to inform me that his Government had now decided to give freedom to the Portuguese countries in Africa. I could have understood that, but I think the point he has raised has no place in this Conference. I am very sorry that I have no time. We people in Africa want to be free; we do not want anybody to come and dominate our country. We have not invited any nation to come and teach us how to govern ourselves. We tell you repeatedly—day and night, every minute, every hour: leave the soil of Africa to the Africans themselves. But you pretend not to hear us. One day you are going to hear us, and I am appealing to Britain, I am appealing to America, because those two big brothers assist the condemned Governments of Portugal and the Republic of South Africa. We are issuing a challenge, because you are assisting those Governments in Africa and you are inviting war, which we are all against. We do not want war, but how are we going to get rid of those Governments if peaceful negotiations fail? Our American friends and Britain today have the only solution. The solution, brothers, is to help us, to help the African peoples to free themselves from the South African Government, to free themselves from Portugal, which you are supporting. Where can we look for assistance? Will you come and join with Africans who want to free themselves?

The PRESIDENT—Your time is up, I am afraid.

Mr. KAMALIZA—I have no more time, and I apologise to my good friends. But I have no apology to Britain, Portugal or our brother Americans, because our salvation is in their hands. Save us, Britain and America!

The PRESIDENT—Before proceeding with the discussion of the Director-General's Report, I would like to call your attention, Mr. Kamaliza, to article 23, paragraph 2, of the Standing Orders, the last sentence of which reads: "Speeches or parts of speeches that have not been delivered during the sitting shall not be published in the report."

Interpretation from French: Mr. N'GUVULU (Government delegate, Congo (Leopoldville))—The Government of the Republic of Congo
I believe that the development of human resources is one of the basic conditions for the development of my country in particular, and of Africa in general. We must find effective means of awakening our rural populations from their age-long slumber, of helping them to throw off their lethargy, of leading them towards the benefits of modern life and civilisation. It is only then that, as governments responsible for the future of our peoples, we can consider that we have accomplished our mission, done our duty. The specialised services of the I.L.O. can help us very much.

I should like to reaffirm here the interest which my Government has in seeing a comprehensive development programme put into effect in the Congo. The problem of co-ordinating activity—and perhaps competition, however friendly—between international agencies, should not be a delaying factor.

I am aware that the success of the general mobilisation of the masses for their active integration in the economy is conditioned by an equitable distribution of incomes.

One must not think of ensuring the economic development of a country by a system of compulsion of labour; on the contrary, we must create a spirit of voluntary readiness for effort. This spirit can be created only if the active population receive a fair share of the product of their labour. We must abolish in Africa systems of profit reserved for a small class of intriguers. We in Africa must overthrow the system of an oligarchy out for profit, supported by the armed forces and taking up a large part of the budget. That system has kept our continent for too long time in a state of underdevelopment which is to the detriment of the masses, on whom we have depended in wresting our national independence.

Before stretching out our hands to foreigners we must set our own house in order by having a healthy policy which will enable us to prepare a development plan, with the assistance of the group which is the motor of all economic and social development in our young countries. I mean labour, capital and public authorities, aiming at securing the interests of the whole population and not only of the governing class. Only in this way shall we be able to associate our masses with the construction of Africa.

Trade union organisations also have a very important part to play in the harmonious development of the nations. They can help governments very much in achieving economic and social development objectives, by organising the workers, teaching them the ways and means employed, educating them regarding their part and their responsibilities in the general effort for national expansion.

The trade unions will also be the best guarantee for the workers against abuses which the authorities might be tempted to commit against them. The trade unions will be the active element which will ensure the constant promotion of social legislation and of guarantees of security which the nation must give to the workers.

The Government of the Congo is also convinced that the existence of a free and powerful trade union movement is indispensable to the construction of a healthy system of management-labour relations. My Government counts on the free and loyal co-operation of the employers and of the workers’ associations, to promote a social and economic policy framed in the interest of the whole nation.

This statement prompts me, of course, to talk about the role played by the International Labour Conference itself. This world forum where all countries can freely discuss their problems has most certainly contributed to a better understanding of these peoples and to the promotion of the solution of all the problems that come within the competence of the
I.L.O. The merits of the important work done, of the fortunate influence of the I.L.O. on the harmonious evolution of peoples, are well known. But faced with the new problems which arise, faced with the urgent solutions which result from the rapid and imperative evolution of the world, I think it would be wise to envisage certain reforms, certain adjustments, in the machinery of the I.L.O. I shall examine these reforms and adjustments principally from the viewpoint of the problems appertaining to Africa.

During a conference recently held in Lagos, the Ministers of Labour of the African States gave consideration to this important question. We explored the means of increasing the dynamism of the International Labour Conference and of the specialised bodies of the Organisation. We invited the Governing Body to consider the primary importance of the problem of education and vocational training of the active masses, and of the workers in particular. We would like to see the best possible use made of the African Advisory Committee by entrusting to this Committee specific responsibilities which are clearer and broader, relating to the problems of Africa. We would like to see the African Regional Conference meeting more often than every four years, as is now the case. There is no doubt that the work resulting from a more frequent convening of the African Regional Conference would be most fruitful, with a view to seeking original solutions to the major problems that arise in the I.L.O. and especially in Africa.

The establishment of new bodies to deal with these problems seems to me completely inadequate. Indeed it might run counter to the targets pursued by causing too great a dispersion of effort, which would certainly result in a lack of co-ordination and diminished efficiency. It seems to me that effective results can be achieved only through developing the activities of already existing agencies or bodies. We must extend the mandate of the African Regional Conference and of the African Advisory Committee, enlarge their staffing and envisage more frequent meetings.

We would like to adjust the structure of the I.L.O. to be adjusted so that it reflects better the needs and problems of the developing countries. To this effect we must consider whether there is a need to appoint more Africans to the regional bodies and, given equal competence, to entrust positions of responsibility in these regional organs primarily to Africans.

The Republic of the Congo believes that the regional activities of the I.L.O. should be expanded. The two centres in Africa, in Lagos and Dar-es-Salaam, are clearly inadequate, considering the immense needs of the African Continent. Besides, the time has certainly come to set up a liaison office with the E.C.A., which has its headquarters in Addis Ababa, like the one that has already been set up in Latin America.

The present system of liaison between E.C.A. and the I.L.O., whether via Geneva or via the Dar-es-Salaam centre, seems to be ineffective and does not answer the problems that arise because of the rapid evolution of Africa. One should not neglect, indeed, the social aspects of economic development; this is of course in line with the mission and obligations of the I.L.O.

Further, it would be wise to institute an African committee which would study the factual and legal problems that arise from the application of Conventions and Recommendations.

Certain adjustments are indispensable because of the needs proper to Africa. These adjustments can be devised through the integral respect of the basic principles and without imperilling the universality of work standards.

Finally, I think it would be useful to envisage the need to devote more place in our agenda to problems peculiar to the developing countries. I would like to draw your attention to the budgetary regulations which govern the financing of the I.L.O.'s Technical Assistance Programme. The existing rules are inadequate. They should be made more flexible. As an example, a request for aid that was filed in 1963 will not begin to be implemented on the spot before 1966, because of the rigid financial procedures which have to be respected. Such financial procedures are of course not in line with the urgent needs of the developing countries.

Besides that I would like to emphasise the way in which technical assistance should be conceived. We need long-term programmes which involve positive study of the problems and the evaluation of the best solution, its application and the training of native personnel who can continue the work of the experts. Short-term missions are usually sterile, especially in the field of social security, which is one of the most effective forms of worker protection.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that in these coming years we shall see at our sides in this very hall—once, thanks to the aid, both moral and material, which they will receive from all freedom-loving countries, they have freed themselves of the fascist régimes which repress them now—the representatives of Angola, Mozambique, of so-called Portuguese Guinea, of South Africa and of Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. FERRIER (Employers' delegate, Australia)—Australian employers have read the Report of the Director-General with great interest and join with others who have complimented him on the coverage and depth of his Report, particularly that part dealing with the role, organisation and procedures of the International Labour Conference. This Report, which is of major importance to all, brings home forcibly the wide variety of projects being attempted and the aspirations of the International Labour Office, and one wonders whether the resources could ever hope to cover the operations outlined.

Therefore, consideration must be given to limiting the activities of the I.L.O. to vital and urgent projects, particularly the requirements of developing countries.

At the basis of all I.L.O. work lie the fundamentals of the Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia. On these basic principles there cannot be disagreement, because every member State has accepted them as a responsibility of membership.
As the Director-General has emphasised, the most important principles implicit in the very existence of the I.L.O. and in its tripartite composition were clearly enunciated in the Declaration of Philadelphia as "freedom and dignity... economic security and equal opportunity".

It has been said that the task of the I.L.O. in carrying out these principles is to aim at achieving three objectives—(1) freedom of labour, (2) freedom of association, (3) primacy of social objectives—and yet how can we envisage these "freedoms" being universally achieved whilst totalitarian régimes exist? Today there are a number of member States of the I.L.O. that would act swiftly to crush any attempt to achieve this freedom of labour or association within their own geographical confines.

In contrast to this, it is inherent in the social life of a democracy, as typified in Australia today, that there is an insistence on the importance of the individual and on his freedom to achieve the highest individual development. The belief that each individual is important for his own sake is the first essential of freedom. This insistence upon freedom is exemplified in two main ways, namely freedom of the person and economic freedom.

Freedom of the person consists, essentially, of freedom of thought and of the spoken and written word, and thus the consequent liberty (without which freedom of thought and speech have little meaning) to organise with groups of like-minded people for religious, political, social or economic purposes. In labour relations this is strongly reflected in freedom of association. In a democracy the employers and workers have freedom of association in their right to form a union and to join that union which may seem best suited to them in pursuit of their own welfare. It is not sufficient for the law merely to legalise or recognise trade unions.

The second type of freedom, economic freedom, includes the freedom to buy and sell—whether goods, land or labour—the freedom to enter into contracts and the consequent freedom for the individual to pursue any occupation he chooses, or to make his living in any way he can.

To the industrial worker, the freedom of choice of occupation and/or employer is of supreme importance. In the democracies, as exemplified by Western industrialised societies, it is accepted that a man may have a "socially approved" discontent with his existing economic condition and it is considered right and proper for a man to strive to increase his income and to acquire wealth. Economic freedom gives such opportunity and in so doing rewards initiative. An increase in income brings with it not only a higher standard of living but a wider social horizon—both powerful incentives to economic betterment. There can be nothing but condemnation for measures the effect of which is to force industry and workers into a state of subjugation, while falsely giving the external appearance of peace and state paternalism. There is also every reason to observe with misgiving the adoption, in non-democratic countries, of policies aimed at eradication of industrial conflict in a community. Such a condition, if achieved, is probably symptomatic or even ominous of a state of stagnation in a community—and certainly indicative of industrial regimentation.

In a free country, vigorous in the health of life, employers and employees will have differences, and it would indeed be unnatural and suspicious if this were not so. This is desirable only, however, while there exist, as in Australia, labour relations laws providing that neither party suffers injury of note and that above all no substantial damage is incurred by the economy of the country or its social fabric.

There is another freedom which must be given attention in the I.L.O. and that is the autonomy of the Employer and Worker groups within the I.L.O. itself, and this must be zealously guarded.

Of one thing I am certain, and that is that the I.L.O. must never attempt to intrude directly in matters of wage fixing or attendant subjects in the various countries.

One of the most controversial—and vital—issues today in the labour relations field, the question of a "wages (or income) policy". This subject has already been so thoroughly discussed that it is perhaps sufficient to say that no matter how wages are ultimately determined, whether through collective bargaining, industrial arbitration, government action, or by any other method—the same objectives exist, viz.: (i) that industrial peace...
be maintained; (ii) that wages shall be at a socially just level; but (iii) that wages must not be such a level as to retard economic growth, employment or relative economic equity and stability.

Our experience in Australia has shown the need, in determining the level of wages, to consider the effect upon production and economic growth. At the same time, it is desirable that wages should provide an incentive both to production and to improved skills. It is self-evident that to increase wages faster than productivity will lead to further increases in costs and prices and will make wage increases granted in such circumstances largely illusory.

A wage policy, whilst aiming at socially just and realistic rates, must ensure that the ultimate result does not discourage investment, result in excess increase in costs, or adversely affect overseas trade and balances. Increased wages granted in defiance of these strictures will only impair and weaken the economy to the detriment of all.

In conclusion, I should like to sound a caution. It is becoming apparent that while the I.L.O.'s Conventions and Recommendations, on paper, now almost completely codify labour laws, they are not able to be applied in more than a few countries.

That this should be so is in no small part due to past errors, where attempts have been made to cover exhaustively a topic without regard to the need to adapt the I.L.O. instruments to meet the circumstances of particular countries. Too often have Conventions and Recommendations failed to take into account the diverse economic and social conditions in the different countries, as well as the variety of national practices for regulating conditions of work.

It appears desirable in future to emulate the good practice of the 1962 Conference when it said, in dealing with the implementation of reduction of hours of work, that account should be taken of the particular economic and social conditions in each country. In all matters the I.L.O. must have uppermost in mind the level of economic development attained and the extent to which each country is in a position to give effect to a particular Recommendation or Convention without endangering its economic growth.

On behalf of Australian employers, I should like to take this opportunity of publicly thanking the Governing Body, the Director-General and the officials of the I.L.O. who, in conjunction with the Australian Commonwealth Government, arranged for the Fifth Asian and the officials of the I.L.O. who, in conjunction with the Australian Commonwealth Government, arranged for the Fifth Asian

Mr. BAHAMAN (Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, Malaya)—We have the privilege this year to confer with us for discussion a comprehensive Report by the Director-General. The Report gives us a concise review of what the I.L.O. is doing and sets out his proposals for future I.L.O. action and for the improvement of the working of the Conference.

I am glad that in the introduction to his Report the Director-General has restated, in concise and clear terms, the basic principles of the I.L.O. action. More research should be carried out with particular reference to trade union participation and collective bargaining, and the results of such research should be widely disseminated. The closer knowledge and understanding of the various economic and social factors that may be involved in income policies will help to foster an enlightened and realistic approach in working out solutions to income...
problems. For example, wage negotiations should be based on reasoned and intelligent arguments and equitable consideration by all parties concerned of relevant factors, and should not be based, for example, solely on a trial of strength, however much an employer or trade union may be tempted to resort to it.

My Government attaches great importance to the growth of strong, free and responsible trade unions and to the maintenance of sound labour-management relations. We are happy that, through free collective bargaining between employers or their organisations and workers' trade unions, under the voluntary system of labour-management relations, we have been able not only to maintain a large measure of industrial peace and harmony in the country but also to secure improved terms and conditions and other benefits for our workers. Labour-management relations, however, like other forms of human relations, continually grow and develop and from time to time bring new problems. With good will and co-operation from employers and workers these problems can be solved.

Whilst the I.L.O. cannot offer any readymade answers, the Organisation can assist in this, and the various proposals made by the Director-General that the I.L.O. should encourage and assist in the formation of national policies for labour relations and the development of industrial relations procedures and machinery are particularly welcomed. Apart from the despatch of expert missions to various countries, I would stress the value of seminars with tripartite participation to study various aspects of the problems. Such seminars, which can be held on a national basis or on a regional basis with several countries participating, will be of inestimable value in promoting understanding of the problems and assisting in the formulation of policies. In 1961 a highly successful Asian Regional Seminar was held in my country on the subject of the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes. I think more such seminars on a tripartite basis should be held.

Another way in which the I.L.O. can assist in this field is to produce for wide distribution practical manuals, similar to the workers' manuals that have been introduced, but on industrial relations subjects showing the various systems prevailing in various countries.

It is vital that in all its activities the International Labour Office should maintain close consultations with, and obtain the full agreement of, the governments concerned, whether specific instruments that should be dealt with, and of member countries and with the Organisation. The proposal that the Conference should set up a Standing Revision Committee to revise certain Conventions and Recommendations is a sound one. The Report has detailed the specific instruments that should be dealt with, and I think we should implement the proposal as soon as possible. The Director-General has given some good advice concerning the need for flexibility in Conventions. The advice should be heeded not only when revising old Conventions but also when framing new ones. It should be heeded by all countries, whether they regard themselves as developed or developing countries, and whatever form of society they have. Some countries may deliberately try to set a rigidly high standard so as to demonstrate that their form of society is so good that such a high standard is nothing to them. Others perhaps may sometimes forget that there are countries less developed than theirs. Still others—developing countries perhaps—may go along with their rigidly high standards because they do not want to lose face and to appear to admit that they are not as well off as their neighbours. Such attitudes should be avoided.

I am in favour of the holding of smaller regional meetings for the study of industrial problems, supported by I.L.O. staff and specialist research, in place of the present Industrial Committees system, based on worldwide representation. Industrial conditions in different countries differ so widely that the present Industrial Committees cannot hope to find common ground for dealing with the detailed problems of all the countries at the same time. For regional studies of industrial problems, I would suggest that attention be given to the plantation industries, rural and cottage industries and possibly on the problems of industrialisation in developing countries.

In conclusion, I thank the Director-General for his stimulating Report and hope that it will lead to the formulation of a suitable blueprint of I.L.O. action in the coming years.

**Interpretation from Spanish:** Mr. SANTOS COY (Government delegate, Mexico)—In my country, which has done me the honour of sending me here as leader of its delegation, the Director-General's Report has been read with particular interest. In the present state of the world the Report we now have before us is more important than in previous years. It shows that the International Labour Office, in accordance with its expressed objectives, is preparing the necessary plans to induce member countries to establish social justice and thus enable world peace to be maintained.

Mexico firmly believes that all countries are
equal and therefore supports non-intervention. Only in this way can national values be fully developed and a just society brought into existence, a society in which men can enjoy in full freedom a decent standard of living without hunger, ignorance or disease. In supporting these principles we act as loyal Members of the United Nations and the I.L.O.

The obligation to protect liberty, and therefore freedom of occupational association, is implemented in my country. Not long ago the very highly worked-out Report of the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labour, spoke of the general freedom of professional association for the defence of the rights and interests of the workers and employers; he affirmed, like the Report, that trade associations must be allowed to express their opinions freely and to take part in discussions where their interests are affected.

The Report discusses the way in which member States should act to develop human resources and points out also how developing countries should bring this about. My country, realising that we must develop human resources, and in agreement with the principles set forth by the I.L.O., has established means of determining fair wages for the workers, has provided housing for them, has looked after their health, has protected them against occupational hazards and arranged for their retraining where necessary in view of the development of new mechanical equipment.

With a view to enabling workers to acquire the necessary skills our laws oblige employers to train their workers, and the State and private initiative have established training centres. The Congress has amended the Federal Labour Act in this regard, prohibiting the employment of persons under 16 years of age who have not completed their compulsory education, save in exceptional circumstances where the authorities concerned think there is compatibility between studies and employment. We consider, like the Report, that general education provides a satisfactory basis upon which a worker can better be guided in selecting his employment.

My Government has sought to encourage national development activity and has associated wide classes of the population in its work. As the Report states, you have to have production before you can distribute. In accordance with this principle, my Government encourages undertakings producing new products and also new undertakings. President López Mateos has also concluded interchange agreements with other countries, thus seeking to promote our national economic development.

In 1962 we took the most important step since the Constitution of 1917, by amending various parts of article 123, paragraph A, of the Constitution, relating to the labour and social welfare. Subparagraph VI now lays down the following rules. Minimum wages for workers shall be general or occupational; the general rates shall apply to one or more economic areas, the latter to certain industries or occupations.

The general minimum wage rates must be sufficient to meet the normal needs of the head of a family, material, social, cultural and educational. Occupational minimum wages shall be determined having regard also to the conditions in the industries or occupations concerned.

Agricultural workers shall have a minimum wage appropriate to their needs.

The minimum wages shall be fixed by regional boards made up of worker, employer and government representatives. They shall be approved by a similarly constituted national body.

Minimum wages determined in this manner seek to raise the standard of life of the worker and of his family.

Subparagraph IX of article 123, paragraph A, of the Constitution merely implemented a right granted in the Constitution of 1917 enabling workers to participate in the profits of all undertakings. As the Report advises, my Government has taken a direct step to increase the income of the workers in almost all sectors.

Social security in Mexico is aimed at providing workers with a standard of living in conformity with human dignity when age or the inevitable risks to which workers are continually exposed prevent them from earning. In this way Mexico has shown once more that it follows I.L.O. policy in ensuring the welfare of the worker.

Employers' and workers' unions in my country enjoy all kinds of guarantees, and trade unionism is at its height. The right to organise and bargain collectively is a reality in Mexico, as our statistics show.

The Secretariat of Labour and Social Welfare, as the Report states, ensures distribution of publications which will enable the workers to intensify the development of trade unions and labour relations.

As has been made clear by the Secretary of Labour, Mexico is a field free of prejudice in which all sectors make an effort for social justice, the inspiration of the Mexican Revolution. All discrimination in employment has been abolished, and the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951, is strictly enforced.

The Report refers to automation and technological change; these are problems which our legislation provides for and the Secretariat of Labour and Social Welfare is taking appropriate action so that we shall not have to face the problem of unemployment.

Those who are in contact with the I.L.O., those who, like Mexico, are interested in seeing that the parties to production live in harmony for the benefit of the national economy, consider that Part II of the Report, entitled "Structure", needs no comment, and we merely ask that we shall be able to take part in elaborating and applying labour programmes.

The workers of Mexico are proud of their advanced legislation; they are proud of having a President who is always alive to the changes going on in the country and who presents to Parliament, with full statements giving the reasons underlying them, the legislative reforms required for maintaining peace and social harmony.

In this way we believe we are doing our duty. We also believe that we have not yet reached
our goal; we shall continue our efforts in order that in our country social justice shall be a fact. And I wish to thank the Conference for having allowed me to speak, in the name of Mexico, and I hope that its work will be entirely successful.

Mr. BECKER (Workers' delegate, Israel)—Mr. President, being the first speaker from among the Workers' delegates this morning in this discussion, it is a pleasure for me to welcome you in the high position you occupy in this Conference and to wish you every possible success.

The Director-General has rightly pointed out in his Report that the I.L.O. now stands at the parting of the ways. There can be no dispute among us as to the fundamental aims of the I.L.O. Those aims, which were laid down 43 years ago, have not lost but gained in significance and urgency with the passage of time. The achievement of social justice, the elimination of poverty and hunger from the world, have guided the efforts of our Organisation. All of us are fully aware that these aims are essential to the building of a true and lasting peace.

Two powerful factors have shaped the international scene since the close of the Second World War. On the one hand, there is the tremendously accelerated pace of technological development resulting from the concentration of human genius and resources in the field of scientific research. On the other hand we are witnessing the revival and emergence of old peoples and new States covering vast areas of Asia and Africa and of other continents. One fact is common to all these peoples: they begin their independent national life with a low standard of living, without adequate sources of employment and sometimes even in a state of dire want.

The main question of our time is: will the technological advances of our age be put to the service of the whole of mankind, for the welfare of all humanity? Or will a large proportion of mankind merely remain objects acted upon by the processes of technological change, while the stream of progress will continue to be carried by those nations which are already industrially advanced? Can we possibly acquiesce in a situation where peoples and States are divided into two categories? For one group science and technology offer unlimited opportunity for future economic progress, while the other group continues to be only an object of assistance and help. That is how the question presents itself on the international scene. On the national scale, the issue is whether technology and automation will lead to the formation of a permanent class of unemployed, or whether they will benefit all sections of the population, bringing higher living standards and new sources of employment, and enriching the community with new goods and services.

The I.L.O. can be both guide and an instrument of enormous importance in directing efforts to reduce the economic and social gap between advanced and developing countries; and in ensuring that the fruits of technological advance benefit all classes in equal measure.

We all know that the I.L.O. is not a world government or a parliament with power of decision and action. But the importance of this Organisation lies above all in its power to influence public opinion and to make it sensitive to the urgent task of eradicating social evils everywhere.

The I.L.O. has an opportunity to fulfil an historic mission in the service of mankind. Despite the differences of opinion and interest which exist among its Members, the I.L.O. has succeeded in encompassing the three major economic and social forces of our time: governments, employers and workers. Most governments in the world today are imbued with progressive social ideas for their people. Any action they may sponsor for the purposes I have mentioned will certainly have the firm support of the Workers' group, and I hope and believe that the Employers neither intend nor desire to fall behind.

We fully appreciate the importance of the legislative work of the I.L.O. Its Conventions are particularly important for those countries where organised labour is weak, though experience teaches us that the ratification of a Convention by a government is sometimes no guarantee in itself, if there are no strong trade unions to stand guard over its implementation.

One must certainly agree with the Director-General that the changes of our time require changes in the work of the I.L.O. Its activities must be expanded, particularly in the crucial fields of vocational training and technical assistance. Today, vocational training is the key to the advancement of the developing countries, and should cover every aspect of production, including agriculture as well as building and transport. Every training project must of course be integrated into the development programme of the country concerned and, taking into account its specific conditions, should also be co-ordinated with the projects of other United Nations agencies.

There is also the all-important question of how to raise productivity in the developing nations. This should not be left to the employers alone. It is of vital importance to the workers; they can and must take part in any productivity drive, but on the clear understanding that the benefits will be shared by all concerned: the national economy, the consumer and the worker. Here the I.L.O. has an excellent opportunity to help through its technical assistance programmes.

We do not believe that it is the task of the I.L.O. to build up trade unions in the developing countries. Trade unions must be organised and supported by the workers themselves. They alone can develop a sound and democratic trade union movement which can and will draw, if necessary, upon assistance and guidance from free trade unions all over the world.

The necessity for national economic planning is obvious. Manpower planning aimed at the full utilisation of human resources is now universally accepted and employed. The active participation of trade unions, particularly in the development plans, in all stages of economic planning is of vital importance and cannot be sufficiently stressed.

It is an essential function of the I.L.O. to ensure the freedom of organisation of the
workers, without government interference, and to help to protect their freedom of action in this important field.

The trade unions have a significant part to play in the modern world, not only in the protection of the workers but also in the moulding and stabilising of a progressive society and in promoting economic development. Their unhampered activity is thus of vital interest not only to the workers but to the entire community. I believe firmly in the right of the worker to organise freely and independently, and in his ability to make a great and perhaps decisive contribution to his country’s progress if given the opportunity; but only a strong and free labour movement can secure stable labour relations and act with a sense of responsibility towards its members and the national economy.

Another field in which the I.L.O. can make an important contribution is that of workers’ education. A variety of means is available to this end, including the granting of scholarships. Of great importance is the International Institute for Labour Studies of the I.L.O., which is a forum for the improvement of industrial relations and a way towards a better knowledge and understanding of social problems.

I have studied with great interest what the Director-General has had to say in his Report about collaboration, standard-setting activities and the discussion of social needs and problems on a regional basis. It should be emphasised, of course, that both on the international and on the regional level the tripartite character of the I.L.O. has to be maintained in all stages of its activities.

Recognising that a common approach on regional activities is essential, I should like to express here on behalf of the Israeli workers our nation’s most sincere wish and readiness for constructive co-operation between all the countries of our region. We are happy to have achieved efficient and mutually beneficial collaboration with many of the developing countries, some of them in our immediate geographical proximity. It is our firm belief that the urgent social and economic needs of Israel and our neighbouring countries make it imperative to strive for closer relations and to collaborate for our common progress.

In summing up I should like to pay tribute to the Director-General, who has given us in his Report this year a clear and concise statement of the basic problems which concern us all. For this we are all grateful.

Fourth Sitting Interpretation from French: Mr. BENJELLOUM (Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, Morocco)—Morocco, which I have the honour of representing for the third consecutive time at the annual Conference of the International Labour Organisation, is happy to make its modest contribution to the discussions at the 47th Session. On behalf of my Government, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the presidency at this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. It is not without emotion that we see today a son of Africa address the I.L.O. and assume such high responsibilities and such honourable duties. Your unanimous election by the States represented here is a tribute to your eminent person, to your great country and to the whole of Africa.

This year the Director-General of the International Labour Office, Mr. David A. Morse, has made a break with his previous practice of dealing in his Report with a particular subject of a social character. This time he has put forward a new theme for our discussion—the programme and structure of the International Labour Organisation. The Director-General proposed that this gathering should have a one-year moratorium on resolutions. I congratulate him warmly for having marked in this way the importance he attaches to plotting a new course for the I.L.O. in the future, without, however, “attempting now to redefine basic principles, to rewrite or revise the fundamentals of the Constitution or of the Declaration of Philadelphia”.

On the international plane the last few years have been marked by very important events. As a result of the accession to independence of many States in Africa and Asia, the number of States Members of the I.L.O. increased. Moreover, the ideological conflict between supporters of free and planned economies has become less acute. The attention of governments will now have to be turned in a new direction. In forthcoming years it will be important to consolidate the economic independence of all these young States which have just attained political independence.

The modern world can be divided into two great parts: on the one hand, the industrialised nations whose incomes rise steadily each year; and, on the other hand, the uncommitted nations whose economic situation is still precarious and whose standard of living is rising only slowly. This development is still further held up by an extremely high rate of population increase.

That is why the major current problem of international organisations in the United Nations family should be the search for new and better means of promoting the growth of national income in these uncommitted nations. True peace cannot prevail among the nations as long as some of them have a high standard of living, whilst others cannot meet the most elementary human needs.

This vast programme is directed, first, to safeguarding peace in the world and, consequently, to the safeguarding of the freedom of the nations. But it is also a question of freedom, so dear to the hearts of all mankind, particularly to those of the workers, cannot be fully achieved except through the adoption of a social policy that will ensure a decent stand-
ard of living to all the workers whilst fully maintaining their dignity as free human beings.

As outlined by the Director-General in his Report, the future programme of the I.L.O. highlights all the tasks to be performed by the Organisation if it is to achieve its object—namely, the improvement of the workers’ lot. Mr. Morse has shown how this policy of economic and social action is to be implemented with the co-operation of labour and employers in accordance with the principles already evolved in the I.L.O., principles which reconcile workers’ freedom with the requirements arising out of the steady advance of science and technology. My country has already entered resolutely on the course outlined by the Director-General. Thanks to the efforts of His Majesty Mohammed V and those of His Majesty Hassan II, Morocco has done a great deal to preserve peace in the world. His Majesty Mohammed V was the pioneer of African unity, an idea which has now made much progress since it is shared by a large number of African countries which co-operated in the Addis Ababa Conference in the practical achievement of this African unity, which is a guarantee of peace not only among the peoples of the African Continent, but also among those of the whole world.

On the economic plane, plans have been made to industrialise the country in order to create the maximum number of jobs. This industrialisation is to be brought about by the harmonious integration of the efforts of the State in certain sectors with those of free enterprise, which will be responsible for manufacturing industries. This industrial development is to be carried out with the active assistance of the trade unions, which in Morocco enjoy the most complete freedom. Freedom of association is formally laid down in the Moroccan Constitution, which was adopted almost unanimously on 7 December 1962, by popular referendum.

Complete freedom in all its forms is a distinguishing feature of the Moroccan Constitution. Political freedom to allow the establishment of a number of parties—which were represented at the legislative elections—and economic freedom, not only make it possible for all citizens to join any association of their choice, but guarantee their rights of ownership and the principle of the right of work for all.

If the workers enjoy every freedom in public life, the Moroccan Constitution has given them privileged status. Not only can trade unions fully defend the economic and other interests of their members; in addition they will be directly represented in the Chamber of Counsellors, together with employers’ organisations, with a third of the seats.

However, Morocco is still a country where agriculture provides employment for the largest part of the working population. In this very important sector of economic life the policy followed with regard to incomes is in full accordance with the recommendations laid down in the Director-General’s Report. Like industrial workers, agricultural workers have a minimum guaranteed cash wage, plus benefits in kind. But most of the workers on the land are small farmers to whom the State guarantees a minimum income by maintaining the price of cereals which provide most of their income.

Moreover, through the activities of two public agencies set up—the National Irrigation Bureau and the National Rural Modernisation Bureau—the position of workers on the land is bound to be greatly improved. These agencies, each in its own field, are trying to increase and diversify agricultural production, to raise the standard of living of land workers and of small farmers, and to promote the creation of new forms of rural existence, in particular integrating into a market economy persons who have until now lived in a subsistence economy.

It is highly desirable that the workers should play an active part in the running of undertakings, in order to acquire a sense of responsibility. Their co-operation with the head of the undertaking, which was established by an Act of 29 October 1962, provides for the election of delegates to discuss the workers’ claims with the employer in certain fields.

In the second part of his Report the Director-General has considered whether the structure of the International Labour Organisation is adapted to the role which this Organisation must play in the years to come, in the light of the programme he outlines. The structure of this Organisation has until now stood up very well to the test of time. It seems, however, that it ought to undergo certain changes, owing to the considerably greater number of member States; and I am happy to note that the increase in the number of States in the Governing Body, which was decided on last year by the Conference at its 46th Session, has been ratified in accordance with the Constitution. It is essential that the uncommitted countries should have more representatives on the Governing Body.

Morocco thinks it necessary that the International Labour Conference should continue to meet each year in its existing form. The discussion on the Director-General’s Report seems essential if member States are to be fully acquainted with the work done by the Organisation each year. Further, it is important to maintain the existing tripartite composition, both of the Conference and of the Governing Body. It is through discussion on a footing of equality among the representatives of governments, workers and employers that it will be possible to continue to define and adopt the principles on which international action in the field of social policy must be based.

It should be possible to make a further increase in the assistance provided by the International Labour Office through the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and through its operational activities. Such assistance is essential to numerous newly independent African countries to assist them in many fields.

Before I leave this rostrum I should like to express once more my gratitude to the experts of the International Labour Office for the work they have done for Morocco in various fields, and I should like to thank the Director-General for the understanding of the problems of my country which he has always shown. His recent visit to Morocco fully shows his interest in the work done by his staff in my country.
The successful results of I.L.O. action in the economic and social development of the African Continent, most of whose States have now regained their independence, cannot be stressed enough. Morocco expresses the hope that the few States that are still dependent may soon join the other independent States in the I.L.O. and the United Nations. Morocco will do its utmost to attain this objective, which is entirely in the interests of world peace and prosperity.

I am happy to see this year again that the ranks of the free and sovereign nations are being reinforced in our Organisation by the arrival of new Members. I join in fraternal greetings to the representatives of Burundi, Rwanda, Jamaica, Uganda, Trinidad and Tobago, and Algeria. On behalf of my delegation and my country I welcome them among us and state my conviction that their participation in our discussions will make a very valuable contribution to the attainment of our objectives.

I should like to extend very special greetings to our Algerian friends and neighbours to whom we are bound by so many ties. The hope I expressed in this connection from this same rostrum in 1961 and 1962 has thus been fulfilled, thanks to the tremendous sacrifices, the courage and eminence of our sister nation of Algeria. Having thus recovered peace and freedom, the peoples of Africa will be in a position to build African unity, a unity which will enable labour to fulfil its deepest aspirations, namely an assurance of a better life for the toiling masses and the attainment of the goals and ideals of the International Labour Organisation.

Mr. EGALA (Minister of Industries, Ghana)
—Mr. President, I thank you most sincerely and profoundly for giving me the opportunity to address this august assembly. I seize this chance, however, first to convey to you personally and also to the distinguished delegates assembled here the warmest greetings and felicitations of the Government and people of Ghana, and secondly, to associate myself with the previous distinguished speakers in congratulating you on your election to this enviable position, which is a great and indelible honour to your country and a tribute to your personal qualities.

The Report of the Director-General which is before this Conference is, in short, an excellent addition to the series of painstaking and considered accounts which the International Labour Organisation has produced before and during similar sessions of this Conference. It gives an indication of a bold and realistic approach to the fundamental issues affecting this world organisation, namely the programme of development in the fields of labour and social problems, and structural and procedural changes, and reminds us clearly of our inescapable commitments to world peace and freedom. It may thus be expedient for us to recall that the I.L.O. is the oldest and the largest of the United Nations agencies and is dedicated in all its activities to world peace and unity. It is therefore reasonable that this Organisation should refrain strictly from anything that will aggravate the existing differences between the so-called power blocs. After all, we all realise that social justice and improved standards of living can be achieved only in an atmosphere of peace and freedom. It is in this context that the Government of Ghana has always emphasised how imperative it is for the developing countries in Africa, Asia and other regions to adopt foreign policies of absolute non-alignment and positive neutrality. Ghana believes that an alignment of any degree or form with any of the so-called power blocs extends the time before world peace can be realised and makes it still more inopportune to achieve and that the perpetuation of the existence of such power blocs makes fun of all our struggles. The international conferences which have been held in Ghana in a bid to focus the attention of world leaders on the issue of world peace and freedom are modest but a visible indication of my country’s interest and concern in this matter.

I wish now to draw attention to the section of the Director-General’s Report which deals with labour relations and the role of trade unions in economic development, which he rightly observes is a subject fraught with considerably difficult and controversial issues. The Director-General demands “What kind of labour legislation is needed and how can it be applied effectively? How can governments encourage the growth of well-organised trade unions without influencing, dominating or controlling them? How can employers be persuaded to recognise trade unions as valid participants in the industrial dialogue, and to move beyond paternalism to constructive personnel and labour relations policies…” In what ways can worker and employer organisations share responsibilities with public authorities in the formulation and execution of national economic development plans and other aspects of economic and social policy?”

These questions are directed to all of us, individually and jointly, and should be considered in the light of the peculiar circumstances obtaining in our respective member countries. My delegation shares the view of the Director-General that it is by no means a small step towards the alleviation of the problem when the International Labour Organisation to produce effective and realistic answers. The over-all principles are there, and we all know them. They are generally good, but how can they be applied in the various countries so as to achieve the maximum benefit?

Regional Conferences of the I.L.O. and other local agencies should examine this subject closely. Conferences which have met before on this issue, would wish to warn that the problems of the developing countries, especially the new self-governing territories, must be clearly understood by those who attempt to provide solutions, in view of the diversity in size, nature and age of the economic, social and political problems of those countries. It would seem in this connection that some existing standards and procedures which have been formulated and adopted by the Organisation have outlived their usefulness in the developing countries and now submit themselves readily for a complete overhaul. I may here refer specifically to some of the Conventions and Recommendations of
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this Organisation. If these legislative instruments are to have meaning and be accepted by all Governments without question then they should take the present world situation—rather the present labour situation in the various countries of the world, particularly the developing countries—into consideration.

In the past the tendency has been to shape the Conventions and Recommendations on western European ideals and principles. As I said earlier, some of the existing standards formulated by the I.L.O. appear to be in need of review if they are to be of use to the developing countries. Quite apart from the fact that the traditional background of labour, social and political matters and their present circumstances in the developing countries are quite unrelated to the principles of some of the Recommendations, the fact that even the older Members of the Organisation have not yet ratified most of them should be a pointer to the International Labour Office to focus attention on this serious position. Anyone taking a quick look at the chart of ratifications prepared by the International Labour Office cannot fail to note that only about 10 per cent. of member countries have ratified some Conventions. I mention in particular Conventions Nos. 34 to 40, 43, 44, 51 to 57, 59 to 62 and 68 to 76.

It is also the view of my delegation that the International Labour Organisation should establish machinery to enforce the implementation of resolutions adopted by the Conference. I believe suggestions have already been made for consideration to amend the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation in order that resolutions of the Conference should have the same force as Recommendations of the Conference.

I wish with your permission, Mr. President, to recall that at the 45th Session of the International Labour Conference, held in 1961, the leader of the Ghana delegation spoke at length on the principles which have guided the Government of Ghana in establishing its labour-management relations system. This can be found at pages 67 to 76 in the Record of Proceedings of that session. I do not wish to reiterate the statement made. I only wish to say here and now that my delegation supports the view of the Director-General that the International Labour Organisation should devise a strategy of action for the promotion of sound trade union development and a viable system of labour relations in the countries pursuing objectives conducive to rapid and stable economic development.

I do not intend to deal exhaustively with the Report at this stage. I have rather raised these few points to indicate that a radical change of procedure in connection with the discussion of the Director-General's Report is absolutely desirable. We cannot deceive ourselves that hitherto the Director-General's Reports and Conventions and Recommendations are often faced with lack of an accepted machinery for disposing of such matters. My delegation feels that the time has come for the establishment of a committee of this Organisation to examine this subject and to design a scheme by which a thorough and deserving debate on the Director-General's Report and the vital items raised in the statements of ministers could be undertaken. Times are fast changing, and we must change with them.

To turn to matters of general information, I will first touch on the need for better utilisation of the labour force by creating high levels of productive employment and vocational training. The Government of Ghana realises that the wealth of a country depends on a large measure on the proper development and utilisation of its manpower resources. In this connection every effort is being made to ascertain the necessary training needs, both current and prospective, and to train the necessary personnel in order to bridge the gap between the supply of and demand for labour, particularly in the professions, the crafts and the skilled trades where investigations have indicated shortages.

The need for training, retraining and improvement in apprenticeship and trade testing has been particularly recognised and every effort is being made to check the imbalance between the supply of and demand for craftsmen and tradesmen. To this end technical education is being expanded and accelerated and there is at present a statutory National Apprenticeship Board to ensure the development and maintenance of high standards in the various crafts and trades. Arrangements are also well in advance, with technical assistance, to set up a training centre for trade instructors, and it is in the same course that my Government has endorsed the I.L.O. proposal to establish a Centre for Advanced Training in Turin.

I should like to state here that special attention has been paid to the need for training officers in the principles and practices, as well as the techniques, of vocational guidance in my country. Plans are envisaged in our impending Seven-Year Development Plan to open more centres to augment the existing facilities for youths who have obtained at least the basic education is being expanded and accelerated. Public education is being expanded and accelerated. Public education is being expanded and accelerated.

I should like to state here that special attention has been paid to the need for training officers in the principles and practices, as well as the techniques, of vocational guidance in my country. Plans are envisaged in our impending Seven-Year Development Plan to open more centres to augment the existing facilities for youths who have obtained at least the basic minimum education. My Government appreciates that employment gives people an income and satisfies the human want for creative activity. It also gives people an opportunity to acquire new skills. From the national standpoint the Government of Ghana is conscious that more employment means greater national output, which in turn promotes economic and capital growth. That is one of the objectives for which the Ghana Government is planning industrialisation and establishing a more diversified economy in order to create employment opportunities and to equip both young and old with new and adequate skills that are necessary for them efficiently to take their rightful places.

Quite recently a National Productivity Conference on the problems connected with productivity was organised in Accra and was attended by experts from a number of countries, not only from Ghana but from sister African countries. Specialists from the East, the West and the neutral countries were all invited to talk to the delegates, and I believe the many conclusions reached will go a long way in helping my Government to tackle the problems related to the impending Seven-Year Plan.
This leads me to the two burning or agitating subjects of "Africanisation of the Regional Offices in Africa" and "geographical distribution of staff of the I.L.O.", as well as the orderly decentralisation of power and responsibility to the regions. These issues must engage the serious attention both of Members here and of the Secretariat. It is a subject about which I can competently say that African member States do justifiably complain and on which they have expressed their views at previous Conferences. My delegation feels that better results could be achieved if the I.L.O. regional organisations could be reorganised and the scope of the functions and responsibilities broadened. It appears that the over-all powers centred at this Headquarters tend to weaken the administration rather than strengthen it. Decentralisation will also offer better opportunities for detailed studies of peculiar problems, and minimise the heavy expenses incurred in our regular and frequent meetings in Geneva. The Director-General has stated his determination to do everything within his power to ensure a more balanced composition of staff at all levels in a manner which will not impair but enhance the efficiency of the Office and preserve its international character and spirit.

It is also argued that, apart from linguistic difficulties, a further handicap to successful improvement appears to lie in the circumstances that excellent career opportunities are opening up in the newly developing countries for persons with the qualifications which the International Labour Office is seeking, with the result that higher salaries are available to such persons in their own countries than are available in the international organisations. Also some developing countries display reluctance to see themselves deprived of the services of the highly qualified persons whose abilities are urgently needed at home.

In conclusion, I wish to thank the members of the Governing Body and to express the appreciation of my Government for the wonderful co-operation they have received from other Governments, as well as Employers' and Workers' delegations, from all member countries during the three years that Ghana has had the esteemed privilege of being a titular member of the Governing Body.

In view of the increasing number of African States which have attained independence and have been admitted to membership of the International Labour Organisation, my Government considers it only fair that some of these African countries should have the opportunity of serving on the Governing Body of this august Organisation. I take this opportunity to welcome the new Members who have been initiated, and hope they will do their best to uphold the principles and policies of this Organisation. I have, with your special indulgence, Mr. President, to pay tribute to the work of the staff of the International Labour Office in connection with this Conference, and to pledge the continued support of the Government of Ghana to the aims, objectives and aspirations of this all-important world organisation.

Mr. ROUTROY (Government delegate, India)
—It gives me great pleasure to have the honour and privilege of participating in the deliberations of this Conference of the International Labour Organisation as leader of my country's delegation. At the outset, I should be failing in my duty if I, on my own behalf and on that of my colleagues in the Indian delegation and also on behalf of my country, did not congratulate the Director-General for the excellent Report that he has presented to this Conference, and for the most comprehensive manner in which he has dealt with the various problems that vitally concern this international Organisation. Being conscious of the differing political, social and economic forces in the world, the Director-General has most conspicuously succeeded in upholding the basic objectives of the International Labour Organisation by taking a balanced view of the record of the member nations in regard to their obligations to this Organisation. It is most gratifying that this international Organisation, which has been working in close co-operation with the United Nations, has successfully kept itself outside the arena of political controversy and has thus continued to inspire the confidence of all the member nations.

At this stage, Mr. President, I would like to convey the great satisfaction in the Indian delegation over your election to preside over this Conference.

The world situation presents some discouraging features. Even during the Development Decade, the rich nations of the world continue to spend far too much on tools of destruction and the poor nations fail to earn enough on which to live and develop. The gap between them grows daily. If the Development Decade is to lead to real results, concerted action must be taken to mitigate the effects of this imbalance.

In the first place, aid to developing countries must grow in volume and variety. Secondly, trade policies and practices must ensure that the good done through economic aid is not undone by fluctuations in commodity prices or unequal terms of trade. The prosperity and rising standards in one part of the world should, in fact, provide openings for exports from the other. There should even be some yielding of ground to make room for the simple manufactures of the poorer nations. It might seem that these matters are outside the pale of the International Labour Organisation's competence, but the Declaration of Philadelphia clearly enjoins that the Organisation examine and consider all international economic and financial policies and measures in the light of its fundamental objects.

The second basic commitment of the International Labour Organisation is to freedom—freedom of work and freedom of association. However, as the Director-General has pointed out, free choice of employment has little practical meaning where unemployment and low incomes prevail, and freedom of association is an empty idea where the trade unions are too weak to be effective. It is towards the creation of this material foundation of freedom that the International Labour Organisation must direct its main attention and effort.

In assigning priorities to action programmes, the Director-General has rightly given the first place to skill—the development and fuller
utilisation of labour forces in economic development. In developing countries, the one resource available in plenty is manpower; but manpower without training is not of much use. In planning for economic development, therefore, two aspects are of particular importance. Scarcity of capital being the common feature of all developing economies, there should be emphasis on the projects which are labour-intensive, and special divisions have to be made for developing the variety of skills which modern industrial development demands.

In the field of training, the role of the International Labour Organisation is immense; in fact, this is a sphere in which the impact of its work can be brought to bear directly on the fruition of many industrial projects. If the International Labour Organisation can set up or assist in setting up a network of training institutes throughout the developing regions, this will be a stimulus to economic growth and will meet, in a tangible way, one of their basic requirements. The rural development programme of the I.I.O. holds great promise for the peoples of the developing countries, and if it is pursued with vigour and boldness it can activate and revolutionise their entire economies.

The problem of evolving a proper incomes policy has also been touched upon by the Director-General. It is common ground that social objectives must inform planned economic endeavour. The spread of incomes must also be such that it feeds the process of growth without creating imbalances or inequity. However, the direction of development has to ensure greater dispersion and less disparity of incomes if the willing participation of workers in the task of economic development is to be secured. In my country the Constitution itself enjoins that economic development demands.

In our country the structure of industrial relations is based on consultation through tripartite and bipartite bodies functioning at different levels. The day-to-day relations between labour and management is governed by a voluntary Code of Discipline which was adopted by the organisations of employers and workers in 1958. We also have our legal system for regulating industrial relations, but a legal system alone cannot stimulate creative relations between workers and employers. Our experience of this voluntary instrument has proved that it is workable.

One difficulty in setting up a sound system of industrial relations in a developing country is the lack of a stable industrial tradition. In many cases both the management and the workers are newcomers on the industrial scene. The basic need in this field is greater education. The growing emphasis in the International Labour Organisation programmes on management development, personnel management and workers' education is, therefore, most welcome.

In our country a comprehensive scheme of workers' education has been in operation for some time. It is a new venture on the part of the Government. Workers' education has hitherto been considered a traditional sphere of trade union activity and the State's entry into this field has, at times, been frowned upon by purists. I am glad to find that the Director-General recognises that in developing countries where trade unions lack the necessary resources to organise the education of workers the State may have to take the initiative. But let me make it clear that, while the Government in my country has made funds available for the Workers' Education Scheme, its implementation is entirely in the hands of an autonomous board which has on it representatives of both workers and employers.

The Director-General has referred to the promotion of worker participation in management in order to give them a better status and a sense of belonging to the unit in which they work. Indeed, in developing countries, an initial unity of outlook between the two sides of industry is basic to economic growth. Even if they industrialise, they must make sure that their factories do not become cockpits of conflict. One way to ensure this is to give the workers a say in the affairs of the industry. We, in India, started a modest scheme of worker participation in management on a voluntary basis and this is working very well.

The International Labour Organisation started with a rather limited membership, more or less as a standard-setting institution and a centre for exchange of information on labour matters. It has known many changes since, both in composition and in functions. Further adaptations are inevitable if it is to meet the needs of its altered membership. The suggestions made by the Director-General in respect of its structure and methods are to be seen from this point of view.

I do not propose to comment on them in any detail during this statement but I do hope that I shall have the opportunity to do so at a later stage in the debate.

We have always felt that there may now be less emphasis on standard setting and more on operational activities. After all, in many
Fourth Sitting

countries there are no cadres of workers to whom these standards can be applied. There the problem is first to create these cadres of workers; without increased operational programmes this process will be delayed. We have also advocated closer contact with regional realities. We therefore welcome the proposal made by the Director-General for an intensification of regional activities. This will give the Organisation's work a greater degree of objectivity.

The formulation of international standards by the International Labour Organisation involves a real dilemma. Conditions in different parts of the world differ so widely that it is hardly possible to arrive at a common denominator. Standards which are good for the advanced countries would be out of line with conditions in the developing regions. The International Labour Organisation has been trying to meet this situation by introducing elements of flexibility in the texts of its Conventions. But an instrument riddled with too many exemptions ceases to be an effective international instrument. On the other hand, adoption of standards on a regional basis might promote a particularism and affect the universality of the International Labour Organisation. The wise course would perhaps be to have more Recommendations rather than more Conventions.

We have travelled far since the International Labour Organisation came into being. The world scene on which it operates today is vastly different from the one it entered upon in 1919. Nations which were outside its membership and were languishing in stagnation are having the first sensation of growth. The International Labour Organisation, together with other organisations of the United Nations family, must help them in realizing a fuller future. Otherwise, the prosperity of the rich nations and the peace of the world will remain on the brink of catastrophe.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. BENÍTEZ (Workers' delegate, Honduras) — The workers of Honduras, whom I represent here, extend respectful, cordial and fraternal greetings to all present at this international gathering, which brings together in unity men of different nationalities, tongues, political and religious beliefs, races, ideologies and social classes, but with only one aim, namely to pool their ideas and aims in order to improve the well-being of mankind.

The benefits received by the human race through the I.L.O. are incalculable. It has been and will continue to be the foundation of social progress of the nations which are now convulsed by the fear that they will be overwhelmed by the powers of anarchy. The I.L.O. through its sound action makes a great contribution to the maintenance of world peace.

Honduras is a country dominated by the mountain ranges which extend the length of the American Continent; two oceans lap against its shores and it bathes in tropical sunshine. This is the country whose representatives have come here to the International Labour Conference with the sound intention of co-operating, in however modest a capacity, with other nations in the study of the action necessary to ensure complete development of the nations.

We have on the agenda first the Report of the Director-General of the I.L.O. In this respect the Honduran labour movement, through me, congratulates all the States Members of this international agency on being so lucky as to have at the head of the I.L.O. a man who has given careful consideration to the objects for which this Organisation was set up. With God's help may he continue to guide the nations along this path of progress. This honourable citizen bears the name of David A. Morse, and he deserves our most sincere applause in thankfulness for his fruitful work.

With regard to financial and budgetary questions, these are the marrow of the various I.L.O. programmes and we should therefore pay the greatest attention to them.

Turning to information and reports on the application of Conventions and Recommendations, we are very much in agreement, but it is necessary that member States which ratify such instruments should apply them in practice in their various countries, since by this means they will be applying I.L.O. ideas to the benefit of their peoples.

One thing which very greatly affects human beings as workers is occupational accidents, and in dealing here with the prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery we shall be safeguarding workers against mortal accidents and reducing costs to employers and social security agencies. It is necessary to give careful consideration to this matter, which we believe to be in the general interest.

With regard to the termination of employment at the initiative of the employer, in some countries labour legislation has provisions dealing with this subject, but it would be of vital importance to give thorough consideration to this matter and to endorse certain measures with a view to avoiding unemployment, which has a great effect on the financial situation of the individual and ultimately on the national economy.

Coming now to the item relating to hygiene in shops and offices, it would be desirable to analyse carefully the various types of shops, in order that the decisions reached may be realistic. There is no need to emphasise that hygiene is an essential basis for the health of human beings; further, it is beneficial to employers and the State.

Although we have previously discussed protective measures for the avoidance of occupational accidents, this is not sufficient, and therefore we must adopt instruments to deal as far as possible with the distressing situation of persons injured in occupational accidents, so as to enable them to maintain their position in society, as well as that of their family. Consequently I am in favour of the controversial employment injury benefits which are suggested to us. May we reconcile our views and aims, and ensure a happy future for our workers through proper understanding.

The free and democratic labour movement of Honduras transmits to the Government and Employers' delegates, through me, its respectful greetings, and asks them to show the
utmost understanding in order to uphold the constructive forces of this hemisphere.

Fellow Workers' delegates, through me the trade union movement of Honduras, which is the strongest and best organised in Central America, sends its fraternal greetings to you and the working men and women whom you represent. I would have you know, too, that in the fine country of Honduras we have men with muscles of steel and agile brains who will fight fairly and who want to preserve industrial peace in order to build a new world in which men will have equal rights and their dignity will be respected.

Mr. MORRIS (Workers' delegate, Canada)—The Report of the Director-General to the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference is a significant document, and it could well become a turning point in the history of the Organisation. It is a bold attempt to review the work of the Organisation as a whole, pointing out the need for, as well as the consequences and results of, suggested changes. The Conference, I am sure, will appreciate this constructive approach, rather than the continued challenges of some Members of this Organisation, concerned primarily with somewhat sterile constitutional and structural issues.

We in the trade union movement of Canada, who have been associated with the I.L.O. since its very inception in 1919, look forward to positive results, hopeful that the debate on the Report of the Director-General will eventually result in a number of decisions which will strengthen this great world organisation. To us, quoting from the Report, the I.L.O. has never been "a platform for pleading special interests or carrying on ideological warfare". We have always conceived of the I.L.O. "as a potent instrument for action on world social problems and as a potent bulwark for world peace". There is no doubt that the Director-General has taken a calculated risk in initiating this discussion, but we share his hope that, as a result of it, "this Organisation will emerge strengthened and with new vigour".

I wish I could share the Director-General's optimism when he states in his introduction to the Report that "it is I believe fair to say that debate is now focused more upon different approaches to the labour and social problems confronting the I.L.O. and less upon political or procedural issues of representation within the I.L.O.". Our experience with Conference debates has left a great deal to be desired in this respect. The last few years, in particular, have witnessed a determined effort on the part of certain delegations to focus the attention of the Conferences on procedural and political issues, with but slight attention paid to labour and social problems.

We share the Director-General's view as expressed in his Report that "there should be no question of attempting now to redefine basic principles, to rewrite or revise the fundamentals of the Constitution or the Declaration of Philadelphia. On this basic principles there should be no disagreement, because every member State has accepted them by the act of membership itself. What it is necessary to discuss is a practical programme and the adjustments in organisation needed to carry it out. I am confident that a broad measure of agreement can be found within the Conference, broader than many may now suspect; and, if such agreement were to be found, this would give a new and powerful impetus to the I.L.O.'s work."

It is in this spirit, in the attempt to seek "broad agreement on practical objectives and practical measures", that we participate in this discussion. This is the way we approach problems in our own trade union movement; this is how we hope the Conference will approach the problems facing this Organisation.

I believe that it is not enough to say that "the I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history". We must add to it that the Organisation finds itself in this situation because the world as a whole is at one of the most critical points of its history. This Organisation is, by its very nature, a reflection of the broad divisions which exist in today's world: divisions between nations and within nations; divisions based on political and ideological orientation, material well-being, climatic and other conditions. I have no quarrel with the Director-General when he states "that the I.L.O. must keep itself an open forum for dialogue among differing world political, social and economic forces; and not become a partisan instrument in any particular interest. It must encourage its Members to respect and to value this international character." We must and we should build bridges between opposing approaches to social and economic problems. These efforts could become, however, very frustrating when the basic conditions for such work do not exist. We must beware that the dialogues do not turn into a series of unrelated monologues and the bridges into mere paper contraptions.

The trade union movement of Canada welcomes every effort to relieve tensions, to create understanding, and to find common solutions to the grave economic and social problems of our day. We do not believe, however, that the achievement of this task would be facilitated by compromising on fundamental principles and commitments. We welcome, therefore, the emphasis which the Director-General places in his Report on the principles which have guided this Organisation; namely, the commitment to peace, the commitment to freedom and the commitment to an ever-advancing social and economic policy. To us they are indivisible, and we cannot make any compromises in defining the goals which these commitments imply. We may agree with the Director-General that "it would be unwise of the I.L.O. to become the advocate of one system or set of institutions in opposition to others". But that does not mean, I hope, that we in the international trade union movement should be asked, while pinpointing international objectives or defining international standards of behaviour, to compromise with basic principles upon which our movement is founded and which have become the very reason for our existence.

We have in the past witnessed the I.L.O. taking ambiguous positions on important economic and social problems, because it felt that it could not speak up clearly on controversial
issues. The I.L.O. reports and documents have not infrequently been quoted as supporting evidence on opposite sides of the same theoretical and ideological arguments. It would be much wiser to accept the reality of the present world situation and admit frankly that certain differences cannot at present be bridged.

Let me point out one example in this respect. The representatives of my organisation have on numerous occasions criticised some of the statements emanating from this Organisation on the question of wages and incomes. I know that many in the Workers' group have felt at all times ill at ease when reading these pronouncements. They have a familiar ring, which we often hear in our own respective countries, about the need for restraint in wages, about the priorities in investment policies pursued by governments and many related subjects. These are sensitive issues. At times the best intentions can be easily misunderstood if they are not defined with clarity and precision. I am taking this opportunity, therefore, in suggesting to the Director-General that this chapter of his Report should be carefully reviewed, so as to avoid any misunderstanding of the policy of the I.L.O., which by and large deserves our support.

The chapters of the Report which deal with human resources and economic development, and the resulting priorities of I.L.O. action, are of paramount importance to the future of the Organisation; so are the chapters on trade unions and labour relations. It is difficult to touch even briefly on all the questions which the Director-General has raised in his Report, but it seems to me that he has outlined an impressive programme of action for this Organisation which, if accepted by the Conference, would augur well for its future.

I agree with the Director-General that "the I.L.O. is not now the only pioneer in the technical co-operation field or in the analysis and policy of social and economic problems". It is a fact that the I.L.O. does not any longer enjoy a monopoly position in these fields. We have in recent years witnessed the emergence of a number of organisations, operating both on a regional and world scale, which engage in activities similar to the I.L.O. It becomes, therefore, extremely urgent for us to reassert our leadership in these fields, and to redouble our efforts to enhance the prestige and the scope of activities as well as the operational programme of this Organisation. Otherwise we stand in danger of seeing the I.L.O. deteriorate a regional and world scale, which engage in activities similar to the I.L.O. It becomes, therefore, extremely urgent for us to reassert our leadership in these fields, and to redouble our efforts to enhance the prestige and the scope of activities as well as the operational programme of this Organisation. Otherwise we stand in danger of seeing the I.L.O. deteriorate in the advanced industrial countries, and that it could never have shared this view. We have said on numerous occasions that the job undertaken by the I.L.O. in 1919 has not been completed in the advanced industrial countries, and that it would never be completed. Changing circum-

partite discussion, and particularly discussion at the International Labour Conference, that there can be a continuing process of definition of the principles which should underlie both national and international action on social and labour policy matters. In most cases the I.L.O. is not dealing with exclusively technical questions in the sense that problems can be settled exclusively by an appeal to technical expertise. Virtually all matters of concern to labour involve the question of what people want; and action can be soundly based only if it carries with it a broad consensus of agreement among the interested parties, such as can be decided and promoted through tripartite discussions."

I also fully agree with the Director-General where he says in another place in the Report that "international standards have always been the backbone of the work of the International Labour Organisation; their relative importance varies with time, place and subject; but in all the fields in which technical cooperation, promotional work and educational and practical activities are closely related to policy it is the existence of the authoritative consensus of responsible opinion expressed in international standards which gives the programmes of the International Labour Organisation their distinctive character and a large part of their value. The current problem and task of the Organisation, as we have seen in varied contexts, is to fuse these essentially complementary forms of international action into a dynamic but coherent over-all programme. In this process the elaboration of new international standards on matters of current importance will continue to play an essential part. The increasing extent to which the modern State deals with economic and social problems by methods other than legislation has not been accompanied by any decline in the importance of social legislation; on the contrary, new social legislation continues to be under constant discussion everywhere, in countries of every shade of economic philosophy and outlook and in every stage of economic social development. The position in respect of international labour standards is analogous."

We may have differences on the form which international standards should take, but I am certain that the Workers' group has no dogmatic views on this subject. It has supported Recommendations when these were deemed to have been the appropriate instruments. It has asked for Conventions only when these were deemed to be the only appropriate measures. We do not consider, in its view, the only appropriate way in which international social standards could best have been defined.

I am also glad that the Director-General has dealt with another fiction in a constructive manner, namely that the role of the I.L.O. is finished as far as the industrially advanced countries are concerned, and that it must concentrate solely on economic and technical assistance to the developing countries. We in the trade union movement of Canada have never shared this view. We have said on numerous occasions that the job undertaken by the I.L.O. in 1919 has not been completed in the advanced industrial countries, and that it would never be completed. Changing circum-
stances and continuous economic growth and development create new social and economic problems which can only be dealt with on an international scale. We are glad that the Report recognises this problem in its proper perspective, and the work which the Director-General outlines for the I.L.O. will deserve the closest scrutiny on the part of this Organisation.

We are convinced that economically advanced countries have as much to gain from I.L.O. activities as the developing countries. A great deal has been neglected in this respect in the past few years, and it is our hope that the new directions which the Report envisages will bring about a number of important and constructive changes.

We are also very interested in the suggestions on how the I.L.O. should deal in the field of operational activities with non-governmental organisations. We agree with the Director-General when he says that "it is difficult to see how action by the I.L.O. in this field could be fully effective if it would be confined to working only with governments". This subject requires close study because of the inherent dangers as well as the opportunities for future I.L.O. action. While refraining from making any specific comments on this point, I hope that this question will receive further attention.

This also raises the problem of tripartite participation in the whole field of technical assistance. What is the role of the workers' and the employers' organisations in initiating technical assistance programmes? How far should these organisations be consulted at the national level in the initiation and implementation of I.L.O.-directed or supervised technical assistance programmes? Is there a role for voluntary organisations of labour and management in the selection of personnel engaged in this work? These and similar questions have agitated a number of us in the past and it is our hope that within the total framework of this review positive answers can be found. In my opinion they touch on the fundamental structure and purpose of the I.L.O., which has become synonymous with this historic concept of tripartite participation.

These are only a few of the problems, those which I have time to raise in this debate. I am sure that the Organisation will come out invigorated and strengthened from this period of discussion. To this end I pledge to you the continued and wholehearted co-operation of my own organisation, the Canadian Labour Congress, and that of the workers of Canada whom I have the honour to represent at this Conference.

(The Conference adjourned at 12.45 p.m.)
FIFTH SITTING

Friday, 7 June 1963, 3.15 p.m.

President : Mr. Johnson

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

The PRESIDENT—We shall now resume the discussion of the Director-General’s Report.

Interpretation from Spanish : Mr. YLLANES RAMOS (Employers’ delegate, Mexico)—First of all, I would like to congratulate the Director-General on this Report, which faces calmly and courageously the principal problems before the Organisation. It is a realistic and objective document dealing with problems which require decision, serenity and imagination if they are to receive a practical solution.

The question is, fundamentally, whether the I.L.O. has answered the call of its destiny, whether it is still capable of co-operating in the establishment of social justice, whether it is an efficient instrument for the achievement of lasting peace.

From 1919 to 1946, from 1946 to today, and particularly during the last five years, the political organisation of the world has developed so fast that we seem to see a new world arising before our eyes. These political changes, dramatically reflected in the independence of so many countries, require the Organisation to examine its organs, its means of expression and operation, and its structure in order to see whether it can understand and help all those countries and the human beings who inhabit them so that they may realise their destiny and move forward in dignity and freedom in the light of their own particular characteristics and the means at their disposal. The unknown quantity lies in whether international labour legislation—Conventions which live or could be a dead letter—is applicable in countries in course of consolidation and development or whether legislative activities should be suspended until the majority of member States have reached the appropriate level and pattern.

Furthermore, we have to see what is the best means for meeting the needs of technical assistance and vocational training in the new countries so as to help them to develop, so that within a short time they may enjoy the benefits of economic progress and the satisfactions which have been created by advanced technology for all mankind.

All these new countries which have reached independence quite rightly claim the same rights as those enjoyed by the old member States and especially those with a great tradition of freedom and social organisation and progress in their own political and economic institutions. The new countries seek for their inhabitants the same satisfactions as those available to the citizens of the most economically advanced countries.

In speaking of the new countries which have reached political independence I include, because of similar needs, those countries which, although they have had independence for practically a century and a half, are still among the underdeveloped countries, or, as we now more charitably say, the developing countries. They have political independence but they have not its complement, economic independence, owing to the lack of opportunities and of the possibility of raising the standard of living of their inhabitants.

I think these matters can be duly dealt with and that the I.L.O. is in fact making an effort within its own field to improve matters by intensifying its operational activities such as technical assistance co-operation in vocational training and other valuable projects.

I should like particularly to call the attention of the Conference to and to thank the Director-General for the International Institute for Labour Studies and the Turin International Centre for Advanced Training, the latter due mainly to the generosity of the Italian Government, and the special training centres in Latin America, Asia and Africa, all of which, by introducing new methods and systems, are providing enormous facilities for the training of managers, instructors and skilled workers for the developing countries. I hope that all this work will be successful. Paraphrasing a great statesman, I would say of the I.L.O. experts how wonderful it is that so few have been able to do so much.

However, let me refer to the great demands made on some countries and on international agencies, particularly the I.L.O., while many countries forget that nobody can or will help them if they do not help themselves, if they do not go on working, making every effort to face their own destiny themselves; they should not expect from others what they cannot or will not do for themselves.

Let us not forget that although in the last 15 years the I.L.O. has been moving forward very much in its operational activities, it was
and is primarily an international legislative organisation.

In the past, international Conventions and Recommendations were planned and elaborated as regards their coming into effect, application and provision, for a certain number of States where conditions were substantially the same. Now, however, political upheavals are taking place all over the world; in fact there has been an economic and social revolution, so that there are marked contrasts between countries which have nothing in common except the sense of their human destiny. However, the member States have neglected the expected instruments of legislation of a universal, binding character are not all at the same level as regards conditions which would enable them to apply the same social and economic standards to protect the worker.

In other words, let us say frankly that the I.L.O. used to be a European organisation; then the American countries came in and the Organisation evolved to meet the problems of the federated States and the others such differing political, economic and social conditions; now we have the new countries of Africa and Asia which at present cannot reach the minimum standards of the international Conventions; and so one must ask what is the use at the moment of international labour legislation.

If we look back to the Treaty of Versailles and the discussions about Part XIII of the Treaty, we must remember what was said on 17, 19 and 20 March 1919 when it was proposed originally that the international labour instruments should be Recommendations. Ideologists of that time, particularly the workers, urged, and the governments accepted, that there should be international labour Conventions, in fact, multilateral treaties. The workers demanded minimum guarantees, the satisfaction of their humanitarian aspirations and the establishment of other principles which they considered to be the basis of every country; and this they wished to be achieved by multilateral treaties.

Thus it was that the I.L.O. Conventions obtained preference, permitting a genuine International Labour Code to be created as the years went on. We must remember that, when in the Conference it has been proposed that a Recommendation be adopted instead of a Convention, this has been regarded as a disappointment or a failure.

We should face the facts, we should see what has actually happened with the Conventions. Very often the Conference has adopted such instruments, without having regard to the necessary technical and factual considerations, merely for emotional and political reasons. Many persons have voted in favour of a Convention knowing perfectly well that their country would never ratify it, or that, even if they did it would never be applied. The important thing for many was, and still remains, to adopt an aggressive and demagogic attitude, posing before the world as "progressive" countries and trying to prove that they were not behind anybody in social progress. It was forgotten that the real importance of Conventions is to arrive at conclusions which have been negotiated, discussed and analysed in complete understanding and tolerance of all points of view, and not to achieve a mere stage triumph with a crown of newsprint.

Certain countries by reason of their policy, their social development and their system of making the individual subservient to the State, vote in favour of what they have no intention of applying. But they treacherously use the I.L.O. to create problems for other countries. In some countries there is not even a submission to the national authority for ratification. In others, even in those where the legal system is such that a Convention automatically has legislative force, there is no further action on the requirement for ratification may or may not be sent to Geneva according to the circumstances of the moment.

Look at the table of ratifications and you will see how poor it is. You see that the majority of the Conventions have not been ratified by two-thirds of the member States. Let me remind you that that "two-thirds" comes into article 19 (2) of the Constitution, which requires that a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present shall be necessary for the adoption of a Convention. As ratification is also required as a second formal act of obligation to apply the Convention, we think that this second act of sovereignty of each country, which has the freedom and the right to ratify or not to ratify a Convention, is an essential factor which must be regarded as an integral part of the Constitution, and that a Convention should not come into force until two-thirds of the member States have ratified it. That is not in the Constitution, of course, but it is required by common sense and technical considerations.

The result is that the I.L.O. has adopted many Conventions, which are not ratified to the extent they should be. Furthermore, and still more serious, they are not applied.

Consequently, referring to the problems raised in Chapter VIII of the Director-General's Report, we have to see whether this one essential thing has been forgotten. It has been forgotten that, as a multilateral treaty binding on member States, a Convention ought to be ratified by two-thirds of them before it comes into force. Anything else is absurd, and so is the present situation, which permits demagogic, political, and indeed improper and unjust, attitudes in the face of grave social problems, when people support Conventions only to win a political battle in the Conference, forgetting the moral obligation to ratify immediately a Convention for which one has voted. If you do not do that, then you have deceived—and I repeat the word deceived—other member States. Morally, a State has no right to vote in favour of a Convention unless it is able to ratify it, and if that obligation is not immediately assumed. It is not enough to require, as does article 19, paragraph 5 (b) of the Constitution, that a country must submit the instrument within one year to the competent authority for the enactment of legislation or other action, unless such a provision is accompanied by a sanction. Logically, if the Convention is not ratified by two-thirds of the member States within, say, two years, the Convention should no longer bind any member State at all.

The Director-General speaks of the test of time and the survival value of the Conventions,
and he is right to concern himself with this, but he is rather optimistic in this respect, for in fact the Conventions cannot be international treaties, nor can they entail the fulfilment of obligations, unless they are ratified by two-thirds of the States Members, and this should be expressed in the due deposit of the ratification, as stated in article 20 of the Constitution. If the entry into force of a Convention as a binding international instrument were subject to ratification in the manner described above, as required by logical and technical considerations, then the Conventions of the I.L.O. would be really valuable.

The present attitude of the majority of member States, however, is one of complete indifference and heedlessness of their obligations, once they have triumphed at the Conference—and I wonder if their triumph has not been a vain one—in voting for the Convention. The Director-General is quite right in analysing the Conventions to make a distinction, referring first of all to the Conventions which contain general principles and which should be adopted and applied by the member States if they really wish to have international legislation of a genuine character. He then mentions that the Conventions should not go into too much detail, because if they do they cannot be ratified and applied. He therefore recognises that the Conventions should be in general terms.

The Director-General makes various suggestions with a view to: repealing the instruments adopted by the Conference which have not achieved their aims, or which have completely achieved them; introducing a simplified procedure for the amendment of certain technical provisions, while respecting the principle that the obligations of States may not be extended without their consent; and systematically revising I.L.O. instruments at the rate of one Convention or group of related Conventions a year—this to be done by a special Conference committee, thus presupposing the creation of a new committee.

In the Director-General’s opinion such a programme would enable 15 Conventions to be repealed and 16 to be revised during an initial period of five years or so.

These suggestions merit consideration by the Governing Body; the first and the third might enable the I.L.O. to live in accordance with its principles, whereas the second would require a fundamental structural change which would be quite unacceptable.

I therefore think that, given the heterogeneous structure of the I.L.O., the Recommendation is the most suitable instrument for general purposes.

There are contrasting conditions in the various countries which make it almost impossible to establish binding standards except on matters of general importance, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and matters affecting the freedom and dignity of the workers, freedom of association, the right to bargain collectively, protection against unemployment, and so on. These involve the fulfilment of general obligations by all member States, and are suitable for Conventions; Recommendations, on the other hand, can establish specific aims and means for their accomplishment. The general procedure should therefore be to promote the adoption of Recommendations and restrict that of Conventions, which—as I have said—must be ratified by two-thirds of the member States before they can come into force. In order to bring the I.L.O. up to date, I would advise that a period of, say, two years be prescribed within which member States must ratify or not ratify the Conventions adopted by the Conference, and that those Conventions which have not then received ratification by two-thirds of the member States should then simply become Recommendations.

*Interpretation from Russian: Mr. VOLKOV (Chairman, State Labour and Wages Committee, Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.)—At the very beginning of my statement I would like on behalf of the Soviet Government to greet the participants in this Conference and to wish the Conference every success in its work. I also have pleasure in greeting the President of our Conference, the distinguished Minister from Nigeria, Mr. Johnson, whose outstanding qualities are known to us all. The appointment to this position of a representative of Africa is a momentous event, which reflects the major changes that are occurring in the world at this time.

The 47th Session of the General Conference of the I.L.O. differs considerably from earlier Conferences. For the first time in many years participants are given an opportunity for a broad and comprehensive exchange of views on the activities and structure of the International Labour Organisation. Such an exchange is overdue; indeed, we are convinced that in many respects the I.L.O. has been outstripped by events. Major changes, major historical problems, affecting entire continents are occurring at this time. Colonialism, the shame of mankind, is living out its last days. Like Prometheus unbound, Africa is casting off the chains of colonialism, and even though considerable further effort is still needed to liquidate the vestiges of colonialism and its aftermath, it is doubtful whether anyone would be so bold as openly to champion the principles of colonial domination. Those days are past, never to return.

Each year that goes by witnesses the strengthening of the socialist countries. Having put an end to exploitation and injustice, they have become a decisive factor in the development of human society. At present the socialist countries cover 26 per cent. of the total surface of the globe, with a population representing one-third of the total world population. The industrial output of the socialist countries accounts for more than 37 per cent. of the total world industrial output. One can choose whether to recognise or ignore realities, but they will not thereby cease to exist. The progress of the peoples towards freedom and lasting peace is inexorable, not because it is imposed from outside but because it is the natural law of mankind. We are living in an era of major achievements in science and technique. The era of the conquest of space has begun; the progress of science and technique has opened new perspectives for the speedy development
of economy and production. New opportunities exist to put an end to poverty and social insecurity, to release the great ideals of peace and progress. As never before, the International Labour Organisation faces this problem: is it prepared and able to participate actively in the implementation of this difficult task?

I do not think anybody will question the desire and the readiness of the I.L.O. to participate in the solution of this problem. However, very much has still to be done in order to improve the activities of the International Labour Organisation.

We share and understand the concern of the Director-General which he voiced in his Report on the programme and structure of the I.L.O. In stating the policies of the Organisation he pointed to a limited number of comprehensive problems upon which the I.L.O. should concentrate its efforts. In our belief the proposals to concentrate the activities of the I.L.O. on a number of problems is in principle correct, and we support it. This is the most effective way of using the personnel and resources of the Organisation. As regards the actual list of these major problems, I must say that, however they may differ, all of them must serve one and the same purpose—to strengthen the peace and to improve the situation of the workers.

Aggressive circles in imperialistic countries are pursuing the policy of an armaments race. They are animating old dangers of war and building up new ones. They are stepping up the cold war and the most extreme of them—those who in the United States are called "crazy"—are openly calling for a hot war. Today more than ever it is important to mobilise all forces against the threat of war, to secure a solid and lasting peace without which it is impossible to achieve lasting social and economic progress.

I represent a country which sincerely and steadfastly struggles for peace and friendship between peoples. The Soviet Union has proved this by its deeds, which are known throughout the world. The Soviet Government consistently champions the idea of general and complete disarmament under proper international control. It is said that guns are made to be fired, but the Soviet Union is manufacturing guns only because circumstances compel it to do so. That is why we are thinking not only about how to prevent the need to fire them, but also about how to make their manufacture unnecessary. The saying that he who lives by the sword shall die by the sword has never been more true. Today he who fires first will fire at himself. Is it not better finally to realise how to make their manufacture unnecessary, how to prevent the need to fire them, but also how to prevent the human race from its own suicide?

Anyone who has visited the Soviet Union will certainly realise that our country is a vast building site. We are building countless factories, schools, kindergartens, etc. Every year many millions of square feet of new housing space are occupied. We are steadily reducing the working day and the working week without cutting, but actually raising, the wages of the workers. How can one conceive that a man who is building a new house is thinking of setting fire to his own or his neighbour's roof? We are at the same time doing everything possible to prevent a lunatic from lighting the flame of a world fire.

The authority and popularity of the I.L.O. will greatly increase if it is able to support actively the actions of governments and other international organisations that are directed towards achieving peace. But unfortunately one must recognise that the I.L.O.—and in this it differs from other organisations—is maintaining a restricted position as regards the struggle for peace. When one reads the reports and publications of the I.L.O., one wonders what is the position of the I.L.O. as regards this struggle for peace; what is its contribution to this great cause? According to the calculations of United Nations experts, $120,000 million are being spent yearly on armaments. This means that hourly—and I stress "hourly"—the armaments race is consuming some $14 million; that is to say, a sum equal to the budget of the I.L.O. in 1963. Can the I.L.O. ignore this vast wastage of resources which is directly affecting the successful activities of our Organisation? The end of the armaments race, the prohibition of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, and general and complete disarmament could create conditions of security for every worker—security in the fact that he could calmly work and take advantage of those vast resources which are now being consumed in incredibly inflated military budgets.

Another task that faces the world is the struggle for the urgent liquidation of colonialism and its aftermath. The Organisation must work out an appropriate programme of action. The I.L.O. can assist not only in the training of skilled national personnel, in drafting progressive labour legislation, but also in doing away—and this has been demanded by many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America—with the unequal trading situation between the industrially developed and the developing countries; in setting fair prices for primary products which are still the main source of foreign trade for many developing countries. According to G.A.T.T. statistics for 1960, exports of foodstuffs from the industrially developed countries increased between 1957 and 1960 from $9,100 million to $13,400 million, whereas exports from the agricultural countries dropped by more than $500 million. We have a situation where the stronger international and national monopolies in the industrially developed countries are imposing their will, and causing more and more harm to the young economies of many countries of Africa, Asia and other continents.

The Director-General is suggesting a programme which he calls a strategy for human resources development. I realise that sometimes processes and events are so complex and so varied that it is difficult to find an adequate name for them. But I am convinced that, when millions of people are unemployed throughout the world, it is necessary to decide with clarity, reflection and determination how we are going to help those people. What I mean is that the problem of the fight against the increasing proportion of unemployment should represent the central core of the programme of activities which the I.L.O. must undertake in the field of employment.
At the end of his Report the Director-General says that, if the Organisation's activities are to do the job according to the main priorities he has suggested, there will need to emerge a new balance among the different methods of I.L.O. action, and that this in turn has some broad implications for I.L.O. structure and organisation. We realise that this is an acknowledgment of the urgent need to review the structural and organisational basis of the I.L.O.'s activities. In our belief, irrespective of how the programmes of the I.L.O. evolve, its present organisational structure requires an immediate and, in many respects, a considerable change. The Director-General says that it would be unrealistic for the I.L.O. to become the advocate of one system or set of institutions in opposition to others. That is of course quite true, and we should like this to be translated into facts. However, in order to achieve this, even a hundred correct declarations would not be enough. It is necessary that the I.L.O. should gear its activities, not to the interests of a narrow group of privileged persons who control vast wealth created by the labour of millions, but in the interests of millions of workers throughout the world. This is something that is required of the I.L.O. under the terms of its own Constitution.

The I.L.O. should considerably democratise its structure and its methods of work. It must create an atmosphere of genuine international cooperation inside the Organisation. On what grounds are obstacles being raised against the normal and proportionate representation of all basic trends of the international trade union movement in the organs of the I.L.O., and especially in its Governing Body? It is only the desire to prevent the participation of the representatives of all trends in the world trade union movement that can explain why certain delegates at first suggest the setting up of committees to study the rights and situation of the trade unions in individual countries and then ignore the more or less objective conclusions of these very same committees. By what right do gentlemen who call themselves "free employers" prevent the admission of heads of industrial undertakings whose management is based on principles which differ from those which they themselves follow?

We understand of course that the present situation is agreeable to them but one cannot extend stock-exchange habits and the traditions of so-called free enterprise to international relations. The Governing Body of the I.L.O. is not the board of a joint-stock company. Membership is based not on a portfolio of shares but on the genuine and equal international co-operation. If the I.L.O. does not wish to remain lagging behind the inexorable course of international progress and its needs, if it does not wish to condemn itself to impotence, it must fully realise and reflect the changes that are occurring in the world. On that will depend its whole basis, its very existence as an international organisation.

The time is long overdue to solve many of the questions I have referred to. Bearing in mind the wishes expressed by the Director-General, we at this Conference have not tabled any resolutions outside the agenda, but we consider that it would be useful to focus the attention of the participants of this Conference on the key problems which in the future could serve as a basis for action for planning of all the important questions posed, and thus expect the discussion of the Report of the Director-General. In this connection the Soviet delegation is submitting for the consideration of this Conference a memorandum in which these key problems are set out. We are prepared patiently to discuss all other proposals in order to find a proper and acceptable solution.

We consider that this Conference not only may represent a turning point in the history of the I.L.O. but should, indeed must, provide that turning point. The International Labour Organisation, renewed and enriched by fresh forces, purged from archaic and undemocratic incrustations, must become an important instrument in the struggle for peace and for social and economic progress.

Mr. LYNCH (Minister for Industry and Commerce, Ireland)—Mr. President, I would like to join with the other speakers who have congratulated you on your election as President of the Conference and who paid tribute to the abilities you possess which qualify you so admirably for this high office. I have particular pleasure in doing so because I recall that when you spoke from this rostrum last year not only did you congratulate me on my election to the same office but you paid tribute to my country and to my native city of Cork where is situated the headquarters of the Society of Missionaries who have worked for so many years in Nigeria. Ireland has indeed sent thousands of workers—religious, teachers, engineers and doctors—to Nigeria and other African countries. We at home look with pride and satisfaction on their work and I hope that I will not be considered presumptuous when I say that we share with your countrymen the pride that they feel at your election as President of this, the most representative of all the international bodies.

I am sure that many of the delegates who will address the Conference on the Report of the Director-General have faced a common problem. This year in particular the Report is of necessity wide-ranging, and it raises so many questions urgently in need of an answer that it is difficult to decide on the very few aspects of it which can be touched on within the time allotted to each speaker.

Some of the matters raised call for an examination of conscience by each individual delegate. Other questions demand expert consideration, and the approach to these might perhaps be led by those among us who have long years of experience of the operation of the I.L.O. However, the great amount of thought and careful preparation which has so obviously preceded the presentation of this Report imposes on us an obligation to give, even in brief and general terms, our views on the main questions posed. These can, I think, be reduced to two. What are the most urgent tasks now facing the I.L.O. and how should the Organisation go about them?

Consideration of one of these questions inevitably involves discussion of the other because, in trying to suggest the kind of tasks that might be included in our future programme, we are bound to ask ourselves whether
we think the present organs and structure of the I.L.O. are well suited to carry out the programme. For over four decades now, the Conference has considered, year in year out, proposals for the adoption of international instruments, and at last year’s session the Conference adopted its 118th Convention and 117th Recommendation. By a process of revision some of the older Conventions have now been either replaced or supplemented by more up-to-date instruments, and in his Report the Director-General suggests guide lines on which this policy of revision should be pursued. It seems to me that this is one task well worthy of attention. As a first step the Conference might take the advice of the Director-General and remove what the Report describes as the “dead-wood” of certain ineffective Conventions. The examination of the remaining older Conventions should be tackled with certain objectives in mind. It would not, I think, be sufficient if these Conventions were examined for the purpose of raising standards which have been overtaken by social progress of the past 40 years. Equally important, to my mind, is the need to have a close look at each of these Conventions to see if the methods of implementation, or even the manner in which the standards are set out in them, could be revised so as to attract ratifications without materially detracting from the value of the instrument as an international standard.

The Irish Government, no doubt in common with others, has from time to time come up against the problem of inflexibility in I.L.O. Conventions to which the Director-General refers. Although we feel that we have maintained a satisfactory record in the matter of ratified Conventions, there are quite a number of instruments which, for technical reasons, we have been unable to ratify. In some cases our legislation or practice has been found to be in advance of the standards proposed in the Convention on all matters of substance, but because of some relatively minor inconsistency we have been unable to subscribe formally to the instrument.

We do, of course, fully appreciate the problems which face a committee of this Conference when the text of a Convention is in course of preparation. Pressures within the committee, the need for compromise and the understandable inclination to pitch standards at a high level—all these are factors which make it difficult to keep constantly in mind the desirability of framing an instrument which will also take full account of realities. But, like every other successful organisation or individual, the I.L.O. must be willing—even eager—to learn the lessons of experience. The ineffectue Conventions mentioned in the Report and those others which have not stood up well to the test of time are strong arguments in favour of a new approach to the problem of drafting Conventions and Recommendations. One approach which might be given a wider trial is the principle of step-by-step or partial ratification. There has, of course, been a recommendation to adopt an “all or nothing” formula of ratification which has been embodied in so many I.L.O. Conventions. While it might be premature to give this trend unqualified support as yet, it certainly seems well worthy of the closest consideration.

If the Conference, with the assistance of its expert Secretariat, could devise instruments which would enable member States to record either a total ratification or a series of partial ratifications by progressive stages there would, I feel, be fewer neglected instruments in the I.L.O. code of labour Conventions. This question might be kept in mind in any programme of revision of the older Conventions, to which the Report refers.

In Chapter IV of his Report the Director-General deals with the role of the I.L.O. in the field of industrial relations. This is a subject with which I, in my capacity as Minister responsible for labour affairs, have found myself preoccupied during the past year. At first sight one might assume that the I.L.O. was the ideal body to propose international standards on this very important question. The tripartite structure of the Organisation emphasises very pointedly the role which governments, workers, and employers have to play, and indeed many of the decisions arrived at by the Conference are the result of a special kind of collective bargaining at the international level. However, as the Director-General points out, the International Labour Conference, by the adoption of instruments on freedom of association, the right to organise and collective bargaining, has gone almost as far as it can with prudence at present in formulating international Conventions on this subject, although there may be, as the Report suggests, further scope for supplementary Recommendations on allied questions.

The reason is, of course, that, while the matters set out in the existing Conventions are general principles which have—or at least should have—universal application, the day-to-day operation of industrial relations procedures cannot readily be standardised. Divergences of political and social systems among member States are such that a pattern of negotiating machinery which works well in one country might be entirely unsuitable in another.

Even if it may be difficult for the I.L.O. to propose new general standards, there is much that can still be done in the field of industrial relations, and new member States can, I think, give a useful lead in this. Many States are now faced with the task of establishing a pattern of negotiating machinery which works well in one country might be entirely unsuitable in another.

Despite the difficulties inherent in the problem, I sincerely hope that the I.L.O. will find ways, particularly through its educational programmes and fellowship schemes, of
These questions are determined by a judicial body, in the Director-General's report. As he points out, there is much to be said for the proposal contained in the Director-General's report which we have before us this year. I am sure that no one will be so over-optimistic as to expect that solutions will be found to all the problems as a result of this debate. It is, however, a good thing to raise these questions now. The membership of the Organisation has altered so much in recent years that it is essential to see whether a substantial majority of our Members today are satisfied with policies and procedures which were acceptable to the Organisation even a few short years ago. Some delegations which are impatient for sweeping changes will almost certainly be disappointed by the results of this discussion. However, one of the built-in safeguards of any democratic institution is that proposals for far-reaching changes must undergo a searching examination. Whether change comes slowly or quickly is not so important as the vital need to be satisfied, before we move, that change will bring real benefit.

I conclude, Sir, by congratulating you again on attaining your enviable office. I, as your immediate predecessor, know what tasks and what problems will be before you, and, enviable though your office is, I for one do not envy you your occupancy of the Chair this year.

The President—Thank you, Mr. Lynch. We will take into serious consideration what you have said, and that is that the I.L.O. should learn from experience. I can assure you that the President is ready to draw from the rich experience which you, his immediate predecessor, have left behind.

Interpretation from French: Mr. MANGAMADO (Government delegate, Cameroon)—I am extremely touched by the honour which has been done me for the second time in succession, allowing me to come to this rostrum to speak as the representative of the Federal Republic of Cameroon. I shall therefore make every effort to live up to this honour and to make, as all members of my delegation, as constructive a contribution as possible to the discussion of the items on the agenda of this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference.

Ours is truly a builder's task and the report prepared by the Director-General is a masterly tender for the work—realistic, accurate and lucid. I congratulate him and thank him from the bottom of my heart. He can rest assured that there are no thorns in the laurel crown we have made for him in tribute to his decisive contribution in giving a new direction to the activities of the International Labour Organisation.

We agree with the Director-General that the senior international organisation has reached a critical stage in its existence. I believe personally that if the Organisation is not to sink in a morass of formalism it must rise higher and look ahead farther than it has in the past, in order to make, with all desirable flexibility and increased effectiveness, a realistic study of the greatest social problems of the moment. There can be no doubt that among these problems the twin problems of the maintenance of peace and the defence of freedom have first
place, at any rate in the eyes of an African like myself.

However, before we add another storey to this edifice, should we not first make sure that the foundations are unshakeable? Before we study the delicate problems of safeguarding liberty, would it not be desirable to allow men all over the earth to taste this ideal fruit, which is still forbidden to all too many of them?

Before I make a few modest remarks or suggestions with regard to the programme proposed by the Director-General, it is my duty to say that the main aim of all Africans, as for all men of good will, whatever position they hold in their country or in society, is above all to bring about as rapidly as possible the liberation of those who are still enslaved, to whatever extent and in whatever circumstances.

I personally consider that it is now intolerable that great stretches of Africa, peopled by Africans, should still be under colonial domination and that the status should, under a legal fiction which is indefensible in relation to the law of nations, be that of provinces forming an integral part of distant Western European countries.

I consider that it is intolerable that there should still exist, half way through the twentieth century, certain sections of the population of a State (some of those who first stood on the country's soil) who are refused civic rights enjoyed by later arrivals, and that discrimination should be based on the most controversial possible criterion, namely that of the colour of their skins. It really seems a gamble, as long as such anomalies have not been abolished and such heresies completely eradicated, to contemplate the maintenance of peace in the world.

In truth, there can be no peace for mankind as long as the political régime under which men are placed does not enable them at any rate to be born with the same rights as their fellow citizens. I also deplore the fact that nothing is done in the political régime under which men are placed does not enable them at any rate to be born with the same rights as their fellow citizens.

I deplore the fact that nothing is done in the political régime under which men are placed does not enable them at any rate to be born with the same rights as their fellow citizens.

I have come to the end of this essential—though regrettable—digression. I am happy to have complied with the dictates of my conscience by asserting that, as long as such a situation continues, all the other actions we shall take to increase the well-being and social value of the workers, will contain a discordant element, a powerful factor causing dislocation and social troubles, the persistence of which is unlikely to give a very flattering idea of the courage which animates so-called men of good will.

I should like to make a few brief comments on some points in the programme envisaged by the Director-General for the next ten years.

It is indisputable that the principles laid down under "human resources development" correspond to absolutely categorical imperatives. It is truly essential that Africa should now undertake the mobilisation of all the human resources at its disposal. To do so, it needs two essential factors—one internal, the other external. The first is the establishment of rapid growth, of a "mystique" of development. These are operations in which all citizens, but above all those of the two categories mentioned here—namely, those belonging to governments and to employers' and workers' organisations, must co-operate.

The second factor is the absolutely essential assistance which the I.L.O. must provide for the development of technical and vocational education at all levels. The conjunction of these two factors will be an application of the old saying "God helps those who help themselves".

The section of the Report which deals with the question of incomes has truly revolutionary objectives, particularly with regard to the consideration to be given to the principle of social justice and the abolition of income inequality. But it really seems that in this field God alone can help us. Our most fervent good wishes, all our trust and loyal support will therefore be given to all that is undertaken henceforth by international organisations, especially those of the United Nations family, with a view to giving new consideration to the needs of the most vulnerable sections of mankind.

This is a particularly generous rule of conduct, one which will promote the rehabilitation of mankind, thus eliminating one of the oldest and greatest barriers to the establishment of a just peace in the world. This contribution to the human welfare is very much to the credit of its bold originator.

With regard to labour relations, we support the proposals made in the relevant chapter of the Report all the more warmly because we ourselves, in the Republic of Cameroon, have established (much to our advantage) fruitful co-operation between employers' and workers' organisations and the Government.

The recent reform in that country of the unions carried out by the unions themselves through a remarkable concentration of effort and goodwill on the part of labour led to the establishment of two federations, namely a federation of believing workers and another federation which brings together all the other previously competing tendencies. A lot still remains to be done, however, particularly in the field of the training of trade union leaders.

With regard to the workers' status and conditions of work, we entirely agree that it is necessary and desirable that the International Labour Office should make a more extensive study of the relevant problems involving a systematic centralisation of information relating to the practice and experience of various countries of the world. We should like to emphasise that, in regard to our country, and in view of the varied protection in it for the worker, who is covered by very liberal legislation, a need is arising, under the strict requirements of a government which is still vulnerable
and has not yet found its feet, for a pause in the acquisition of new social benefits.

What attracts us most in the suggestions in Chapter V of the Director-General's Report is the topical interest which attaches to the definition of the features of traditional societies where industry recruits its workers. By this means it will be possible to help those who come from rural areas to adjust to their new lives and to settle down to their new work as they acquire all the stability and dexterity which is desirable.

One of the essential elements of programmes for the adjustment of workers to new conditions of work and life is, in our opinion, the re-establishment of traditional forms of mutual assistance, which are disappearing with the accelerated urbanisation of rural populations. Social security is an urgent and imperative need in a developing society and that is why we recommend that an increased effort should be made to provide assistance through the International Labour Office for member States in the preparation and implementation of social security schemes.

With regard to the activities proposed under the heading of "Automation and Technological Change", we were particularly struck by the—to our mind—especially timely announcement that the General Conference would soon consider the problems of employment and unemployment. All the I.L.O. does in connection with the study and solution of these problems—extension and modernisation of educational and vocational training facilities for young persons and adults, improvement of the functioning of the labour market, regional economic development and development of pilot areas, etc.—will receive the greatest attention.

I must now reply to the various suggestions to be found in the Director-General's Report under the heading "Structure", which constitutes the second part.

We agree with the Director-General that the I.L.O. must not waste its time in considering resolutions which raise political issues with which it is not fully competent to deal, and we consider that it is therefore very wise to accept his suggestion that resolutions relating to matters not on the agenda should not be considered.

With regard to credentials we feel that the existing procedure is satisfactory, and we are very glad to join the Director-General in his tribute to all the members of the Committee who, in the past, have successfully assumed this invidious and heavy task. The suggestion which is made that in the future we should call on an independent judicial body to examine any objections before they are transmitted to the Credentials Committee strikes us as being ingenious and of great practical value, but it does not satisfy us from the psychological point of view. We Africans prefer that this kind of operation should be carried out before our eyes, though I am not expressing any doubts with regard to the impartiality of the members of the independent judicial body the establishment of which is being discussed.

Finally, we are in favour of the reform suggested with regard to Industrial Committees, the sessions of which could well be held at greater intervals and which could particularly be replaced whenever possible by regional technical meetings. The work of these Committees would undoubtedly be increasingly effective as a result, since it would be easier to distinguish among the issues involved and to adjust the proposed remedies more effectively to the often imperative local requirements.

I should now like to express our most fervent hope that the Director-General will be successful in his attempt to reach the two objectives outlined in his Conclusion.

We are, moreover, convinced that, thanks to the overwhelming majority of men who have come here without ulterior motives and moved by the same conviction that it has become necessary to adapt the I.L.O. to its new tasks, the Director-General will be fully successful. At any rate, he can rely on our modest but genuine assistance.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. GONZÁLEZ NAVARRO (Workers' delegate, Venezuela)—I am greatly honoured at being permitted to convey in the name of the workers of my country and of the Workers' delegation of Venezuela, a friendly greeting to you, Sir, and to all delegates to this 47th Session of the Conference.

The Director-General has been extremely wise in starting his Report with a review of the programme undertaken by the I.L.O. in the interests of peace and freedom. Yes, we must establish these principles as the indispensable guarantee for the basic rights of men and of human communities. These are the safeguards for improved political, economic, social and cultural conditions for the workers and the peoples.

The Director-General states that the I.L.O. must continue to be a free world platform which permits the exchange of views between forces based on different political, social and economic ideas, and that it must not become an instrument in the service of any particular interests.

In referring to these matters, the Director-General also states that we are living at a time in which the fate of mankind is at stake. We would add that two great social and economic structures are struggling to secure the guidance and control of the world. There is a battle between democracy and totalitarianism, between freedom and slavery.

In our opinion these two structures can be defined as follows: development with bread and freedom, or development with tyranny.

We defend democracy because we consider that it is a system under which the workers can improve their standard of life and fight for future complete emancipation. But in the face of the struggle between the great powers the smaller nations, not divided, must seek their freedom in a movement of reunion with a view to achieving sovereignty and improved welfare.
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In this situation Venezuela has been firm and
definite when we have urged that in the great
international decisions of today, which may
injure our sovereignty, we be consulted as a
sovereign people. Only in this way can the
principle of independence be respected. We are
not satisfied with being informed afterwards of
decisions which concern our own destiny and
that of mankind. Only in this way will the
peoples cease to be material for trickery and
bargaining; only if they are previously con­sulted on decisions on which depends the
future of the world can there be a real prospect
of peace.

We have chosen the path of democracy, in
which man has the right to think and to express
his ideas, where he has access to bread, a roof,
culture, and where the trade union organisa­tions can develop without obstacles of any kind.

Under the other structure there is also a
search for development, but without the basic
rights, including freedom. The workers have
nothing to gain except slavery, more work,
lower wages and loss by their trade unions of
their representative and independent character.
For us this is the antithesis of the former sys­tem, and we absolutely reject it.

For this reason we agree that the I.L.O.
should be turned into an instrument of under­standing so that there may be an atmosphere of
coexistence in which the efforts of the two
parties can be conjugated for the good of the
working class and of the peoples. In a country
where the working class has no freedom to take
its own decisions and elect its own leaders and
where trade union democracy is not respected
there can be no independent workers' move­ment. The Venezuelan Confederation of Work­ers, of which I am the President, says that
respect for trade union democracy and freedom
is the best means of ensuring the unity of the
workers' movement so that it may be an
effective instrument in defending the immediate
and the long-term interests of the workers.
And it adds a restatement of our determination
to struggle so that democratic methods of
government may triumph as the system within
which the workers' organisations can exist and
operate freely.

Thus peace must go hand in hand with
freedom and human rights, otherwise it is
inconceivable. I mean, not a romantic peace,
nor the devilish peace behind which some seek
to hide their plans for conquest, but true peace
with freedom, welfare and happiness for all.

My country is a democratic State which has
been applying an extremely interesting policy of
social change. Steps have been taken towards
an reform, industrialisation, industrialisation
of communications, housing, rural water
supply, thorough educational reform and greatly
improved public health.

We have supported the Government's petro­leum policy because we thought it in accord­ance with our principles and also conducive to
the national interest, but we have also made
constructive criticisms of the Govern­ment's mistakes because we think it is our
duty under a constitutional régime to con­tribute by expressing our standpoint quite
frankly and thus showing our interest in a rapid
advance towards the Government's objectives,
which are those of the majority of our people.

The Report rightly refers, in Chapter II,
on human resources and economic development,
to three fundamental objectives which are closely related one to another, namely
better utilisation of the labour force by creating
higher levels of productive employment, impro­ving the quality of the labour force by
education and vocational training, and enlist­ing popular support for the tasks of national
development, and the participation of broad
social groups in them.

One of the great problems facing Latin
American workers has been lack of employ­ment opportunity. This is because the in­dustrial development of Latin America has
come very late and has coincided with rapid
technological advance and modernisation.
Formerly when a new undertaking was estab­lished it meant provision of employment for
many persons, but now machinery is so efficient that a handful of men and women can
now do an extraordinary amount of work. In fact
our development has come when automa­tion is already in full swing. We must
therefore seek new ways of creating employ­ment and providing the mass of the population
with purchasing power.

The first of these is a reduction of working
hours. Our recent collective agreement in the
petroleum industry provides for a 40-hour
week with only 36 hours. This involves a
saving of 148,000 man-hours every week in the
industry, and if the agreement is effectively
applied by our unions and works committees
it will involve the employment of about
3,500 persons. The time saved by the workers
will be spent on education and training and
on improving their health.

The second measure is to extend vocational
schools for the training of future skilled workers
who can then play their part in national
development and industrialisation.

The third measure is old-age or retirement
insurance which will enable older people to
maintain their purchasing power.

These are matters which the I.L.O. should
carefully study. A reduction in working hours
can reduce existing unemployment and thus
diminish a social phenomenon which is widely
feared, particularly by the workers, as well as
helping to meet our need for development.
In fact, shorter working time through a longer
school period, a lower pensionable age and a
reduced working day is proposed by the
working class in order to balance automa­tion in a gradual and socially healthy process.

We are also urging strong support for the
consumers' co-operatives, particularly for the
construction of workers' housing, and also
urging special protection for the small handi­craftsmen engaged in a single trade. This class
has hitherto lacked special support from the
State, because most of these persons cannot
qualify for support from the credit institutions.

The Government's health policy has led to an
increase in our population. In 1953 the annual
increase was about 1.6 per cent. Now it is
3.025 per cent.

It is also necessary for the workers to strug­gle to avoid excessive influence by developed
countries, which absorb the great markets and
have the privilege of manufacturing goods,
without permitting the underdeveloped peoples
to process their own raw materials and create new sources of employment. We must continue the struggle to enable our raw materials to secure fair prices.

We make these suggestions, because we think they are applicable in our countries. In Venezuela the National Institute of Educational Co-operation is operating with success as a training school for skilled industrial workers. Another matter which deserves special attention, in our view, is the participation of the workers' and employers' organisations in the economic planning of the country. The reference to this in the Report is in accord with our own affirmation to participate in bodies at the national and continental levels to give effect to economic rationalisation and development plans.

The Report also says that there must be equality of educational opportunity for workers and peasants. We call for public education for all.

As regards social legislation for the protection of workers, I may tell you that the Confederation of which I am President has introduced in Congress a civil service law which establishes grading. It also provides for freedom of employment, of expression and of philosophy, and it maintains that stability of employment shall be determined by merit and training. It further establishes a social security scheme covering risks of sickness and old age.

I should like to state that in my country the Venezuelan Confederation of Labour is in very good relationship with the Federation of Chambers and Associations of Commerce and Production, which represents the employers, and one must recognise that in recent years the great majority of Venezuelan employers have brought a new and healthy approach to the problems of the working class, and have accepted many of our just requests. For our part, our Confederation has adopted a very clear policy, under which relations must be based on collective agreements, and the provisions of these must be adjusted to the burden which the undertaking can really bear. These are the rights which the parties wish to lay before the Conference. We support the Organisation and wish it every success in its work on behalf of the workers and of mankind.

Mr. TATA (Employers' delegate, India)—I agree with the Director-General that the International Labour Organisation is at one of the critical points of its history, and the delegates to this Conference should welcome this rare opportunity of speaking frankly and sincerely without mental reservations on matters which vitally concern the future of this Organisation.

Changes in the economic and political structures of member States have undoubtedly given a new look to the original concept of tripartism as visualised by the founders of this philosophy. But the question is whether such changes have rendered the principle of tripartism unnecessary. It is true that a growing importance of the public sector through nationalisation of industry and the division of the trade union movement have distorted the picture somewhat. But do such factors justify writing off the philosophy of tripartism which the matured wisdom of the founding fathers conceived as an essential element? One cannot help feeling that, if they had so desired, they could have made the I.L.O. a mere international governmental agency, like several other international organisations. It is obvious that the I.L.O. was intended to create at the international level the process of collective bargaining with Government representatives as conciliators or mediators, bearing in mind the fact that all such decisions arrived at had to be ultimately implemented at the national level, if they were to be of real value to the parties concerned.

In some state-owned and managed units, whenever the workers' union is under the control of the State, or when management does not enjoy independence as codified in the I.L.O. Convention on freedom of association, the workers have no opportunity of bargaining with the management, and the Convention is consequently meaningless. I do not wish to convey an impression that all nationalised units in all the States present this spectacle. In fact, despite nationalisation, certain States have autonomous managements and the workers, too, have full bargaining opportunities. Nor do I wish to convey that such a state of affairs exists only in totalitarian countries. Nevertheless, workers from some developing countries have repeatedly complained that they are ill at ease in matters of freedom of association and collective bargaining whenever the management of a state-owned unit is non-autonomous. In the context of such facts, let us reflect on the implications of watering down the principle of tripartism. At our meetings, the measure of agreement or disagreement is expressed in terms of votes cast in favour of or against a proposal. So long as the Workers' and Employers' representatives are genuinely independent, the votes are evenly balanced and the process of collective bargaining is honest and unquestionable. On numerous occasions, appeals before the Credentials Committee have laid bare facts which, on circumstantial evidence, would render a Workers' or Employers' delegate ineligible. If such representatives enjoyed the right and were autonomous, the appeal would be a nullity. Nevertheless, voting as an index of agreement or disagreement remains on our statute, our action can never be questioned by any judicial authority. During a temporary period, the representatives in question were deprived of their voting rights while they continued to take part in the deliberations. To my mind, this measure, though a palliative, had sound logic behind it, as the discrepancy of voting was really meaningless. So long as voting as an index of agreement or disagreement remains on our statute, our action can never be questioned by any judicial authority. During a temporary period, the representatives in question were deprived of their voting rights while they continued to take part in the deliberations. To my mind, this measure, though a palliative, had sound logic behind it, as the discrepancy of voting was really meaningless. Nevertheless, voting as an index of agreement or disagreement remains on our statute, our action can never be questioned by any judicial authority. During a temporary period, the representatives in question were deprived of their voting rights while they continued to take part in the deliberations. To my mind, this measure, though a palliative, had sound logic behind it, as the discrepancy of voting was really meaningless. Nevertheless, voting as an index of agreement or disagreement remains on our statute, our action can never be questioned by any judicial authority. During a temporary period, the representatives in question were deprived of their voting rights while they continued to take part in the deliberations. To my mind, this measure, though a palliative, had sound logic behind it, as the discrepancy of voting was really meaningless. Nevertheless, voting as an index of agreement or disagreement remains on our statute, our action can never be questioned by any judicial authority. During a temporary period, the representatives in question were deprived of their voting rights while they continued to take part in the deliberations. To my mind, this measure, though a palliative, had sound logic behind it, as the discrepancy of voting was really meaningless. Nevertheless, voting as an index of agreement or disagreement remains on our statute, our action can never be questioned by any judicial authority. During a temporary period, the representatives in question were deprived of their voting rights while they continued to take part in the deliberations. To my mind, this measure, though a palliative, had sound logic behind it, as the discrepancy of voting was really meaningless.
the need for implementing the I.L.O.'s concept of freedom of association.

It has often been argued that if Employers did not disturb the peace of the I.L.O. in this fashion, then this Organisation could do many useful things in other fields. I would like our critics to consider the fact that, with growing emphasis on planned economy " and the completion of " anti-colonial " revolution, there is every likelihood of a greater number of representatives who do not enjoy such freedom coming to our Conferences. We may soon reach a stage, if such breaches go unchecked, when through a heavy weight of loaded votes, we may come to conclusions on various subjects which are not in reality approved by Employers and Workers. In such cases, what guarantee is there that workers' and employers' organisations of member States so exploited would implement such decisions and ratify such Conventions? Such events might well one day lead to aggrieved Workers and Employers making a joint declaration at the end of each Conference to the effect that, owing to the normal process of voting being vitiated, they would take no responsibility for such decisions arrived at, and therefore request their respective organisations not to honour them. Let me assure you that the Employers, through such protests, seek to expose such violations, disputing our action to expose such violations, spurious pleas of the sovereignty of the State. If you believe, as I do, that our Conference is an agency for collective bargaining, then the parties to bargaining have a right to decide whether the bargaining agent is genuine or not. Then surely, such adjudication should rest within the joint autonomy of Workers and Employers, and the Government delegate should stand aloof. So long as the disputed Worker or Employer has opportunities to participate in the deliberations of the committee, the Government group should not mind such disputed representatives losing their right to vote, as was the case during the temporary application of this system. I do realise that such a decision involves the political sensitivity of member States; but since we are seeking solutions to such perplexing questions, one should not hesitate to express freely and frankly one's views on such subjects. That does not mean that there are no other solutions. Perhaps my suggestion may lead towards other and better solutions.

Unfortunately, the Conference decided to solve this question by planting an outside agency in the form of an Appeals Board. By mere suppression of the healthy principles on which our entire edifice was erected we have done a great disservice to the cause of progressive development of the social conscience of member States, about which the Director-General has spoken so passionately on so many occasions. It is indeed a great pity that, though the interests of labour and management are inextricably connected on this vital question, the Workers' group remained comparatively passive during this controversy. I am sure they would have spelt out their protests more vigorously had they been confronted at the time with the episode concerning Mr. Salem Shita's inability to attend Governing Body meetings.

I come from a developing country. With my intimate knowledge and experience of the working of employers' and workers' organisations, I can say with pride that the impact of the I.L.O.
and its traditional belief in such basic principles as freedom of association have developed, beyond doubt, the social conscience of my country. Imperfect as it may be, compared to some of the industrially developed countries, the trade unions and employers' organisations in my country breathe freedom from interference to a degree which would do credit to any democratic government. Many developing countries would be deprived of this benefit, if there is a growing tendency at I.L.O. Conferences to jettison such basic principles.

In the years to follow, the I.L.O. will have to deal more closely with the United Nations in the interests of so many new member States with developing economies. Within the framework of the United Nations Development Decade the Director-General will have many opportunities of tackling similar problems. I am happy to note that, recently, intensive consultations have taken place between the United Nations Commission for Industrial Development and the executive heads of the agencies for concerted action among the United Nations family in regard to industrial development. The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination of the United Nations had an opportunity of giving some preliminary consideration to the report of the Advisory Committee of Experts on Industrial Development. There is immediate necessity for assisting developing countries to attain higher rates of economic growth by increasing their manufacturing output, thus minimising disparities in standards of living between more developed and developing countries. The Director-General should ensure that, in this connexion, new specialised agencies are not brought into being, creating an unnecessary drain on our limited resources.

The throats of developing countries are thirsting for such development programmes. Whilst obviously international assistance is the main source of help, that alone cannot satisfy the primary needs of people in emerging and developing nations who have so little and need so much. Furthermore, the problem cannot be solved by trying to legislate on economic development, as some countries are inclined to do. The problem can be resolved only by (a) the development of human resources through education; and by imparting technical, vocational and managerial skills; (b) the creation of an appropriate climate for attracting private investment from internal as well as external sources; and (c) the promotion of a sound environment for accelerating development and growth.

We look with great hope for the establishment of the Asian Economic Development Institute proposed by the E.C.A.F.E. session in March 1963. I have no doubt that such agencies would endorse such economic measures mentioned by me earlier. It is also gratifying that in the United Nations Development Decade, bearing in mind the predominantly rural world, sufficient emphasis will be laid on rural development. The I.L.O. has a definite role in this programme, particularly in the matter of self-employment, as also in respect of living and working conditions of rural workers and training problems. I have no doubt that this problem will receive the energetic attention of the Director-General.

I do hope that the special discussion we are having on many issues of the I.L.O. programme and structure will give the Director-General, with his vast experience of 15 years, fruitful guidance, despite somewhat divergent and conflicting viewpoints expressed from various quarters. In the fast changing world the I.L.O. can do a mighty lot, and I have no doubt that the Director-General has the energy and vision to achieve it. We are equally conscious of our obligations in fulfilling such aspirations, and we are prepared to show tolerance, wherever needed, for reconciling conflicting viewpoints in the hope of attaining new targets and goals.

The President—I am happy that the Conference is not faced at this session with the problem of equal pay for equal work. It is the exercise of freedom of choice by the individual governments that makes this almost an all-male Conference. In the circumstances you will welcome a happy break, and I now call upon Miss Pohjala, the Minister for Social Affairs of Finland, to address you.

Miss Pohjala (Minister for Social Affairs, Finland)—First I beg to extend my congratulations to you, Mr. President, on the esteemed task with which you have been entrusted—to preside over this world-wide and authoritative assembly. Personally I should like to express my pleasure at being able to attend the International Labour Conference, and I seize this opportunity of presenting to the Conference the compliments of the Government of Finland.

It is with great pleasure that I thank the Director-General of the International Labour Office, on behalf of the Finnish Government, for the Report he has submitted to the International Labour Conference this year. The present Report differs in a marked way from the previous Reports, of which most have focused the readers' attention on some special question of great importance but of relatively limited scope. This time the Report deals with the direction the activities of our Organisation should take, with the adjustment of the means and intentions of the I.L.O. to a changing world situation. In a thorough manner the Director-General has fulfilled the promise he gave last year in his speech to the Conference to put under discussion the programme and the structure of the I.L.O. as a whole. The Report before us is of particular interest, and so surely will be the debate on it.

The Director-General's Report is so extensive and contains so many suggestions and alternatives, also very detailed ones, that he cannot probably here receive answers to all of them. A document which is so valuable and of such a fundamental nature is, however, worth being analysed even more systematically.

On page 31 of the Report, English version, the Director-General says that it would be quite unrealistic merely to attempt to add new activities unless there were also some agreement on what was less important, what could be dropped. This view deserves to be supported. If there are too many attempts in the I.L.O. activities at the same time, the results will be unsatisfactory. On the page I mentioned the Director-General sets forth five important constellations of problems challenging the
L.I.O. The first of them is the improvement of skills and the fuller utilisation of the labour force for economic development. The plans relating to the extension of vocational training should really be given a high degree of priority in I.L.O. action. In this connection special attention should be paid, in my opinion, to the continuing study of educational methods and vocational training problems. We have not yet reached the stage where an International Vocational Training Information and Research Centre in connection with the I.L.O. The regional research centres envisaged by the Director-General in his Report would also surely prove useful. Without such research work vocational training, especially in developing countries, cannot develop as quickly and effectively as needed to serve economic growth. And without workers with vocational training the trade union movement cannot develop adequately, which would weaken, on the other hand, the tripartite character of the I.L.O.

In the second part of his Report relating to the structure of the I.L.O. the Director-General has likewise put forward a number of proposals which deserve to be very carefully examined. So the Director-General considers it important that at five-yearly intervals on the average the Conference should have before it a report which could serve as the basis for an over-all appraisal of the I.L.O. programme. Such a report, as concise and concrete as possible, where the development of activities would be compared with the objectives set forth in the previous report as well as with needs which have become apparent afterwards, would no doubt contribute considerably to the flexible adaptation of I.L.O. action to a changing world. The interval of five years proposed by the Director-General would not seem to be too short, taking into consideration the speed of change.

The Director-General has also dealt with the question of whether the intervals between the sessions of the Conference should be lengthened. As far as I can see this could be taken into consideration.

In Chapter VIII of the Report the Director-General has dealt with the traditional field of work of the I.L.O., the setting of international labour standards. As to the revision of Conventions adopted at previous sessions of the Conference, the Report shows with numerous illustrations the necessity to adopt a more effective revision procedure. With regard to some cases, e.g. cases in which a given Convention cannot receive the number of ratifications necessary to bring it into force after the adoption of a new revising Convention, it could perhaps even be thought that provisions for the abrogation of such Conventions might be included in the Constitution of the I.L.O. For other cases the establishment of a special standing revision committee proposed by the Director-General might be appropriate. To complement such a committee there should be, however, a corresponding Governing Body committee which would do the necessary preparatory work.

As we consider the question of revision of older Conventions to adapt them to technological and other development it is of course proper to pay attention also, as the Director-General has done, to the procedure which should be followed in the future in the preparation and adoption of new Conventions and Recommendations. In this connection a number of interesting aspects arise. One of them is the flexibility of Conventions, about which the Director-General has received, as he says, a great deal of good advice in the course of years. Among these suggestions mention may be made of the I.L.O. and the Governments of all the five Northern countries—Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Denmark—sent in the autumn of 1961 to the Director-General, and in which it was suggested that future draft Conventions be prepared with maximum regard to the desirability of avoiding provisions of so narrow or detailed a nature as to impede ratification of the Conventions by member States with a high standard in the field concerned.

The requirements relating to flexibility will naturally not mean indeterminateness and the risk of endangering the standards set forth in the Conventions. The necessary flexibility has sometimes been ensured by adopting a Convention containing the general principles and a Recommendation containing more detailed provisions to supplement the Convention. In some cases special suggestions relating to application have been treated in a Recommendation. Such suggestions may include so many technical details that one may ask whether it is appropriate to burden the Conference agenda with them, as they might be wholly prepared and adopted in an expert committee. I think that thereby the work of the Conference committees could perhaps be facilitated and their reports could be submitted earlier than they have up till now for the plenary discussion. The Conference would then have more time to examine the proposals made by the committees, particularly in cases where the proposals of the committees have been adopted with a narrow majority, to which the Director-General has also referred in his Report. As to the Conventions, they should only deal with essentials; they should not contain rigid requirements in regard to matters in respect of which national practice may reasonably vary widely. For many developing countries it may be particularly useful if in certain cases they could implement the Conventions gradually. Also, it may be appropriate to take into account more than before, in the formulation of Conventions, the need of developing countries to receive guidance suitable in their particular circumstances. Principles will remain the same but obviously technical application may vary.

It is natural that the changes taking place in the world around us are also reflected in the action and structure of our Organisation. If it were not so, the I.L.O. could not fulfil its task. The discussion on the Director-General’s Report in this forum will indicate the desired direction in which the alterations should be made. I believe that this will give some very useful solutions which will prove happy and successful for the whole Organisation.

The Hon. A. A. OJERA (Minister of Community Development and Labour, Uganda)—Uganda became a Member of the International
Labour Organisation on 25 March of this year and although an observer delegation attended the last session of the Conference in 1962 this is indeed the first time that we have had the opportunity of participating directly in the work of the Conference. This is an opportunity which we welcome, and I trust that we shall be able to make some contribution to, and I have no doubt that we shall derive great benefit from, the work of the Conference. Uganda has made a solemn declaration to abide by the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation. In accordance with the policy of my Government all treaties, including international labour Conventions, by which Uganda was bound prior to independence have been, or are being, the subject of a careful review. In the meantime, as far as possible, treaty relationships are to continue to be preserved and our obligations to other countries honoured. Suitable interim arrangements are being made to preserve our international relationships, pending a firm and binding decision upon each treaty. The following letter has been sent by the Prime Minister, in his capacity as the Minister responsible for external affairs, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

"Prior to Uganda's attaining independence on 9 October 1962, treaty relationships were entered into on its behalf by the Government of the United Kingdom. The Government of Uganda now wishes to make clear its position in regard to obligations arising from those treaties entered into prior to 9 October 1962 by the protecting Government. The Government of Uganda accordingly makes the following declarations.

"In respect of all treaties validly concluded by the United Kingdom on behalf of the Uganda Protectorate or validly applied or extended by the former to the latter before 9 October 1962, the Government of Uganda will continue on a basis of reciprocity to apply the terms of such treaties from the time of its independence, that is to say 9 October 1962, until 31 December 1963, unless such treaties are abrogated or modified by agreement with the other high contracting parties before 31 December 1963. At the expiry of this period, or of any subsequent extension of the period which may be notified in like manner, the Government of Uganda will regard such treaties, unless they must by the application of the rules of customary international law be regarded as otherwise surviving, as having terminated.

"The declaration in the previous paragraph extends equally to multilateral treaties; and during this period of review any party to a multilateral treaty which was validly applied or extended to Uganda before 9 October 1962 may, on a basis of reciprocity as indicated above, rely on the terms of such treaty as against the Government of Uganda.

"It is the earnest hope of the Government of Uganda that during the aforementioned period the normal processes of diplomatic negotiations will enable it to reach satisfactory accord with the States concerned upon the possibility of the continuation of such treaties. In the case of multilateral treaties the Government of Uganda intends, before 31 December 1963 or such later date as may be subsequently notified in like manner, to indicate to the depository in each case the steps it wishes to take, whether by way of confirmation of termination, or confirmation of succession or accession, in regard to each such instrument.

"It would be appreciated if Your Excellency would arrange for the text of this declaration to be circulated to all Members of the United Nations."

For this reason and in view of the fact that Uganda has been a Member of the International Labour Organisation for such a short time, it has not been found possible hitherto for us to make any formal declaration with regard to the international labour Conventions. I am pleased to say, however, that my Government has now agreed that these Conventions may be ratified and a formal communication to this effect has been conveyed to the Director-General.

The wealth of experience and knowledge of labour and social problems amassed over the years by the International Labour Organisation and the contribution which has been made to the establishment and maintenance of labour standards is clearly reflected in the excellent Report of the Director-General. The Report takes cognisance of the rapidly changing world scene and lays particular stress on the problems arising from differences between levels of income in developed and developing countries. Within this context of changing conditions the Director-General poses the need for rethinking with regard to the basic programmes of the International Labour Organisation and to the changes in the structure of the Organisation which may be contingent upon this. Uganda and I am sure, other newly independent and developing countries welcome this move as a practical and dynamic approach to present-day world social problems.

On page 31 of the English text of his Report, the Director-General lists five broad spheres in which he suggests the International Labour Organisation should direct its activities in the coming years. These are, of course, all problems of primary importance in the context of world requirements but there is no doubt in my mind that for developing countries such as Uganda which, as the Director-General has stated in his Report, give rise to major problems, the first two will command support to have first priority in the work of the Organisation.

The central aim of my Government is to achieve within the framework of a free society the maximum possible increase in the prosperity and welfare of the people of Uganda. The achievement of this aim presents formidable difficulties, since resources of money and skilled men are scarce. The Government has a task of applying these scarce development resources in ways which will yield the greatest return to the economy as a whole. My Government is therefore initiating positive steps to develop the economy as rapidly as possible and at the same time conserving the conditions essential to such development, the chief of which are the unity of the country and the maintenance of law and order. The Government's strategy for increasing production rests on the proposition that the most effective way of achieving this is a skilful application of scarce capital resources to bring into play the under-utilised resources of
labour and the land. Owing to shortage of managerial skill and political difficulties of achieving a rapid change in systems of land tenure and the need to spread the benefits of economic development as widely as possible, it follows that efforts must largely be concentrated upon raising the productivity of peasant farmers and livestock owners, without, of course, neglecting industrial development. One of the essential ingredients of economic planning which is necessary to achieve these aims is greater information regarding manpower problems and methods of the improvement of skills and the full utilisation of the labour force for economic development. I am in entire agreement with the Director-General when he says that "if, through research, through technical co-operation activities, through the confrontation and careful evaluation of the experience acquired by different countries, the International Labour Organisation were to perfect a knowledge of an effective human resources strategy, it would contribute immeasurably to economic and social development".

We consider the problem of income distribution to be a matter of the first importance on both social and economic grounds. On the relatively narrow front of wages my Government has, since independence, caused an inquiry to be made into wage rates throughout the whole of Uganda; subsequently statutory minimum wage rates have been fixed in all urban areas. A commission has also been appointed to inquire into conditions in the Uganda civil service and its report is now under consideration by the Government. Some work has also been done in the field of budget surveys in the urban areas and a start has now been made on the more difficult problem of a rural budget survey in certain parts of the country. It is appreciated, however, that these steps only deal with limited facets of the whole problem of income in the context of social and economic development and that, in the determination of an equitable income policy which will stimulate development, many other factors are involved. The studies, research and other action suggested by the Director-General and outlined in pages 53 to 55 of the English text of his Report should do much to provide bases upon which policy can be formulated with regard to this important subject.

I am glad to note the intensification of the regional activities of the Organisation during recent years and in particular the establishment of an African Regional Conference and of field offices of the Organisation in Lagos and Dar-es-Salaam. I suggest that the pressing problems existing in African States not only are of importance to the States concerned but also have a direct effect on world problems. I feel that these problems merit special consideration and that this can best be done not only by examining the particular problems better be examined on a regional basis and I would ask that, when the organisational structure of the I.L.O. is being recast, greater emphasis should be placed upon the regional organisations. In view of the fact that labour problems have to be considered in the general context of development planning I would also suggest that there should be greater co-ordination, particularly at the regional level, between the I.L.O. and other agencies, particularly those of the United Nations Organisation.

Finally, on behalf of the Government and people of Uganda, I wish to express our gratitude for the acceptance into membership of our country and the invitation to attend the Conference as a fully fledged Member of the International Labour Organisation.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. MURO de NADAL (Employers' delegate, Argentina)—I have the honour of addressing this gathering on behalf of Argentine employers, who are interested, like all the delegates present here, in finding suitable ways of eliminating social injustice from the world and in providing the necessary sustenance for economic development to guarantee to all men the benefits of progress and freedom.

In examining the Director-General's Report, which serves as a basis for this discussion, we note that the I.L.O. feels the need to stop by the wayside, to weigh its achievements and to make its plans for the future, introducing the structural changes that are necessary to keep up with the new situations that have arisen. This reveals above all a realistic view, a spirit of wakefulness and flexibility. For any body it is necessary to admit at a certain moment in its existence the necessity to change the system, and this principle has particular validity in these times, in which we are witnessing far-reaching changes in the political, social and economic organisations of the nations which are rapidly outgrowing procedures and customs which have persisted unchanged for one or two generations without anyone feeling any need to modify them.

The subjects discussed by the Director-General in his Report are too extensive for me to be able to refer to them all. I shall therefore concentrate my comments on some aspects of this valuable work which in my opinion might give rise to controversy or confusion, in the hope that this may be of use for the achievement of the objectives in view.

With regard to the first part—that is to say, the programme of the I.L.O.—I wish to make a general point. I wish to emphasise how important it is for the I.L.O. to act not only as a motive force behind economic and social policy directed to dealing with current problems, but also as a force to regulate that policy. That is to say, it should clearly define the limits of such policy in order to avoid the danger that, because we want to go too fast and too far, action based on sound and just motives will cross the safety line fixed by natural laws and end in failure and discredit.

In saying this, I am thinking first of the importance given in the Report to planning. Nobody can list long-term plans, to set targets and to assess the resources available to reach them, but we must not forget that it is undesirable that any government action should tend to limit personal initiative or underestimate the importance of the factors that lead to spontaneous economic development.

Similar reflections may be made with regard to the labour laws, which the I.L.O. should
re-examine in revising existing Conventions and Recommendations. Nothing will do more to strengthen social legislation than its wise administration. When welfare measures are adopted without assessing the economic implications of such measures, as occurs in many countries, the consequences are deficits in the national budget, inflation, withdrawal of capital, loss of markets and unemployment. Welfare measures are paid for through taxes or contributions, and in either case they affect the price of consumer goods and exports; and although economics has been studied for 2,000 years, there is no political party that avoids this.

Few publications sum up the world social problems more eloquently than the Encyclical Mater et Magistra, which was issued in 1961 by Pope John XXIII, whose death is now being mourned throughout the Christian world. But I should like to point out at this stage that one of its most notable characteristics is precisely its moderation, its respect for the rights of the various sections of society, the balance it strikes between capital and labour, between state authority and private initiative, between private property and its social function, between wages and the work done. I think the complex panorama of social legislation becomes clearer if viewed in the light of this precious document.

I now wish to refer to the second part of the Report, that devoted to the structure of the I.L.O. and the possibility of altering it. There are two reasons which have led people to think in the past few years that the machinery of the I.L.O. shows signs of age and that it might be necessary for it to revise its methods. These reasons are the considerable increase in the number of member States and the entry of the communist countries. With regard to the first, I consider that there is nothing to be done, apart from taking practical measures connected with the large number of delegates. Moreover, the voting strength of the new countries in the decisions reached by the I.L.O. cannot give rise to difficulties, especially if the great powers try to understand and help to deal with the problems of the new countries and to facilitate the raising of their standards of living.

On the other hand, the presence of socialist countries gives rise to greater complications, and I shall try to be objective in discussing the consequences.

In principle, the system of government existing in a country is no impediment to its entrance to membership of the I.L.O., not only from the traditional point of view but even from the point of view of the objectives of the Organisation. In the I.L.O. we do not discuss questions of politics, but those of welfare—that is to say, questions affecting mankind in general. We try to achieve social justice, a decent life for all, whatever their nationality or the type of government existing in their countries. The I.L.O. does not pass judgment on events; it simply influences them.

I am therefore sure that it is in accordance with these arguments that many observers consider that the attitude of the Employers in not accepting communist delegates as members of their group is unduly transient and that after all there is also an employer's function performed in state undertakings.

To these opinions we must reply as follows. The authority of the I.L.O. lies in the fact that its decisions are accepted by all sections of human society. If the opinions of governments of whatever régime slip in among Employers' or Workers' votes, the result of the voting is distorted. Naturally, in those countries undertakings still operate, but there are no employers to give their opinions; there are only employees who reproduce the opinions, or rather the orders, given them by their governments. There are also Soviet trade unions, but they are under the direction of the sole and official political party. So soon as one goes into a Soviet organisation one finds that within it employers are not employers and trade unions are not trade unions in the true sense of the words, and the same applies to other organisations of whatever kind. There is a government which gives orders, and a people which obeys, and the names given to the bodies set up to maintain this state of affairs are of no importance, nor is the opinion of the Congress.

Moreover, the Communists have not concealed the fact that their object in joining the I.L.O. is to make propaganda for their régime. Through their speeches we might reach the conclusion that in their countries there is abundance of everything, prices are falling, wages are rising, everybody is happy and satisfied, whereas in the rest of the world the nations are facing ever-growing poverty owing to the cruelty and warlike aims of their rulers. Perhaps the delegates from the socialist countries have brought supplies with them in order not to go hungry while in Geneva.

We Employers naively believed that the solution of this misunderstanding lay in the Credentials Committee. While in the socialist countries there are no free employers' and workers' organisations which can nominate delegates in accordance with the Constitution of the I.L.O., those countries should send delegations composed solely of Government delegates. We already know what has been the outcome of our efforts. Our objections have invariably been rejected. I would go further: after the rejection of our last objection we must admit that there are a number of delegates prepared to reject any objection, since it would be difficult ever to put forward a more complete catalogue of infringements of freedom of association than was submitted last year in the case of the last communist Employer whose credentials were challenged.

We must assume that the Credentials Committee now serves no useful purpose, so that the substitution for that Committee of an independent body, as suggested in the Report, might well be a good thing.

But it would be excessively optimistic to believe that we shall arrive at a solution of this serious problem by that means. In the meantime, we must not forget that the tripartite system has given the I.L.O. its strength and vitality, and that adulteration of the tripartite principle carries the seeds of the breakdown of the Organisation.

Passing to other problems of the machinery of the annual Conference, I think it would be a good thing if in future the Director-General's Report were drafted in a form which would compel speakers to give their views on a
number of specific points. This would have
two advantages: first, the opinions of the
delegates could be classified and could serve
as a basis for the future guidance of the
Organisation, with reference to the subject
under discussion; secondly, it would en­
courage the tendency of some speakers to use
the rostrum to refer to matters not connected
with the agenda, since it is those speakers who
generally create strife and embarrassment
among the delegations.

With regard to the work of the committees,
I think that the laborious system of analysing
documents paragraph by paragraph is not
suitable for application in committees with as
many members as they now have. I think
that the system adopted should be to appoint,
in each committee, subcommittees or working
parts after a general discussion, and the
committees should approve the final text in a
final plenary sitting. In short, each committee
should act as if it were a conference in itself,
though the number of its members now makes it
more like a conference than a committee.

I also think that the right of delegates to
submit amendments in the plenary session of
the Conference should be limited when texts
come before it approved by committees. The
limitations could be that only amendments
that could be submitted would be those which,
having been considered by the committee,
have been rejected by a small margin, such as
25 per cent, of the votes cast. There is no point
in allowing an unlimited number of amend­
ments and subamendments to be submitted
at the end of the Conference, in relation to
matters which have already been discussed,
and on which delegates have already made up
their minds.

Finally, I wish to refer to the task of the
Resolutions Committee, which in the last few
years has interfered with the normal working
of the Conference owing to the number and
nature of the resolutions submitted. Since
it is to be expected that these difficulties will
increase rather than diminish, I think that,
as suggested in the Report, the time has come
to place certain restrictions on the submission
of such resolutions. I am therefore in agree­ment
with the machinery which was discussed
by the Governing Body, for selecting each year
a number of resolutions on which a vote
is taken, and for limiting the time allowed to
the speakers to express their views. I would
add that it would be very useful if we could
also find a more rapid procedure for rejecting
those resolutions which do not fall within
the scope of the I.L.O. or the adoption of which
is inopportune for whatever reason.

Having given the views of my delegation
with regard to the points in which it was
particularly interested, I should like to say
that the changes I have suggested must be
regarded as showing a desire to co-operate,
and that they in no way diminish our recognition
of the work done by the Office and its officials
up to the present. The I.L.O. was founded at
a turning point in human history, with the
object of ensuring peace through social justice,
and there is no reason why it should be
possible for us to see that it will never change,
except to meet the new requirements of the
common good.

Fifth Sitting

Interpretation from French: Mr. BOOKA
(Workers' delegate, Congo (Leopoldville))—
Every year the rostrum of the International
Labour Organisation offers trade union workers
an opportunity of stating before the world of
labour the main problems of their respective
countries. According to the system of rotation
established by the Government of my country
with a view to ensuring the representation of
the Congolese workers at the International
Labour Conference, it is my organisation, the
Confederation of Free Trade Unions of the
Congo, which this time leads the Workers'
deployment to this 47th Session of the Con­ference.

As is the case with most of our African
neighbours, we in the Congo (Leopoldville) are
living in the very first years of our national
independence. The colonial page of our history
is turned. We are seeking for the time being
to write the first chapter of the history of a free
and independent Congo. The task seems ardu­ous, for the foreign personnel previously in
office have been replaced by untried indigenous
personnel, lacking experience because of the
bad former colonial policies which consisted in
maintaining the native personnel on the lower
run of the ladder, for fear of being ousted from
choice posts by nationals with the same
intellectual and technical training. Incidentally
this crisis has been cynically exploited by cer­tain
powers eager to see chaos reign in Central
Africa.

What is most ironic about the Congo crisis is that our country has the social setup and
the technical equipment which could have
turned it into one of the brightest stars of the
African firmament. Unfortunately, because of
the economic disequilibrium caused by a
disastrous colonial policy, the Congo remains
a tragically underdeveloped country, despite its
vast economic potential—which is unique in
Africa—and despite the diversity of its re­sources. As with so many countries of the non­alined world, it continues to export raw
materials and to import manufactured goods;
to export wealth and to import poverty;
to export work and to import unemployment.

The salvation of our country will come, as
we know, from our efforts. But it will also
depend on the success of a programme of tech­
ical resurgence, which is indispensable and
which requires the altruistic assistance of all
countries of the world. We believe that this
assistance will be all the more generously
offered since the Republic of the Congo is
seeking the friendship of all countries of the
world, and has adopted officially and irrevo­
cably a policy of non-alignment in the inter­
national sphere. To succeed we will have to
pool harmoniously the investment capital that
is lacking, the human capital which abounds
and, finally, a faith in the future which the
Congolese people have displayed despite ages
of suffering.

It is in this context that we wish to say how
much we share the general admiration that has
been displayed in labour circles of the en­lightening Report of the Director-General,
which instigates us. It is in this context that
we feel it is the duty of this body of perennial rut so as to give the social revolu­tion a new impetus based on new methods and
new means appropriate to new realities. The
In several underdeveloped countries, and ours among them, there is no independent judiciary competent to deal impartially with labour conflicts. Most of the procedures are either incomplete or too timorous so that arbitration and interpretation makes the work even more complex. We would therefore like to ask the International Labour Organisation to intervene also with those States which are faced with this problem so that such courts be installed without delay. One cannot allow the paradox that a government acts at the same time as sole judge and as principal party in a conflict.

By way of conclusion, here are the points on which our delegation wished more particularly to insist, in the light of the excellent Report of the Director-General and bearing in mind our position as an underdeveloped country but with vast resources, situated in the very heart of that Africa whose role in the world economy will certainly grow in the years to come.

The crux of the problem is to give in a short time to the labouring masses of the developing countries a standard of living that is worthy of their present effort and of their past suffering. The crux is, as I said, the implementation of a climate of sincere co-operation and mutual understanding between the various interests which ensure the working of an economy: the government, the employers and the workers. To achieve this it is necessary for each group to avoid repeating the errors which in the past have often demolished so many hopes. The governments are duty bound to abstain from authoritative and arbitrary acts inspired by the worst excesses of the departed colonialists and which are the shame of the non-aligned world. The employers must respect labour, not classify human beings in the same category as tools and machinery. Nor must they indulge in the odious crime of the cynical exploitation of the weak by the powerful.

As regards the workers, the trade-union leaders have the sacred duty to subordinate all actions to the higher interest of the nation and of the workers, who represent the most precious capital of a country, and to resist with determination the temptation to engage in egoistic demagoguery which, even if it may seem to further in the immediate future the personal career of this or that leader, will sooner or later lead the country to ruin. We have all to accept our responsibilities. On how we do so will depend the social and economic structure of the world which we must one day bequeath to our children. According to how we do so will history judge us.

Ratification of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation Instrument of Amendment, 1962, by Albania, Argentina, Luxembourg and Poland

The President—I should like to make one welcome announcement.

In the last few days the Director-General has registered ratifications of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation Instrument of Amendment, 1962, by the following States: Albania, Argentina, Luxembourg and Poland.

(The Conference adjourned at 6 p.m.)
old African civilisations that have been cut short, if not destroyed, by colonial occupation, rather than identify them with other civilisations in order to justify themselves. It is sufficient if their form is not contrary to universal public order, for them to be worthy of the respect of the whole world. Whatever the new policies adopted by the I.L.O., whatever its new structures adapted to the hopes of human society in a harmonious evolution, the new crusade will have to avoid initiatives which are unrealistic and unbalanced, which would be apt to provoke perilous reactions.

In their daily relations the trade unions, the employers and the government will have to create through their joint efforts a climate which is favourable to sincere and close cooperation, with a view to allowing productivity to increase so that the national economy will continue to improve. Especially in the developing countries, positive relations between these various human groups, which represent the motor of economic and social betterment, are not only important but indeed indispensable if we wish to enhance systematically the standard of living of the population.

The most important task of the International Labour Organisation is to request of its member States the integral application of resolutions and Recommendations adopted by the Conference, within a view to achieving productive relationships between the above-mentioned parties. Often countries which profess to be Members of the I.L.O. refuse to implement those measures which have been adopted officially by the I.L.O. with a view to encouraging peaceful co-existence between the various forces in the national economy.

As regards the status and conditions of employment of the workers, the drafting of such a complex document will have to be the work of a tripartite commission, with a view to making possible the association of the three principal elements, so as to arrive at a solution that will satisfy all the legitimate interests involved. If we were to fail in this objective we would be weighting the balance in one direction, and the economic and social progress of the nation would be the victim.

As regards automation and technological change, it is absurd that in this twentieth century developing countries should not be able to benefit, thanks to international co-operation, from the many advantages of modern technology. Of course, automation and other advanced technology represent a real danger for the human economies of the developing countries if they are not achieved or exploited in a manner that would be the victim.

As regards freedom of association, this has been recognised in our country ever since 1957. Nevertheless, despite this recognition by the central authorities of my country the balkanisation that has set in has dangerously compromised trade union freedom. The provincial authorities, ignoring the decisions of the central authorities, are seeking the restriction of this freedom. Here we should like to stress that in labour questions, as in other matters, there is a conflict of authority between the central and provincial governments. Let me quote, by way of example, the suppression of trade union activities in the province of Central Congo, where all trade union centres have been closed down by the authorities of that province. At a time when we are representing thousands of Congolese workers at this assembly our Civil Service Trade Union has been suspended by the provincial authorities of the Central Congo. Illegal measures have been enacted by the authorities of the Cuvette Centrale province.

Faced with this ever-growing hostility of the provincial authorities, the central authorities have taken decisions which were often favourable to the trade union movement but which have hardly ever been respected by the provincial authorities. The most revolting case was that which took place in Leopoldville, where the municipal authorities maltreated the trade unionists and the workers on the celebration of 1 May 1963, at a time when thousands of workers were peacefully marching about the streets of the capital.

That is why the workers of my country are suggesting to this distinguished assembly that sanctions be envisaged against those governments of member States which would make a mockery of trade union freedoms as consecrated in international Conventions.

Because of their effectiveness, collective agreements have shown in all countries that it is thanks to the effort and the comprehension of the employees and the workers that it is possible to resolve the problems which often oppose employers and workers. They have been generalised in the more developed countries, but in the developing countries this social benefit has often not yet been enacted.

As regards my country, we are studying the implementation of collective agreements in all sectors of the national economy. It is only a matter of time before this is done. We have also noticed that in a country such as ours, which has gone through complete chaos and where almost all institutions had to start from scratch, events are succeeding one another at such a speed that it is not possible to envisage social peace in the near future. Thus, in less than three years, the workers' wages have increased by approximately 95 per cent., without this preventing the trade unions from claiming more, and this is because the cost of living has increased since June 1960 by 300 per cent.

So that if we workers were bound by collective agreements for a period of three years, for instance in terms of wages, we would find ourselves today in a very awkward situation. That is why we have preferred to postpone the promulgation of the draft of collective agreements, so that the country may first be completely stabilised politically and economically.

One of the major concerns of the workers in the developing countries is the establishment of national labour courts.
THIRD REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE:
Submission and Adoption

The PRESIDENT—The first item on this morning’s agenda is the third report of the Selection Committee. I call on Mr. Weaver, Chairman of the Selection Committee, to submit this report.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)— I have the honour to submit to the Conference the third report of the Selection Committee, the text of which has been circulated. It deals with the date for elections to the Governing Body, the participation of non-governmental international organisations in the work of certain committees, certain changes in the composition of committees, and the closing date for the list of speakers in the discussion of the Director-General’s Report. I ask the Conference to adopt this third report of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT—I take it the report is now adopted?
(The report is adopted.)

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

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue discussion of the Director-General’s Report.

Mr. SIRIWARDENA (Minister of Public Works and Posts, Ceylon)—I consider it a privilege to be able to address this assembly today as a representative of the Government of Ceylon, whose ties with the International Labour Organisation go back 15 years. Our happy association has been strengthened by the transfer to my country of the Asian Field Office in April of this year. My Government is gratified by this decision of the International Labour Organisation to use Ceylon as its base for operations in the Asian region, and we sincerely hope that the Asian Field Office will evince many years of fruitful activity in its new setting.

It is customary to base one’s remarks at sessions of the general assembly on the content of the Director-General’s Report, which this year is in the nature of a balance sheet: a frank and critical appraisal of what has been achieved, a prognosis of what the future might hold, and some suggestions as to how some of the problems could be met. It would be presumptuous for me to attempt to assess the worth of this document, but permit me to add my measure of praise for the Director-General’s forthright analysis. With each passing year we have learnt to expect the Director-General to excel himself and he has not disappointed us this year.

The International Labour Organisation is not a thing apart from us, and what measure of success it achieves can only be because of our own concerted efforts. Are we who are partners in this great international venture giving each according to his means and receiving each according to his needs? This question has been posed many a time before, but never has the time been more opportune than this very session of the Conference for the question to be put anew and to be answered.

In this great society of nations there are the very rich and the very poor. Are the affluent nations of the world sincerely concerned with the struggling nations that find their resources of knowledge and material totally inadequate even to hobble along in the race for self-sufficiency? The budgets of many nations provide for expenditure of unassessable millions on the space race merely to score a “space first”. Protagonists of space research seek to justify the expenditure of these countless millions by claiming that the by-products of space research have contributed in no small measure to the amelioration of the living conditions of the people of this earth by the deliberate or chance discovery of new techniques, of new medicines, of new inventions. While I do concede that out of any action some good must come, I must affirm that the sum total of the benefits derived by mankind in general are infinitesimal when viewed against the background of the colossal sums expended. We need to direct our attention and our resources more to this earth on which we live and not to bodies extra-terrestrial. We need also to start right now, in the immediate
present, and not in the future when the space race has been won and lost. If we can make two grains of rice grow where only one would grow, if we can find work for one more pair of idle hands, if we can help to clothe the naked and to build roofs over the heads of those who are forced to sleep under the canopy of the sky, we shall have done for humanity immeasurably more than if we should succeed in sending one man to the moon.

The budget of the International Labour Organisation will shortly engage the minds of you who are gathered here. In common with other international agencies, the I.L.O. has its budgetary problems. Let those nations who can give, give till it hurts. The good things of this world must be shared if there is to be global peace. *Bis dat qui cito dat*—He gives twice who gives quickly.

Before I conclude, I must make reference to one overwhelming problem that besets many nations today—especially the newly emerging countries of the world. I refer to unemployment and underemployment in the background of a rapidly increasing population. We have heard dire forecasts of the likely congestion of humanity on the face of the earth in the foreseeable future. The population of my country, Ceylon, stands today at about 11 million. According to population projection data, Ceylon will 20 years from today have a population of twice this number. The prospect no doubt alarms; but should we not, while there is yet time, plan how we can keep them gainfully occupied? In spite of accelerated industrialisation and all other measures taken to find employment for the able-bodied, the problems of developing countries are manifold. The recorded figures of the unemployed in these countries keep rising. Labour is not a commodity that can be kept in cold storage against possible future needs. Labour will not keep. It must be utilised. I grant that the working out of orderly programmes for providing each potential worker with a job in keeping with his individuality and his dignity should be one of the principal tasks of a good government, but the nations of the world must put their heads together, plan boldly, and infuse radical ideas into plans for an intensified action, backed with adequate resources, to meet those problems, for which remedial action is both imperative and urgent.

*Interpretation from Arabic: Mr. SALAMA (Minister of Labour, United Arab Republic)—Mr. President, I am happy to congratulate you and the Conference on your election. We all admire you and are confident that the Conference will be most harmonious and successful. I also take pleasure in congratulating and wellcoming our sister Arab country, Algeria, which occupies today a seat among us after its long and strenuous struggle and the record of bravery of its people in their fight for liberty and independence. By taking its place in this Organisation it is but reaffirming the determination of all nations to rid themselves of all forms of imperialism. I am equally happy to welcome the other new Members of the Organisation: Rwanda, Jamaica, Burundi, Uganda, Trinidad and Tobago. This regular increase each year in the membership of the Organisation will certainly increase its effectiveness and universality. It is at the same time concrete evidence of the ever-growing move for liberation in various parts of the world. It is a characteristic of which this generation is most proud.

A few days ago the summit conference of African nations held in Addis Ababa was attended by 30 nations for the purpose of studying all questions relating to a union of African countries of the world. I refer to unemployment and underemployment in the background of a rapidly increasing population. We have heard dire forecasts of the likely congestion of humanity on the face of the earth in the foreseeable future. The population of my country, Ceylon, stands today at about 11 million. According to population projection data, Ceylon will 20 years from today have a population of twice this number. The prospect no doubt alarms; but should we not, while there is yet time, plan how we can keep them gainfully occupied? In spite of accelerated industrialisation and all other measures taken to find employment for the able-bodied, the problems of developing countries are manifold. The recorded figures of the unemployed in these countries keep rising. Labour is not a commodity that can be kept in cold storage against possible future needs. Labour will not keep. It must be utilised. I grant that the working out of orderly programmes for providing each potential worker with a job in keeping with his individuality and his dignity should be one of the principal tasks of a good government, but the nations of the world must put their heads together, plan boldly, and infuse radical ideas into plans for an intensified action, backed with adequate resources, to meet those problems, for which remedial action is both imperative and urgent.

The organisation must therefore work seriously to ensure that developing countries acquire the largest possible share of technical assistance from the more advanced States. The collaboration of East and West in extending their aid to nations in the course of development is a possible step towards consolidation of the social and economic progress of those rising nations. Although the Conference, having approved in 1960 the recommendation that the subject of technical assistance be listed on the agenda of the Conference every three or four years, it is our view that the subject should
be listed every two years in view of the effective part that such technical assistance can play in helping developing countries.

The International Labour Conference is not new to me. I had the honour of participating in quite a few sessions as a trade unionist representing the workers in my country. Today I am delighted to take part in the work of this Conference as the first Minister in the United Arab Republic chosen from among the unionised workers—a fact which confirms the participation of the working class in the effort to improve the lot of the workers, social and social advancement in our growing society.

If I might take the liberty in this connection of speaking about the additional labour gains recently realised in our country, I would be happy to mention that as a result of the participation of the workers representing the workers in my country, I would be happy to mention that as a result of the success attendant on the experiment of workers participating in management it has been decided that half the members of the board of directors of any given concern shall be elected from among the workers. This is a tremendous step forward towards self-management, enabling the workers to contribute seriously to the democratic operation of major projects in a far wider and deeper manner than hitherto.

Moreover, during the past year the greater part of the five-year development plan has been realised. For the first time national income from industry has exceeded that from agriculture, despite the record the country has achieved in agriculture. Real average income has increased by 21.5 per cent. over the base year. As for employment, after only three years of application of the five-year plan the United Arab Republic has been able to reach its employment target. Consequently three-quarters of a million new workers have been absorbed by new industries, in addition to the increase of employment in existing industries. As a direct result of the increase of the standards of employment in the United Arab Republic and the decision to double minimum wage scales, there has been an over-all increase in actual wages paid estimated at some 35.9 per cent. over the base year. The success of the socialist experiment giving the workers 25 per cent. of the net profit of the companies has been confirmed by the fact that this year the balance of 75 per cent. has exceeded by far the total dividend distributed among the shareholders in the last year.

Limitation of dismissal of workers by the employer is one of those matters which must be organised in such a way as to preserve industrial relations. A decree has been enacted specifying that whenever dismissal of a worker is contemplated the management of any concern must seek the opinion of a tripartite committee representing the Ministry of Labour, management and the workers. It has also been decided that legislation will be promulgated to protect trade union members and workers who are members of boards of directors elected to represent workers in the concerns from any arbitrary measures or dismissal, in such a way as to ensure that they can assume the important role assigned to them with determination and strength.

The United Arab Republic has expanded the application of social security against sickness, occupational disease, old age, injury, disability and death. It has also extended the application of pension schemes for workers and their dependants to cover all workers in industry, commerce and public and general services and non-industrial workers employed in agriculture, as well as their families. The State has waived its rights to proportions of the pensions and has exempted all such pensions from any form of taxation, in order to increase the social security of workers and their families. 

At each session the Director-General presents to us a Report on a particular issue of world concern. This year's Report is a summary of his Report in Philadelphia in 1944 and of that in Geneva in 1958. We agree that the International Labour Organisation is at present going through a delicate phase of its history—a phase in which it is possible to leave the traditional path it has been following for a wider scope of work. The International Labour Organisation is today facing a constantly changing world. At the same time, it is faced with a gradually increasing membership. That is why we must discuss thoroughly the programme of this Organisation as well as its structure.

The part played by manpower as a basic component in economic development cannot be ignored. It will be noted that although developing countries have tremendous manpower resources, yet their utilisation is insufficient. That is why we support at all times the efforts which the Organisation undertakes in the field of training. We also believe that it is essential to pay attention to varying vocational training programmes so that they conform to the actual needs and conditions of developing countries.

The Director-General has placed before us in this Report an enormous programme, which we hope our Organisation will be able to achieve during the coming years. In order to do this we should revise the whole structure of the Organisation to conform with the tremendous development of its programmes on the one hand, and with the increase in membership on the other.

The Conference is the general assembly of this Organisation, the supreme authority. It is our duty here to insist that it must be able to carry out its functions and bear its responsibilities harmoniously with regard to other organs. Its annual meetings must continue to conform with its importance as supreme authority of this Organisation.

Over the last 44 years the International Labour Conference has adopted a great number of Conventions and Recommendations which all, taken together, now form the principles of international labour legislation. Some of these Conventions and Recommendations are today incompatible with the new conditions of our world. We therefore support the proposal to form a permanent committee of the Conference to review these Conventions and Recommendations.

There has been a great deal of discussion over the past few years about the size of the various committees set up by the Conference. The increase in membership of the committees is only natural as a result of the increasing number of members of the Organisation itself. Moreover, the increase has in no way hindered the work of the committees. We believe that there must be equal opportunity for all delegates to take
an active part in the deliberations of the Conference and the work of its committees, with no discrimination between the different delegates.

Among the problems raised in the past few years has been that of procedure in the Resolutions Committee. Since it has become obvious that the procedure must be amended, we must bear in mind that any such amendment should not in any way jeopardise the right of any member to move motions or express a view with full freedom.

The Governing Body is of major importance. It constitutes the executive machinery of this Organisation, responsible for co-ordinating its activities and formulating a general programme for the attainment of the Organisation's objectives. However, I do believe that it is important to define the authority of the Governing Body in such a way as to preserve for the Conference the vital part it has to play as the supreme authority of the Organisation.

I think you will agree with me that there are many observations that could be made with regard to the Governing Body as regards its responsibilities, authorities and formation, particularly as concerns the permanent seats—a system which does not exist in any other specialised agency of the United Nations. Such a system, whatever may have been said in its favour under the circumstances of the creation of the International Labour Organisation in 1919, is undoubtedly incompatible with the Organisation and its membership today.

The centralisation of the activities of the International Labour Office in Geneva cannot help in recognising the real problems in the different regions of the world. Distribution of these activities at the regional level increases its effectiveness. This distribution has become a necessary step in view of the different conditions in different parts of the world. We should therefore bring to an end the present centralised system followed by the Organisation, and start instead a decentralised system. This could be done through strengthening the regional and branch offices and increasing their responsibilities with a view to enabling them to find solutions for different local problems.

The structure and the system of work in the Geneva office should also be changed so as to strengthen this regionalisation plan and to enable the regional offices to perform their new functions properly and effectively. We believe that this regionalisation will not affect the international character of this Organisation; on the contrary, it will strengthen this character and will bring the Organisation much closer to the real problems and needs of the different regions of the world.

In his Report the Director-General referred to the share of Africa in the activities of the International Labour Organisation. Fourteen Regional Conferences have been held up till now, but only one of them took place in Africa. Africa's participation in different International Labour Organisation committees and meetings is only very slight. It is highly important that the International Labour Organisation should underwrite a "catch-up programme" for Africa so that this continent may be compensated for what it has missed.

This African "catch-up programme" must include, among other things, the establishment of a third regional office to serve the northern part of the continent and to co-operate with the two offices at Lagos and Dar-es-Salaam. It is our hope that the Director-General will do his best to supply these offices with the necessary personnel, especially those in senior positions, from amongst African nationals. The number of correspondents in African countries should be increased in order to strengthen the relationship between these countries and the International Labour Organisation. It is highly important that the meetings of the African Regional Conference and the African Advisory Committee should be held at close intervals, and we hope that the next meeting of the African Regional Conference will be held early in 1964.

The short time available to us does not permit a detailed discussion of the different questions raised by the Director-General in his Report. In view of the utmost importance of these questions to the future of the International Labour Organisation and the need to discuss them in greater detail and to exchange different views among all members, we propose the formation of a committee stemming from this Conference to study all matters touched on by the Director-General in his Report, and debated by the distinguished delegates. The committee should report to the General Conference on the outcome of its studies and its recommendations at the next session. The very fact that this committee stems from the Conference should emphasise that the Conference remains the supreme authority of the Organisation.

I thank you and wish this Conference every possible success.

Mr. ECEVIT (Minister of Labour, Turkey)—

A popularly supported revolution took place in Turkey on 27 May 1960. The sole purpose of this revolution was to restore parliamentary democracy and the rule of law and human rights in Turkey on a sounder basis. The restoration period is now over. The revolution of May 1960 has certainly achieved its purpose.

However, it is in the nature of a successful revolution to go beyond its purpose; for a successful revolution shakes a society down to its foundations and brings many of its hidden and dormant problems up to the surface. Such has been the case in Turkey since 27 May 1960.

Economic and social problems that had been accumulating for a long time—some of them for centuries and some during the inflationary decade that preceded the revolution—have all come up to the surface. The people suddenly became acutely aware of these problems. Our new Constitution, prepared by a constituent assembly after the revolution and brought into effect by a referendum in July 1961, bears deep marks of this awareness. While, on the one hand, it lays the basis and provides for the legal institutions of a sound democracy, on the other hand it subscribes to the principle of planned economic development based on social justice.

The term "social State" is used in the new Constitution as one of the main attributes of the Turkish Republic. This attribute is sup-
ported by a large section of “Social and Economic Rights and Duties” which include articles that, when taken together, ensure the social character of the State while protecting the rights of private property and enterprise within the bounds of public interest. The Constitution allows great scope and provides security for private enterprise, but it also gives the State the duty to take such measures as would ensure that private enterprise functions in conformity with the requirements of the national economy and with social objectives. I was glad to observe when I read with great interest the Report of the Director-General to the current International Labour Conference that the “Social and Economic Rights and Duties” section of our new Constitution closely conforms on many points to the Director-General’s recommendations for developing countries. As long as this Constitution, which is now protected by an independent Constitutional Court, remains in force, no government in Turkey should be able to take measures for rapid economic development by neglecting or deferring the rights of the workers for a decent living, for security, and for a just share in the rewards of economic growth.

The Turkish Government realises that it is also its duty to ensure that the weight given to social considerations at the present stage of our economy does not impede our economic development at a rapid pace. The Director-General, in his Report, rightly draws attention to this necessity. In its efforts to achieve this difficult balance between social justice and rapid economic development, the Turkish Government has been putting great stress on obtaining the voluntary co-operation of the workers in measures to prevent inflation and to encourage saving and investment. The tax reforms now being initiated, which have already increased our tax resources by 15 per cent. as from the beginning of the current fiscal year, have also been designed to serve this purpose. These reforms have increased taxation on luxury items and extended income tax to large landowners, while lessening the tax burden of the workers. They provide incentives for saving and investment, especially in the underdeveloped areas, and they discourage excessive spending for consumption or for unproductive and speculative investments. As a result, there is already a growing trend for more modest living among the well-to-do. This paves the way for moderation in requesting wage increases. In practice, it has now become the policy of the present Government not to wait for pressures for initiating wage increases when there is a marked increase in profit or productivity in any section of the public sector. This policy has already begun to bear fruit—namely, there is a growing realisation among the workers of the necessity to support wage increases with increases in productivity. The Confederation of Labour Unions has willingly subscribed to this principle in a recent joint statement with the Turkish Government.

The Government’s reliance on the voluntary co-operation and support of the workers in the efforts for economic development does not confine itself to verbal proclamations of good will. A dynamic mechanism has already begun to take shape during the last year-and-a-half of effective co-operation between the Government and the workers for the success of the newly initiated five-year Economic Development Plan. The Turkish Confederation of Labour Unions, which represents a very great majority of the unionised workers in Turkey, has been consulted in the preparation of the Plan, just as the Board of Trade and Industries has been consulted. They are also being closely consulted at every stage of application of the Plan. Besides, the Government initiated the system of holding joint meetings every three months with labour union leaders since last summer. These meetings have already proved very successful and have helped the labor leaders in taking greater interest in the general economic problems of the country. The immediate application of many of the decisions taken in such meetings has inspired confidence among the workers. Representatives of the Confederation of Labour Unions have also been included, since last autumn, in the committee that lays the basis for the Government’s import and export policy. We have already found out that we can greatly reduce unnecessary imports by consulting the workers on the unused capacity of our national industry, whether in the public or private sector, and open new possibilities of work for the unemployed.

An inter-ministerial board of co-ordination of vocational training has been set up this year, which also includes representatives of the employees and the employers.

During the last year-and-a-half since the general elections of October 1961, we have been rewriting practically all our labour legislation to bring it up to date and up to the level of our new Constitution and the growing social awareness of the Turkish people.

We have co-operated with the representatives of the workers’ and employers’ associations in the preparation of these Bills as well. Among the most important of these Bills is the Bill for collective agreement, strike and lockout. This Bill has already been approved by the National Assembly and by a special committee of the Senate. It is to come before the Senate next week, and I am confident it should become law in a matter of a few weeks.

A new Bill for labour and employers’ unions is also to become law simultaneously.

Our five-year Economic Development Plan, which was initiated this year and which envisages a minimum annual rate of growth of aggregate income of 7 per cent., regards the rights of collective agreement, strike and lockout. This Bill has already been approved by the National Assembly and by a special committee of the Senate. It is to come before the Senate next week, and I am confident it should become law in a matter of a few weeks.

A new Bill for labour and employers’ unions is also to become law simultaneously.

The Government’s reliance on the voluntary co-operation and support of the workers in the efforts for economic development does not confine itself to verbal proclamations of good will. A dynamic mechanism has already begun to take shape during the last year-and-a-half of effective co-operation between the Government and the workers for the success of the newly initiated five-year Economic Development Plan. The Turkish Confederation of Labour Unions, which represents a very great majority of the unionised workers in Turkey, has been consulted in the preparation of the Plan, just as the Board of Trade and Industries has been consulted. They are also being closely consulted at every stage of application of the Plan. Besides, the Government initiated the system of holding joint meetings every three months with labour union leaders since last summer. These meetings have already proved very successful and have helped the labor leaders in taking greater interest in the general economic problems of the country. The immediate application of many of the decisions taken in such meetings has inspired confidence among the workers. Representatives of the Confederation of Labour Unions have also been included, since last autumn, in the committee that lays the basis for the Government’s import and export policy. We have already found out that we can greatly reduce unnecessary imports by consulting the workers on the unused capacity of our national industry, whether in the public or private sector, and open new possibilities of work for the unemployed.

An inter-ministerial board of co-ordination of vocational training has been set up this year, which also includes representatives of the employees and the employers.

During the last year-and-a-half since the general elections of October 1961, we have been rewriting practically all our labour legislation to bring it up to date and up to the level of our new Constitution and the growing social awareness of the Turkish people.

We have co-operated with the representatives of the workers’ and employers’ associations in the preparation of these Bills as well. Among the most important of these Bills is the Bill for collective agreement, strike and lockout. This Bill has already been approved by the National Assembly and by a special committee of the Senate. It is to come before the Senate next week, and I am confident it should become law in a matter of a few weeks.

A new Bill for labour and employers’ unions is also to become law simultaneously.

Our five-year Economic Development Plan, which was initiated this year and which envisages a minimum annual rate of growth of aggregate income of 7 per cent., regards the rights of collective agreement, strike and lockout. This Bill has already been approved by the National Assembly and by a special committee of the Senate. It is to come before the Senate next week, and I am confident it should become law in a matter of a few weeks.

A new Bill for labour and employers’ unions is also to become law simultaneously.
unions financially, while encouraging them to take part in the economic development of the country, not only as workers but also as investors. Very few limitations have been put on the right to strike, while one important reservation has been made for lockout in order to ensure that no employer should be able to exploit this right in support of obviously unreasonable demands with the intention of getting rid of certain weak enterprises without having to pay compensation to his workers. This danger exists in certain under-developed countries, particularly in the wake of an inflationary period.

Besides these two Bills, we have prepared a new Bill of labour, which will cover every worker, instead of about half the industrial labour force as has been the case until now, and create a centralised and more efficient system of fixing minimum wages. The Bill also makes it compulsory for all large establishments to employ certain percentages of the disabled or ex-servicemen. This provision of the law will be supplemented by rehabilitation centres and by a more efficient system of vocational education in the prisons, geared to the manpower targets of the Economic Development Plan.

A new Bill for social security, now before a special parliamentary committee, which will considerably enlarge the scope of, and increase the benefits accruing from, our existing social security system for workers, is to extend social insurance to all workers in industry and services wherever the Workers' Insurance Department has set up the necessary establishments. The Bill extends health insurance to the workers' families and increases the old-age, invalidity and death pensions by about 100 per cent. Pensions already in payment will be revalued, and there will be up to 300 per cent. increases in them.

Another Bill, which is now about to be passed by a special parliamentary committee, is to introduce the system of workers' participation in management and profit in all the public sector. Considering the large size of the public sector in Turkey, this system can be expected to open a new era in industrial relations in Turkey. The system to be introduced roughly consists of workers' representation in the boards of management of public enterprises as well as in the committees of management of each establishment attached to such enterprises. The workers will be entitled to up to 10 per cent. of the profit; and they will benefit by up to 25 per cent.—in certain cases 50 per cent.—of their annual wages from the increases in productivity secured through their suggestions or efforts.

We are looking forward to the application of this system of workers' participation in management and profit in the public sector, primarily as a means of achieving closer identity between the interests of the worker and the enterprise, and of achieving a fuller industrial democracy. I was glad to see that the Director-General, in his Report, had stressed the importance of this system, especially for developing countries with large public sectors. We have benefited also from the report which the International Labour Organisation published on this subject last year.

I hope that the International Labour Organisa-

The Director-General's rich experience and his capacity for sound judgment in these matters, I would not dare to challenge the wisdom and truth. Indeed I do believe that it is based on undeniable facts. But I think one might also consider the fact that this principle of associating the workers in the running of industries, this method of industrial democracy which is the expression of great faith and confidence in man, can be regarded as one of the means of narrowing down those very divergencies between systems and doctrinal differences to which the Director-General rightly draws attention. Indeed this principle of associating the workers in the running of undertakings has, in varying degrees and forms, been applied with equal success in some countries with divergent systems and has in fact helped to narrow down, in practice, the differences between those systems.

I, for that matter, believe that all measures of social justice and security can prove to be the most effective factor in narrowing down such differences, and for this reason they can prove to be of great service to international understanding and peace.

In conclusion, I would like to state that Turkey, as one of those developing countries whose problems have been given due consideration in the Director-General's Report, hopes that in this International Development Decade she will be able to fulfill her share of contributing to human happiness and to world peace, by helping to prove that it is possible for an underdeveloped country to achieve its development target with a political régime based on respect for human dignity and freedom and with an economic and social system that is based not on any dogma or doctrine but on the principle that the economic problems of a developing country should and can be solved with social justice.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BOUMAZA (Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, Algeria)

First, permit me to bring you the greeting of the Algerian people and of the Government of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria. Permit me also to extend to you, Mr. President, my warmest congratulations on the honour done to you in electing you to preside over this gathering. Through you the whole of Africa is honoured. I should like also to thank Mr. Parodi, the Chairman of the Governing Body for the year about to close, for the warm and friendly words of welcome with which he greeted our delegation. I should like also to thank all the delegations of brother African and Arab countries—these very countries which did not spare their help and friendship so that Algeria might become free and take its place among the nations. I should also like to
express our fraternal thanks to the representative of Morocco for the friendly welcome which he addressed to our delegation, and also the delegate of the United Arab Republic for the words of welcome which he has just spoken.

It is a very great honour to me to represent at this important Conference my country, taking part for the first time in the work of the International Labour Conference.

It is particularly pleasant for me to point out that at the very moment at which Algeria takes its place in the I.L.O., the Director-General has given us a proof of the dynamic and clear-sighted character of the Organisation in taking as the principal theme for our work the adjustment of the programme and structures of the Organisation to a developing world. Perhaps better than any other international organisation the I.L.O., by its past, by its long tradition, by its original tripartite composition, is able to grasp and understand the scope and sense of the changes in the world. Algeria suddenly raised the whole problem of the adjustment of the programme and structures perhaps the most important is the emergence on the international scene of former colonial countries which, after a struggle, often relentless, are recovering their independence with the firm determination to mobilize all their energies to promote their own economic and social development.

In Algeria the transfer has been made. Our country, though still covered with ruins, now faces the challenge of constructing a modern, prosperous and peaceful nation. On the morrow of independence, in addition to the enormous task of reconstruction after the war, one of the fundamental problems facing us is that of reducing the differences of economic opportunity in Algeria and promoting a coordinated and balanced development. Algeria consists of a coastal strip which is very similar to a developed area and an enormous hinterland which has become extremely backward. If this structural duality is not peculiar to Algeria—for indeed it is general in most of the developing countries—nevertheless this fundamental datum largely explains the original character of problems which we have had to face since the first months of independence and, therefore, the original character of the solutions to which we are moving and which are necessarily different from classical methods.

This coastal strip, on which most of the French settlement was concentrated in the colonial period, is the only region which has been developed. It has considerable infrastructure and equipment—that must be admitted. The massive departure of Europeans from Algeria suddenly raised the whole problem of their succession in the sectors which they deserted. That raised the whole problem of effective and rapid vocational training and large-scale management development. It was not possible, having regard to the urgency and importance of our needs, to use classical methods of training, for those would have been rendered inadequate by the situation.

This coastal strip, on which most of the French settlement was concentrated in the colonial period, is the only region which has been developed. It has considerable infrastructure and equipment—that must be admitted. The massive departure of Europeans from Algeria suddenly raised the whole problem of their succession in the sectors which they deserted. That raised the whole problem of effective and rapid vocational training and large-scale management development. It was not possible, having regard to the urgency and importance of our needs, to use classical methods of training, for those would have been rendered inadequate by the situation.

The contacts between the representatives of the employers, who are French, and of the workers, who are Algerian, are not characterised by rancour. The composition of our delegation itself is witness to this. In Algeria, which has just emerged from seven years of war, most healthy contacts are being established. We have come from the struggle without hatred or resentment. In the Algeria we are constructing, and where this co-operation is so necessary, we are determined to free ourselves from the quarrels of yesterday and to seek only the development and progress of our whole nation.

By the means that we have clearly defined, we are starting our economic development. The end of colonialism means a greater access to the world, the way to real international co-operation, and the opportunity to make our own modest contribution and bring the fruit of our experience to the consolidation of peace without which, as we all know, no progress is possible.

We speak of authentic international cooperation, and we regret sincerely that there should be represented in this assembly countries whose very presence is an insult to the principles of the I.L.O., to the Constitution it defends, an insult to all workers of the world, an insult to all men for whom the words liberty and respect for the human being still
have a meaning; I am speaking of the mass murderers of the Angolese and the racialists of South Africa. The whole of Africa at Addis Ababa swore to pay the price—even the price of blood—to extirpate this cancer from its territory.

We are persuaded that we shall soon be able to welcome the true representatives of the people of Angola, of Mozambique, of so-called Portuguese Guinea, of South Africa and of all the countries which attack with magnificent courage the last bastions of colonialism.

It is difficult for a country which has only just joined the I.L.O. to form a precise and complete judgment on the programme, composition and operation of the various organs making up the I.L.O., because of the lack of direct practical experience of the Organisation, whose work we have been able to follow only from without. However, during the past year independent Algeria has been able to become acutely aware of these problems because of the disorganisation of its administrative apparatus, the massive departure of skilled workers and the destruction caused by war. On the basis of experience acquired by Algeria during our first months of government, we can make some remarks on the rearrangements which appear to be desirable in this Organisation.

The scope of this Organisation for peace and international co-operation has considerably expanded. The decisive factor has been the collapse of the colonial systems and the appearance of the non-committed countries. We are glad to have noted at many points in the Director-General's Report a determination to face the problems of the developing countries and to stress the original aspects taken on by general labour problems in those countries. The Director-General rightly refers to the advantage of international co-operation for reducing the enormous disparities between the industrialised countries and the developing countries which are seeking to make up their extreme backwardness. These disparities seem to us Algerians a graver threat to the balance of the world than ideological divisions. To reduce them is to work for peace. The I.L.O. must remember this in its programmes, structures and methods.

The basic idea which must guide the work of the Organisation in regard to international co-operation is that the assistance given must be really adjusted to the actual situation of the receiving countries, and must correspond to their effective needs and effectively contribute to facilitating their progress towards economic and social betterment.

Of all the forms of international co-operation it is technical assistance which is the most effective in reducing the gap between the rich peoples and the poorer peoples. Each supervisor or technician trained in a developing country means dozens of jobs for workers. Technical assistance by training skilled personnel is one of the safest means of combating underemployment and making it possible to save, for reinvestment, lost working days which, without that, would mean great riches lost. The I.L.O. must have at its disposal an army of technicians, to help the countries to fight for their independence with the double imperative: train well, train fast.

It seems desirable that periods of training open to candidates in developing countries should be carried out in the country itself or, at least, in countries where the economic and social conditions are analogous. Too often, trainees are sent to study abroad, forgetting the conditions in which they have to apply their instruction. This need for international technical instructors is therefore primordial. It has been said that, after bread, education is the first need of peoples. We think that education is more necessary than bread.

In addition to its greater efficiency, technical assistance is for newly independent countries regarded with less suspicion of neo-colonialism or paternalism than some of the food and economic aid given heretofore. It makes it possible to develop the potentialities of the country concerned and to provide it with its own skilled workers who can then further the economic and social objectives of the country.

We believe in universal civilisation and we know that there are other experiments going on in the world which may be profitable to us. But we wish to make our own contribution as a self-governing and responsible country. We do not wish to have political and economic blueprints and schemes from any source merely transported into our country.

We see this universal civilisation as Teilhard de Chardin visualised it: as the ocean where each river brings the alluvium of the soil through which it has flowed.

The new international situation, with the new relations being woven among the countries of the world, means that the I.L.O. must examine its conscience; but we already know that the results of over 40 years of activity have been amply positive and we do not doubt that, after the discussion on the adjustment of structure and methods to a developing world, it will stand stronger still, more effective, more able to extend the radiance of its principles of freedom, social justice and friendship between the peoples, and Algeria will spare no effort to make its modest contribution to this great task of progress and international rapprochement.

The PRESIDENT—Mr. Ribeiro da Cunha, Government delegate, Portugal, has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. RIBEIRO da CUNHA (Government delegate, Portugal)—I am sorry, I did not want to interrupt the speaker—I have already done so once. But again I must appeal to you, Mr. President, not to allow the use of expressions for which there is no reason at all in the context in which they are used.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. PITHART (Government delegate, Czechoslovakia)—Mr. President, please allow me, on behalf of the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, to say how glad we are that you were elected President of this session of the International Labour Conference. I see the greatest significance in the fact that this important Conference is headed by such a distinguished representative of the African Continent.
Allow me also to say that we are sincerely glad to welcome the new Members of the Organisation whose advent symbolises the historical changes which are occurring in the world, but we deeply regret that a number of representatives are missing still who either have not been able as yet to free themselves from colonial domination or who, for some other reason, are being denied the right to become members of our Organisation.

One of the basic ideas behind the I.L.O. is that lasting peace can be based only on the principle of social justice. I would add another thought, that maintenance of peace is an elementary premise for social progress. The year that has elapsed since the 46th Session of the International Conference has confirmed this dramatically. I do not propose to appeal to the delegates to picture to themselves what the world would be like if, last autumn, during the threatened aggression against Cuba, reason and the principle of the solution of international problems through negotiation had not triumphed. One thing is certain: we would not be discussing here the problems of the International Labour Organisation and many of us would certainly not be able to discuss anything any more. I am saying this because I am profoundly convinced that, in regard to the problem of war and peace, which is the key issue of our time, a significant role can be played by the International Labour Organisation and, indeed, it is in duty bound to play it.

The vast changes that have occurred in the world also bring the need for considerable changes in the activities and structure of the I.L.O. For the first time since the Philadelphia Conference our Organisation finds itself obliged to discuss the principles underlying the structure and operations of the Organisation. That is why this year's session of the Conference is of such exceptional importance and why it must become also a landmark in the history of the I.L.O.

The Report of the Director-General contains some interesting and positive thoughts and proposals regarding a number of matters pertaining to the Organisation. However, it seems to me that more attention should be devoted to the purposes pursued by the I.L.O. For the first time since the Philadelphia Conference our Organisation finds itself obliged to discuss the principles underlying the structure and operations of the Organisation. That is why this year's session of the Conference is of such exceptional importance and why it must become also a landmark in the history of the I.L.O.

The Report of the Director-General contains some interesting and positive thoughts and proposals regarding a number of matters pertaining to the Organisation. However, it seems to me that more attention should be devoted to the purposes pursued by the I.L.O. For the first time since the Philadelphia Conference our Organisation finds itself obliged to discuss the principles underlying the structure and operations of the Organisation. That is why this year's session of the Conference is of such exceptional importance and why it must become also a landmark in the history of the I.L.O.

I fully support the idea of further developing the special programme of activities of the I.L.O. However, any solution of these important problems must be based on the experience of all economic and social systems. There is hardly any sign of this yet, although there is, notwithstanding, increasing recognition of the need for comprehensive experience both in theory and in practice.

Over a period of years we in the socialist countries have accumulated great experience in regard to manpower planning, special training, and so on. Yet, despite that fact, experts from the socialist countries are very poorly represented in the various courses and seminars of the Organisation, and in the various sections of the Secretariat.

Another important instrument in the work of the Organisation is constituted by its basic statements of principles. In this connection I would like to draw attention to the Declaration of Philadelphia. That Declaration was to some extent an element of progress in comparison with the Preamble to the Constitution of 1919. However, we are living today in 1963, not in 1944. In our changing world all programme documents are bound inevitably to become obsolescent. That is why it would be vain to seek in the Declaration of Philadelphia a reply to many of the universally recognised pressing problems which now face the world, and therefore the I.L.O. as well. One of the main weaknesses of the existing documents is, for instance, the fact that no mention is made in them of the need to solve important world problems by negotiation. Nor is there any mention of the need for peaceful co-existence and co-operation between countries, the need for general and complete disarmament or the need to liquidate colonialism and its consequences, and so on.

It is also time to enshrine in the basic documents of the Organisation the right to work, which was inserted in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The basic documents of the I.L.O. also include mention of the need for every worker to achieve a minimum living standard in line with the state of develop-
ment of production, culture and civilisation in a society worthy of mankind in the second half of the twentieth century, and of the need for the workers to share properly in the benefits resulting from improved technology.

The Declaration of Philadelphia ignores the problem of the liquidation of colonialism and its consequences, yet this problem is so important that it certainly deserves a separate section of our statement of principles. The Czechoslovak delegation believes that the Conference should consider whether the time has not come to have a basic document which will govern these problems. The Czechoslovak delegation has prepared certain proposals and considerations which it would be glad to communicate to other delegations.

I would now like to touch upon another and very pressing question. However perfect our programmes, they will never solve anything if the proper conditions do not exist for their comprehensive and consistent implementation.

The first part of the Report outlines certain tasks the fulfilment of which would buttress the efforts designed to improve the lot of mankind. However, many sections in the second part of the Report relating to structure offer no guarantee that those measures will be carried out. It is true that the Governing Body has been expanded, but that does not solve the crucial problem—namely, the fact that it is the General Conference which should, both de jure and de facto, determine the policies of the I.L.O. It is the Conference that should be the policy-making body of our Organisation. It is only the Conference, after all, which is composed of representatives of all the member States. It is not in line with the principles of democracy and it does not serve the cause of fruitful work if the decisive part is played by the Governing Body. Do you not think that the time has come to put an end to such an anomalous situation, which has no equal in other organisations, such as U.N.E.S.C.O. or W.H.O.?

It must be laid down in the Constitution of the I.L.O. that the Governing Body operates under the direction of the General Conference and is answerable to it.

In regard to many pressing requirements of our time—for instance, the needs of the peoples of the developing countries—the response of the I.L.O. is still indecisive and inadequate. One of the basic reasons for this is, of course, the fact that many forces which want to solve these problems rapidly, comprehensively and democratically are denied the right to play the part in the Organisation that should be theirs in view of their real importance and their position in the world today. I would therefore like to see included in our documents the principle of the equal and fair representation of countries from different geographic areas and with different economic and social systems. This is a compelling condition for the future successful work of our Organisation.

Many of the causes of the lack of flexibility in the resolutions of the Organisation lie in the Standing Orders, but I do not see how the solution can lie in restriction of the right of delegates to discuss their resolutions. Resolutions have played an essential part in the life of the I.L.O., and this can be seen also from the Report of the Director-General where he refers to the action taken on these resolutions. Experience shows that the time has come for the Standing Orders to be subjected to a comprehensive analysis, and for appropriate conclusions to be drawn.

Those are the few arguments I wish to put forward at this stage. Of course, 15 minutes is quite inadequate to talk about all the important problems with which we are concerned. The practical proposals which we have heard and those which are undoubtedly still to come must not be forgotten or pigeon-holed. I am referring especially to the memorandum that has been tabled by the delegation of the U.S.S.R. The Czechoslovak delegation is convinced that it is necessary to create appropriate working conditions so that all proposals and ideas can be discussed in a businesslike manner and carefully prepared with a view to specific action to be decided by the next session of the Conference.

Mr. NAPIER (Workers' delegate, New Zealand)—I would like first of all to congratulate the President on the high office he has achieved at this Conference, and to wish him every success in the fulfilment of his very important duties.

I wish to thank you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Government of New Zealand, which I represent as Workers' delegate, for the opportunity to speak from this rostrum, and also to express appreciation of the Director-General's Report. It is certainly not my intention to attempt to criticise that very comprehensive Report on the programme of the I.L.O. and the methods and means to meet the changing circumstances throughout the world and to achieve firmer foundations for world peace and higher levels of social justice. I feel sure that all sections of the people of my country fully support the I.L.O. in its earnest endeavours to achieve such worthy goals. I know that the organised workers of New Zealand are in full agreement with the I.L.O. in the struggle for and the maintenance of the three basic principles set out on pages 16 and 17 of the Report for the consideration of this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference.

In my country on the other side of the world and in the southern hemisphere we do, as wage earners, have the right to organise, but not as freely as we would like. It is true that we are more fortunate than the workers in most of the underdeveloped countries in this respect. It is equally true that we do not enjoy the freedom of organisation, association and collective bargaining to the degree that it exists in countries such as Denmark, Norway and Sweden. As an example, we have in my country an industrial law known as the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Under this Act 15 workers in an industry can register a union under the Trade Union Act, if the proper conditions do not exist for their registration. But registration carries with it compulsory arbitration and denies the right to strike under pain of heavy penalties. It is also true that wage earners in New Zealand are not forced to register a union under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Wage earners can register a union under the Trade Union Act,
1908, or under the Incorporated Societies Act, and endeavour to obtain satisfactory rates of remuneration and conditions of employment through negotiation with their employers but without being forced into the channels of compulsory arbitration. Registration under these two latter Acts allows for more freedom of action, but this is thwarted and restricted by virtue of the fact that it is open for 15 workers of the union registered under the Trade Union Act, 1908, to break away, register a union under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and enter into conciliation and compulsory arbitration for an award with their employers. The employers are always prone to encourage this course, and the Government and the state officials condone it. Furthermore, registration under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act encourages a multiplicity of craft unions and small local unions. Even in the waterfront industry, of which I am an official, the employers are entitled to have a very large percentage of the workers individually called upon, when becoming members, to accept compulsory arbitration. The right to strike does not exist under the industrial laws of New Zealand, and where it is permitted it is hemmed in with all kinds of restrictions, obstacles and penalties. Punitive measures applied, and obstacles placed in the path of the endeavours to raise levels of living and the status of wage earners, open the way for the adoption of other means and ends. Comment in this respect is no attempt to uphold the wisdom of all strikes. The facts are, however, that so long as employers have the right to buy labour power to make profits, the employees claim the right collectively to withdraw their labour power to protect their levels of living. So long as the employers have the sole right to hire and fire, the workers will claim and exercise the right to strike.

While the wage earners of New Zealand are organised and appear to enjoy levels of living yet to be attained by the wage earners of many other countries, the facts cannot be avoided that no New Zealand Government has ratified the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), or the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98). On 2 May 1963 the annual conference of the national trade union organisation—the New Zealand Federation of Labour—called upon the Government to ratify the above Conventions. We will continue to do so irrespective of which political party is in control of the legislature.

Perhaps there are some delegates who do not appreciate our position. In New Zealand we had compulsory unionism, together with compulsory conciliation and arbitration. By legislation, the New Zealand Government has decreed that compulsory unionism be eliminated. It now no longer exists. But this Government has not ratified Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. We in New Zealand do not desire to invoke compulsory unionism and arbitrate with their unions, but we do desire the right to organise and the right of collective bargaining. We do not desire government handouts. All we desire is an I.L.O. Convention of protection as agreed. Restrictive measures and added penalties for industrial action have been provided by legislation. We can—and will—face up to that situation as it arises. But our Government is a party to the I.L.O., and it should be expected that all I.L.O. decisions should be ratified by it.

The New Zealand Federation of Labour may yet call on the I.L.O. Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations to ask the New Zealand Government to grant the Committee the opportunity to investigate and survey the industrial laws of New Zealand in relationship to I.L.O. principles. It would be of interest to see what the response would be.

My country is basically an agricultural and pastoral country. Very large numbers of the world's population still require more nourishment, and many countries are faced with the problem of selling not surpluses of an industrial commodity but agricultural products. It appears that in the years to come adjustments will have to be made in the pattern of trade and production in my country, and we are concerned as to what will be the function of the trade union movement and the wage and salary earners. Trade unionism has been one of the decisive factors in preventing unfair competition, stabilising living standards, and thus creating a stable economic system. Trade unions will continue their vital function as guardian of workers' living standards. They will also strive to develop another function—that is, as partners in the process of increasing productivity and production. We are repeatedly being informed that this, with the rewards, is in operation in totalitarian and dictatorship countries. It will have to be encouraged, and established, in the democratic countries also.

If production is to be increased in democratic countries as fast as population and world trade demand, there must be incentives for all the factors in production—wages, profits (private, public and state), and capital investment. The status of wage and salary earners must be raised. Their organisations must play a part in the fields of social planning and production. Failure to respond in this respect means that greater emphasis is going to be placed on all forms of public ownership.

Organised with the unions of workers, democracy will survive and thrive. Organised against the unions of the workers, democracy will decline and disintegrate.

It has been openly stated by prominent politicians in New Zealand that the Government could not continue to function satisfactorily without the good will of the wage and salary earners as expressed through the New Zealand Federation of Labour. The New Zealand Federation of Labour is a responsible body and is willing to carry the responsibility of furthering the welfare and status of workers, advancing a planned economy for New Zealand, and its national security. This can be achieved with a minimum of state interference in the affairs of the workers' organisations, and in line with I.L.O. principles.

Time does not allow me to go into a lengthy generalisation of I.L.O. activities, but in conclusion let me say this. The New Zealand
Federation of Labour fully recognises the good work done by the I.L.O., and I am authorised to say that we in New Zealand will render any assistance within our power to further the aims and objectives of this body to the greatest extent, and so further good relations between government, management and the workers throughout the world. This, in our opinion, is the only valid solution to the many vital problems that confront workers, governments and employers in this world today.

Mr. TESSEMA (Government delegate, Ethiopia)—I have the honour to express the great satisfaction which my Government felt when it became possible for Ethiopia to be represented at this session of the International Labour Conference with a complete tripartite delegation. This happy event, which has come about as a result of the recent labour developments in Ethiopia, is certainly a positive indication of my country’s determination to strengthen its ties with the I.L.O. and to promote social and economic progress within its boundaries.

The Ethiopian Government has studied the annual Report of the Director-General with the care that it always deserves. Before I make a few comments on that Report may I briefly inform the delegates of some steps that my Government has taken during the last two years in the field of labour.

The first step that we had to take was to establish an administration which could efficiently handle the increasing labour problems of the country. Therefore, it was designed that we should arm ourselves with a proper administrative set-up and a legal backing to deal with the situation, both as it presented itself now and as we anticipated the problems in the near future. Thus, in 1932, the Public Employment Administration Act was issued by the Government with a view to making fuller use of the country’s labour force and to developing its skills.

Following this Act the Government has started with the gradual build-up of a network of employment offices which is intended eventually to cover all important industrial areas of the country.

The second main legislation that the Government enacted was the Labour Relations Decree so as to bring about co-operation between labour and enterprise. Under this law a Labour Relations Board has been established and charged with the function of considering, conciliating and arbitrating in labour disputes. This has helped to promote the creation of employers’ and workers’ organisations and has brought about the true process of collective bargaining. We have reason to believe, on the basis of the activities of the Labour Relations Board since its establishment, that the Government has laid the foundations for sound labour relations and the settlement of disputes.

In the matter of organisation we are happy to report that already some 40 labour unions have been registered. The establishment of a national confederation has been completed by these unions, associations of employers have been organised and, according to plans, employers’ and workers’ delegates will soon be represented in a number of policy-making advisory committees.

During this period considerable attention has been given by the Government to problems of training at different levels. The legislations I have just mentioned were not enacted before we undertook to give the necessary amount of special training to a great number of labour officials. This was done with the assistance of the I.L.O. last autumn. Two seminars, one for industrial managers and another one for labour union leaders, were also held successfully during the last few months. My Government places great emphasis on these training programmes and proposes to continue such and other training projects as required from time to time.

The Department of Labour was established in the Ministry of Community Development only two years ago. Much of the work I have reported till now has been achieved during the last year. While we would certainly like to move as fast as we can, I believe, in these matters, it is more desirable to hurry up slowly. For this short period, we do believe we have undertaken the necessary steps to prepare ourselves better than ever before. The new labour laws we have enacted represent a significant landmark in our social policy. On their basis we hope to be able, in the long run, to improve substantially the utilisation of our labour force and its skills. We are also determined to create sound and reliable labour relations which may, apart from other consequences, lead to investment of the necessary capital and related facilities from which economic and general progress will certainly result.

For the immediate future we have a few plans. The first of these is the preparation of legislation which will enable the Government to set up a system of labour protection and inspection which, I am sure, will contribute considerably to labour safety, health and welfare. A number of regulations to ensure that workers have at least minimum labour standards are also under preparation. Here again, we would certainly like to do as much as we can, but you will agree with me that the demands of labour have to be met in the context of the total development plans of the nation. The allocation of funds and the undertaking of programmes must be consistent with the financial and personnel resources of the Government. It is in this spirit that my Government has studied a number of I.L.O. Conventions with a view to their eventual ratification. My Government hesitates to assume any international obligations unless it can be sure that they can be not only honoured on paper but also implemented in practice.

From this point of view, Mr. President, it gives me very great pleasure to be able to announce today the ratification by Ethiopia of I.L.O. Conventions Nos. 11, 87, 88 and 98. My Government has also ratified last year’s amendment to the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation.

The African summit meeting held in Addis Ababa a few days ago has just ended. The Charter signed by the Heads of State not only gives a directive to the African governments, but brings hope and faith to the people of Africa and a message to the people of the world. In essence the leaders agreed to unite in action that benefits the people in the social and
economic field. They agreed that unity in action for the welfare of the people, for raising their standard of living, must start right now. High priority was also given to the liberation of people in political bondage. The Conference thus underlined their concern for the dignity of man. I believe the I.L.O. is also basically working towards that end. You are also wedded to the ideal of releasing the labourer from social and economic bondage, from injustices that he may be subjected to, so that he may live as a dignitary as a partner of the economic community in which he lives.

As I have already indicated, my Government has studied with great care the annual Report of the Director-General.

We have no hesitation in giving general approval to the Report and commending the I.L.O. for its useful work during the year under review. In the following remarks, I wish only to comment in support of some of his salient views and underline some from the point of view of a developing country.

We recognise the increasing need for co-operation between the industrially developed and the economically developing countries. In its efforts to build up its economy, Ethiopia would be glad to have the co-operation of the developed countries. Recently my Government has proposed its second Five-Year Plan. We propose to proceed as much as possible according to plan, and plan for further years. And, in these plans, we would be glad to have the co-operation and guidance of the more experienced countries. But, at the same time, no country can hope to achieve its goals or find itself if it depends mainly on outside assistance. Our basic faith, therefore, must be in our own efforts as a nation. We hope our labour population will appreciate this basic approach to development and as a major member of the industrial sector of the nation will contribute in full in achieving the nation's goals.

My Government is giving increasing attention to industrialising the country. Though our country is largely agricultural, it is necessary for us on the one hand to industrialise our agriculture and get more out of the land; on the other hand, faster industrial improvement through planned development is given high priority in our efforts to raise the standard of living of our people. In this effort we certainly have many problems, but the best hope for quick results lies in active and understanding co-operation between labour and management. Trade unions of labourers are taking shape, but we hope not only that they will be there to fight for the rights of labour but that they will include in their philosophy and activities the responsibilities of labour towards industry and the country. Employers' associations are being formed, and we hope that they too will not be looking at industry from the point of view of management only but will learn to understand the needs and problems of labour in the context of the total needs of industry and the welfare of the nation.

We are also aware of certain inevitable consequences of industrialisation. Generally, urbanisation accompanies industrialisation and creates social problems. In our planning, therefore, one of the concepts we are promoting is the idea of spreading out our industries in different parts of the country and near cities instead of in cities. This, we believe, will promote the regional planning within the country and help the development of different parts of the country simultaneously, thus preventing, to some extent, the creation of slums in cities.

It is the hope of my Government that in the process of industrialisation we should learn from the history of industrialisation and its consequences, and thus anticipate these problems and take such action as will prevent the social evils that generally accompany economic development through industrial growth.

Another aspect of industrialisation is usually rural-urban migration. This is not in the best interests of the nation. Therefore, my Government again looks at this as a human problem which must be tackled at the human level. Therefore, rural community development is an accepted major programme of my Government. The central theme of this programme which, in fact, is a post-war movement in developing countries, is to help and organise the people to help themselves with such assistance as the Government can give. Self-help projects are being promoted systematically, and the goal of all these is to improve the economic, social and cultural life of the rural people so that they are able to find the fullness of life in their own environment and need not look longingly towards the bright lights of the city. This, incidentally, is also one way of preventing urban unemployment.

It may be of interest to note that what I have dealt with till now, while they are basically problems concerning the larger interests of labour, also come within the scope of social welfare, including community organisation and co-operatives. In other words, my Government looks upon the problem of labour as a human problem, and therefore all these disciplines are grouped in different departments but under one Ministry. My Ministry, therefore, deals with social welfare, community development, co-operatives and labour. We are thus concerned with both the rural citizens and the urban citizens, and we are concerned with the labourer wherever he is.

The labourer in the urban setting is a product of the rural culture, and the new economic life that he is brought into in the process of industrialisation is strange and unfamiliar to him. In this new economic life he has to be understood and dealt with as a human being. Man, with a capital M, is the central approach of my Ministry in dealing with the industrial or labour problems of the country. It is in the light of this that I was keenly interested in the remarks of the Director-General that the world expenditure on arms is $120 billion per year. My Government's annual budget is about $150 million. If you take this as the average for the 33 African countries, which is probably an exaggeration, the total annual budget is not more than $5 billion. May I further assume that the Asian countries would have a total annual budget of say double this figure, making it $10 billion per year. We thus come to the staggering figure of $15 billion as the total amount that the governments of Africa and
Asia are probably spending for their nation-building activities to serve the cause of Man! This, Mr. President, is only 12 1/2 per cent. of the amount that the world is spending on arms in efforts, in activity which leads towards the destruction of that Man!

And yet we talk of the United Nations having entered into the “Development Decade”. My interest, therefore, in disarmament is purely pragmatic. If only the countries of Africa and Asia, which are known as the “developing countries”, could get for development 12 1/2 per cent. of the total billion being spent on arms, our budgets would be doubled, our efforts would be redoubled and our spirits would soar high in the hope that we could raise the standard of living of our people to a decent state in a foreseeable future.

Permit me to express on behalf of the Ethiopian Government my appreciation for the assistance we have received from the I.L.O. We are looking forward to continued fruitful collaboration between my Government and the I.L.O. in the years to come.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should be failing in my duty if I left this rostrum without associating myself, personally and on behalf of my Government, with the distinguished delegates who have spoken before me in congratulating you upon your election to the high office of President of this august assembly. I wish you all success.

Interpretation from Polish: Mr. BURSKI (President of the Labour and Wages Committee, Poland)—With all due seriousness and with full awareness of the responsibility facing all the nations of the world represented in this hall, we are today discussing measures to improve the methods and means of action of our Organisation, which has as its objective the attainment of the most noble and human goal of social justice.

It is undeniable that lasting and universal peace, based on the sincere renunciation of war, on a desire to settle the questions at issue among States solely by negotiation, is an essential prerequisite for the achievement of that aim. There should therefore be an end to the armaments race, not by mutual understanding and confidence among States, respect for the interests of each and every one of them, no interference in their internal affairs, abandonment of discriminatory action in the field of trade, and increased and mutually advantageous economic and cultural co-operation on a footing of equality.

The divergences and tensions can and must be overcome by peaceful means, by fruitful negotiations. We have of late lived through a period of serious tension in the Caribbean, but the crisis has passed and the forces of peace and reason have triumphed.

We should therefore welcome the statement of the Director-General on pages 13 and 14 of his Report that he has under continuous consideration the question of what plans should be envisaged by the I.L.O. for the utilisation, for matters coming within its competence, of the enormous sums spent each year on armaments—amounting to $120 billion—if the countries concerned reach agreement on general and complete disarmament.

To realise the volume of expenditure it is sufficient to say that armaments swallow up an average of $350 million a day, $5.4 million, or a sum equal to that set aside in 1962 under the Expanded and Regular Programmes of Technical Assistance, is spent in only 23 minutes.

The Polish nation, which suffered so much during the last war, wants to eliminate once and for all the threat of sacrifice and suffering inherent in war, particularly in nuclear war.

We have lived through hard years of self-denial during the reconstruction of our devastated country. At present we are advancing along the difficult road which leads to the satisfaction of our ever-increasing material and cultural needs.

In order to provide the population with a higher standard of living, and above all to make available a sufficient number of jobs, we have tripled our investments over the last 12 years. The rapid rate of industrialisation of our country has contributed to the fact that employment in the non-agricultural sectors of the national economy has increased by 2,750,000 persons. In industry the number of persons employed increased by 1,250,000 or 60 per cent., an increase of over 300 per cent. in the total industrial production. About 80 per cent. of the increase in industrial production has been achieved through increased productivity as a result of the modernisation of existing industrial undertakings, the construction of new, modern and highly mechanised factories, steps to eliminate physical effort for workers and to improve their qualifications, and to provide industry with engineers and technicians.

Consequently, the social and professional structure of the population has changed markedly, and the urbanisation of the country has increased. The percentage of the urban population rose from 39 per cent. in 1950 to 48.1 per cent. in 1960.

We attach great importance to the problem of vocational training of young persons and adults employed in the various branches of the economy. About 1.54 million people completed their studies in vocational schools during the above-mentioned period, and about 1,183,000 people completed studies in institutes of higher education. This has provided the economy as a whole with 1,815,000 skilled staff.

At present, for the school year 1962-63, we have in the vocational schools over 1,183,000 pupils, and in institutes of higher education about 189,000 students. About 23 per cent. of our total population has attended schools of various types and levels in the academic year 1962-63. In 1962 we spent 63,000 million zloty on education, health and social insurance. This amount to 27 per cent. of our budget.

Side by side with the increase in the national income there has been a gradual improvement in the conditions of the working people. Our Government is constantly trying, within the limits of available resources, to increase wages while preserving price stability and preventing unjustified increases in prices. The average real wage has risen over the last seven years alone by 33 per cent., although it has not yet reached the target set for 1962.
It has not been easy to achieve all this. The implementation of our plans depends on the solution of numerous extremely complex demographic, social and economic problems; but our difficulties are due to the rapid and many-sided development of our economy.

The economic and social problems which I have touched upon show us the nature of the vital and indissoluble connection between the future of the Polish people and the maintenance and consolidation of peace. In the modern world the question of peace or war is a question of life or death, no longer for millions but potentially for billions of millions of people, if not for the whole of mankind. We are all aware of the fact that a nuclear war, whether started deliberately or by chance, would annihilate the whole world. Peaceful co-existence between States with different social systems is the key to our Government's policy. It may be asserted that this policy corresponds to the aspirations and the ideas of people all over the world.

On the international plane our attitude is confirmed by the Polish proposals, known as the "Rapacki Plan", for the establishment of a non-nuclear zone in central Europe, which would cover Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, and the Federal Republic of Germany; and also by the speech made by Mr. Gomulka at the 15th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in which he said: "Peaceful co-existence is an historical imperative. The sooner the world is converted to this conviction and draws the necessary conclusions the better for humanity; the easier it will be for us to deal with the problems facing the nations today; the sooner we shall be able to ensure that life on earth is free of hardship and fear."

The notion of disarmament, the abandonment of the production and testing of nuclear weapons, growing number of supporters in the world. Proposals to establish non-nuclear zones are being made by countries and nations in all parts of the world. The Soviet-Indian proposals for the de-atomisation of the Pacific zone, 1959; United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1652/XVI on the de-atomisation of Africa, 1961; the declaration of the presidents of five Latin American countries, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico, for the de-atomisation of Latin America, 1963; the Irish Aiken plan, 1959; the Swedish Unden plan, 1962; these are the expression of a single idea, a single concern—to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and consolidate peace.

The success of the I.L.O.'s efforts with regard to social problems depends on a decisive extent on the consolidation of peace. The Director-General confirms this when he says that the I.L.O. has "a responsibility to work towards a lessening of world tensions" and to preserve and strengthen the foundations of world peace. This cannot be achieved by mere words; something positive must be done.

One of the essential principles to be followed if we want to ensure lasting peace based on social justice is that it is necessary to liquidate the colonial system. We are deeply convinced that freedom will soon be attained by countries which are today still dependent, and that they will secure their legitimate right to decide their own fate.

For many years the Polish delegation at the International Labour Conference has been asking for the deletion of the colonial clause contained in article 35 of the I.L.O. Constitution. It is high time that this clause disappeared.

I should like at the same time to state my profound conviction that the I.L.O. will make an effective contribution to the elimination of the economic and social consequences of colonialism in States which have attained independence.

The Polish Government deems it essential that the I.L.O. should become a truly and completely universal organisation. It is high time that the proper recognition of the Chinese people through the Government of the Chinese People's Republic should be ensured. The rights of other States, primarily those of the German Democratic Republic, must also be recognised.

Owing to the need to adjust to new conditions and to social and economic developments in our rapidly changing world, the I.L.O. must make profound changes in its methods and in the direction of its operations. It must democratise its methods of work, that is to say, find a just and effective solution to the vital problems facing the 47th Session of the Conference.

These changes, as distinct from what is being planned by conservative and reactionary forces, are essential for the realisation of its tasks and aspirations.

Allow me to assure you from this rostrum that the Polish delegation will give all its support to the initiative taken by the I.L.O. with a view to the effective application of the principle of the safeguarding and consolidation of peace based on social justice.

Mr. TOLBERT (Government delegate, Liberia)—Whilst we intend to devote our attention during the next few moments primarily to the discussion of the Report of the Director-General, we cannot fail to seize this opportunity to express our congratulations to the President of this session of the Conference. We do this on behalf of our Government and our people.

With a personality of your stature, talent and ability we have no doubt, Mr. President, that this Conference will be the beneficiary of your wide and varied experience and the results will be fully indicative of the importance both of the Conference itself and of your contribution thereto.

Your service as Minister of Labour of your country for a long time, your astuteness in administrative matters and your long association with the I.L.O. cause us to be confident that through your guidance and leadership our deliberations at this Conference will be of immeasurable benefit to the progress of the International Labour Organisation and the objectives for which it stands.

We recognise, and this recognition gives us a feeling of uplift, that, through the unanimous election of an African as the President of this Conference, a new record of forward thinking has been established by the I.L.O. and we, therefore, have reason to believe that the attitude of all the delegates present at this Con-
ference will continue in harmony with this type of broad and objective thinking.

To those Members recently admitted to the I.L.O., the Liberian delegation wishes to extend a friendly hand of welcome. We entertain no doubt that their participation at this Conference and future Conferences of the I.L.O. should contribute towards an appreciable solution of the social problems affecting the world today.

We have read with interest the Report of the Director-General and we wish to register our thanks and appreciation for a well-documented and masterly presentation. Should this Conference, soberly and without undue resort to political or regional influences, give careful scrutiny to the programmes outlined, taking into consideration subsequent constructive suggestions which may be brought forward by member nations of the Organisation, we can expect the evolution necessary for the adaptation of this Organisation to an ever-changing world.

The importance and timeliness of the subject well treated by the Director-General—Programme and Structure of the I.L.O.—cannot be over-emphasised. Full evaluation of the programme and structure of the Organisation for future needs, therefore, is not likely unless full consideration be given equally to the comcomitant question of the present programme and structure of the I.L.O. and its adequate adaptability to the changing world conditions.

In many areas of the world, today, despite ideological differences, new programmes and projects are being embarked upon that sometimes seem as monumental and as uncertain as the journey to the stars. Ours would not be to advocate anything but practical, feasible and necessary projects that would be in line with the present programme and structure of the I.L.O. The history of achievements of this Organisation clearly reveals that it has successfully undertaken many programmes and has survived many structural changes; however, as a consequence of a thorough examination of the present programme and its adequacy to our changing world, the I.L.O. seems to have redoubled its realisation of the dire need to bring the whole of its programme and structure into line with world conditions and the demands and needs of people everywhere. Many of these needs were brought into focus at the All-Africa and Malagasy Conference of Labour Ministers, held in Lagos earlier this year. Some of those call for a closer and better co-ordination of labour matters and activities among the African nations, in our effort to promote social progress and stability of the African labour force. To this end, the Governing Body of the I.L.O. may be called upon to make better and fuller use of the Organisation's African Advisory Committee; to reorganise and strengthen the African regional organisations, and to review international labour Conventions and Recommendations in light of the common problems and needs of the African nations.

To accomplish these desired changes, the I.L.O. must recapitulate some of its experiences in the past, take note of important decisions it has made. At the same time, in the order of their happenings, causes and effects, we have to take account of some of the major world problems past and present. Because whatever change is needed will have to be made in accordance with what is happening today in the world.

Post-war activities of the I.L.O. can be both hailed and remembered. During the period 1944-46, the whole programme and structure of the I.L.O. was reconsidered in terms of "Future Policy, Programme and Status of the I.L.O.". Even at that time some of the activities of the I.L.O. were of sufficient usefulness to warrant continuation. Similar decisions to continue some of the good programmes will be confirmed as we consider programme and structural changes this time, in accordance with the needs of the future. It was also at this period of its existence that the I.L.O. combined forces with some major economic entities of the world, established regional programmes in some less developed areas of the world and undertook technical assistance programmes for economic development.

Now, as we seek to enter into larger orbits of I.L.O. activities, we should not forget to recall some of the major world events which have occurred since the Organisation last considered programme and structural changes. The more clearly defined economic and political divisions between the East and West; anti-colonial revolutions leading to the emergence of nations in Africa and Asia; the clearer definition of the relationship between industrialised and developing countries. Most important of these changes is a recognition throughout the world, today, that all men, regardless of race, creed or religion, are entitled to enjoy the inalienable and God-granted rights of mankind and that mutual respect, understanding and co-operation are basic to world peace.

The world, and the I.L.O. for that matter, need not be reminded of the existence or far-reaching effects of these world differences. The very fact of the existence of these differences, particularly in an atomic age, may unduly undermine the I.L.O. commitment to give effect to its three basic principles—of universal value—of freedom of labour, freedom of association and the primacy of social objectives.

It is understandable to us that the programme priorities suggested by the Director-General for general as well as particular application are reasonable means by which the I.L.O. may be able to adjust itself to present world conditions, and we are very happy therefore to associate ourselves with many of his proposals.

This association is predicated upon the following recognised needs: (1) the need to employ more labour force throughout the world; (2) the need to raise the productivity of existing scarce resources; (3) the need to provide adequate occupational mobility and certain types of skill and knowledge by means of training programmes in order to provide a balanced growth of employment through national, regional and inter-regional projects; (4) the need, in developing countries, for a balanced regional programme of development which will close the gap between employment and the rate of economic growth; (5) the need to create enough new employment, specially in the developing countries, to keep pace with the increase in the work force and to provide for the un-
employed as well as the underemployed; (6) the need to encourage developing countries to supply available data of the extent and cause of underemployment which can be used as a basis for the enumeration of practical policy measures; (7) the need to expand the international flow of capital through technical assistance to increase the absorptive capacity of the developing countries; (8) the need for the intensive exploration of all existing, as well as new, channels of international capital flow in the form of grants and loans; (9) the need for foreign investors to accept the employment and training of local staff including management personnel and to encourage local producers and subcontractors; (11) the need for the I.L.O. to undertake broader programmes of technical assistance at all levels.

The Director-General, on the question of credentials procedure, has suggested that the Conference consider the possibility of entrusting certain of the present functions of the Credentials Committee to an independent judicial body which would consider objections before they were submitted to the Credentials Committee or the Conference. This suggestion is well taken. Besides the fact that this arrangement would remove the defect of members of the Credentials Committee being both party and judge, it could eliminate a lot of unnecessary debate, thereby allowing the Conference to handle those matters before it with more dispatch.

Also, the suggestion to establish a revision committee in addition to the permanent committee structure to assist in considering each year a Convention or related Conventions for revisions of particular provisions or features has, to our thinking, tremendous possibilities, and we would like to express sympathy.

During this day and time when nations and peoples of the world find themselves confronted with the problems of ideological differences, it becomes the responsibility of all freedom-loving men to respect and support those elements of life that are constant, such as man's struggle for great causes.

Our dedication to the principle of law and order, our respect for and acknowledgment of the rights of millions of people around the world, and our devotion to the great causes of peace and freedom for which this Organisation of world renown and permanence was created, should all promote better understanding of the common problems of nations.

The principle of law and order centres around and is tempered by the elements of rationalism and equity. Any law based upon reason and justice of necessity seeks to advocate and protect the interest of a great cause.

We find that most great nations, and the great men of all times—through whose efforts and contributions many wonderful deeds were attempted and accomplished—are the abiding ones whose devotion to and respect for law and order established a systematic pattern which has guided the lives of nations over the years.

It is this type of coming together, eliminat-
The Report of the Director-General has, in our opinion, dealt openly with the problems related to the programme, organisation and methods of work of the I.L.O. The tasks underlined should be given priority in a long-term programme to have, on the whole, been correctly chosen. The problems underlined should however be more carefully studied; their causes should undergo more consistent and comprehensive analysis, and ways and means should be devised in order to find bold solutions for them.

I wish to stress particularly our agreement with the efforts aimed at directing the programme of future activities of the I.L.O. primarily towards assisting developing countries in the solution of their most urgent economic and social problems. We should not thereby neglect the fact that there are big problems in developed countries as well—problems which are of a different character but in which the I.L.O. is bound to take an active interest.

The fact remains, however, that the achievement of permanent economic and social progress for the peoples of developing countries is a particularly serious problem, since it is further worsened by the backwardness from which these countries suffer.

We all know the efforts made by developing countries to overcome their backwardness. Such efforts have already yielded results. But the modernisation of production and the steady and rapid increase in the productivity of labour in developed countries have led to a further highly dynamic increase in the productive forces and material wealth of these countries.

The result is a further widening of the inequality of development between advanced and developing countries and the appearance of a number of obstacles seriously hampering the establishment of more equitable economic relations between them. The rapid development of emerging countries is thus an essential precondition for the progress of the world economy as a whole, and for the further economic development of industrially advanced countries as well.

The problems arising in this connection are more and more felt in international life and exert a powerful influence on the whole system of international, political, economic, social and cultural relations. It is thus justified that they should receive all the attention of the contemporary world, and it is precisely in their solution that the I.L.O. should look for its field of practical activity.

It is generally recognised that the national efforts aimed at promoting economic and social progress through industrialisation on the basis of long-term programmes should be supported by a co-ordinated international activity, and first of all by a more substantial international financing of economic, technical, educational and social development. Such assistance should be granted on a larger scale under more favourable conditions, free from all political implications, on a long-term basis and with the primary aim of supporting the national, economic and social development plans of each particular country.

The I.L.O. should stimulate the recognition and the more rapid and effective implementation of such principles by which all forms of international assistance should be inspired. It should more actively concentrate on the implementation of the conclusions of the Development Decade and other programmes.

Economic interdependence is a characteristic of our time. Consequently, if the emerging economic integrations are to be interpreted as a further step forward in the international division of labour and the establishment of a unified world market, and if they actually result in a further increase of the productive forces of the world, then they are positive.

However, some of the integration movements develop along the line of discrimination in regard to other countries and particularly in regard to developing countries. The unequal exchange of economic goods between highly developed and underdeveloped countries leads to a further widening of the gap between developed and underdeveloped regions. The I.L.O. should take a firm stand against such forms of economic discrimination.

We are convinced that the forthcoming World Economic Conference will adopt decisions on the matter with a view to stimulating a more rapid and effective liquidation of such negative trends in international life. The I.L.O. must be ready to adopt all the positive decisions of this Conference and to join in their actual realisation.

The successful solution of the above-mentioned problems is closely connected with, and conditioned by, the effective fight for the maintenance of peace in the world. Without no permanent peace there are no real conditions for social progress, or for the rise and improvement of working and living standards of all workers throughout the world. One of the main tasks of the I.L.O. is thus to contribute, by all its forces, to the maintenance and consolidation of the foundations of world peace. The I.L.O. should, as the Director-General has rightly pointed out, examine all possibilities for better international co-operation, remain an open forum for the exchange of opinions between upholders of different political, social and economic systems and not turn into an instrument in the service of vested interests.

Our Organisation must take a positive and active stand in regard to the efforts aimed at a successful conclusion of the disarmament negotiations, the ban on nuclear tests, the final liquidation of colonialism, of all its remnants, of all forms of neo-colonialism, and of all other sources of international tension. The I.L.O. must contribute to the development of concrete forms of co-operation in the solution of international problems on the basis of the principles of equality of rights and of active and peaceful coexistence.

In the setting up and carrying out of the programmes and forms of technical assistance the beneficiary countries should have a greater say than they have now, so that these programmes may be better suited to the needs and specific features of the country or region for which they are intended.

The scientific and research activity of the I.L.O. and of all the institutions set up within its framework should be made more systematic and extended to a wider range of social activities. It should be an even stronger expression of contemporary trends, it should allow for a
better insight into modern relations and the causes and effects of different phenomena, and it should assist in providing a better knowledge of the positive experiences and achievements of all countries.

In a world characterised by enormous disproportions in the level of development of different countries, international labour standards can no longer be just an average value of national legislations; they must be founded on the scientific knowledge of the exigencies and needs of contemporary developments. They should be formed as instruments for the setting up of essential principles aimed at facilitating the solution of key problems in different fields, without thereby forgetting the need for concrete solutions in a given number of cases. We agree that a whole set of adopted Conventions are in need of revision.

The powerful development of material productive forces and the big social and economic changes taking place in the world are accompanied by the increase in numbers of the working class and the strengthening of its role in the field of social progress.

The principle of freedom of personality should find consistent expression in the position of man in society, in the inalienable right of the worker to decide on all questions of importance for the economic and political development of society, and in all main questions related to production, labour conditions and distribution of income, exchange and consumption of goods. With a view to ensuring better living and working conditions for all the workers, the new Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia guarantees the introduction of the 42-hour week.

The freedom of work and trade union freedoms presume the complete liquidation of all forms of discrimination—political, ideological, economic and racial. In this connection the I.L.O. should play an active and important role.

We consider that an organisation which does not reflect the needs of modern developments gradually becomes a serious obstacle to all further progress. That is why we are devoting all our attention to organisational questions. That the powerful development of the I.L.O. must reflect the needs of the contemporary world and allow for the full participation of member countries of all regions, irrespective of their social and political systems, their ideology or seniority in the Organisation, in the determination of the programmes and tasks of the I.L.O.

We consider that only the Conference is qualified to determine the policy and tasks of the I.L.O., and any procedure which would weaken the role and the importance of the Conference is unacceptable.

We also consider that the tripartite structure of this Organisation should reflect contemporary trends by ensuring a representation on equal terms to representatives of all forms of economy: to those from the private ownership sector and to those from nationalised enterprises, of the collective ownership and co-operative economic organisations. It is inadmissible that every year, at the sessions of this Conference, the representatives of the economic associations of socialist countries should be denied the right to sit in the capacity of Employers' delegates.

The regional activity of the I.L.O. should be based on the crucial interests of the countries of this region themselves. Adequate constitutional and procedural solutions should be devised to this effect. We propose that this Conference should adopt conclusions on the principles and tasks of the future activity of the I.L.O. and determine the main fields and lines of this activity. On the basis of such conclusions, a long-term programme of work should be set up, which would be submitted to the next Conference for discussion and adoption. In this sense we support the suggestions made in the speeches of the honourable delegates from some African countries, the Soviet Union and others. By the setting up of a complete programme of future activities which will reflect the needs of the contemporary world by the adjustment of its organisation and methods of work to recent changes, by the full respect of democratic methods and the adoption of a policy of active and peaceful coexistence in its fields of activity, the I.L.O. will give a powerful contribution to a more rapid and progressive development of the present trends of social progress.

Mr. OFURUM (Employers' delegate, Nigeria)—As the Nigerian Employers' delegate—and as a fellow countryman of yours—I offer to you my sincere congratulations and those of Nigerian employers on your election as President to this Conference. For many years the Nigerian Government delegation has been favoured with your leadership at these Conferences; the considerable zeal with which you have carried the heavy burdens of your office has earned you the highest respect of employers. You have always held the highest ideals in the field of labour relations and we feel that the honour this Conference has bestowed upon you is richly deserved.

I would also like to place on record our appreciation of the Director-General's Report. It is difficult to blend the conflicting views of member States so as to provide some concrete plans for the future organisation of the I.L.O. That the Director-General has achieved the objectives is a reflection of the man and his willingness to serve faithfully the ideals of the Office.

The last ten years have established clearly that great differences of wealth exist between countries. The growth in the number of independent States has brought new problems and responsibilities to this Organisation; these problems are the principal reasons why we sit here today examining past programmes and the organisation of the I.L.O. to see how best they may serve the new circumstances.

In discussing the past work of the I.L.O., Nigeria is particularly conscious of the positive and vital role that has been played by the Office in its development. Nigerian employers have co-operated with technical experts in the establishment of schemes initiated by the Office in consultation with the Employers' delegate of the Federation. In particular I would mention the setting up of a National Manpower Board, which is currently conducting a pilot survey to establish more accurately the numbers of
skilled and professional personnel available in Nigeria, to estimate future requirements and the availability of training facilities and to ensure that demand and supply of such personnel are harmonised. A vigorous policy by the I.L.O. to encourage a more scientific study of manpower problems is welcomed by employers who have faced chronic shortages of skills for many years. The identification of shortages of skilled personnel enables employers to plan business activity with more confidence; it also provides government with accurate information to enable more mature judgments to be made in employment policies.

Identifying shortages, estimating future demands and gearing the machinery of State to meet the deficit is one thing; to plug the gap between demand and supply in relation to the real need of a country's basic successful development is another. Priorities have so far been established more in keeping with the political and social problems of the country than with scientific estimation, and whatever our aims may be this has contributed to the short-fall.

Nigeria, like most of Africa, depends upon agriculture for its principal sources of wealth. Industry is growing, but it will for some time provide by comparison only a small amount of the total national income required for the successful development of our country. The land is our major provider and occupies nearly 96 per cent. of our working population.

The Nigerian Government has reiterated time and time again its determination to foster collective bargaining as the better method of regulating wages and conditions of service. The number of agreements made between the employers and workers testify to the success of that policy. Very good work is being done by workers' internationals, academic and other institutions to equip the unions for effective bargaining. The average farm worker, compared with the wage earner, is, however, very badly off. There is a danger that this bargaining power could be used to widen the gap between those who live on the land and those who work for wages, particularly since the farm workers are not yet unionised. It is, of course, not true to say that bargaining alone is responsible for the gap between incomes, but schemes should be so carefully worked out as to ensure that the interests of the whole economy are balanced and harmonised. I would urge that greater emphasis should be given to training facilities which underline the social and economic implications of trade union policies. Trade unions must be made up of good citizens. The Director-General has pointed out that this policy can be referred to the need for training programmes based upon a thorough understanding of the practical working conditions in each country.

I will now turn to that part of the Report which concerns the role, organisation and procedures of the Conference. The problem seems to have arisen largely from the growth of the Office and the significant increase in the membership of the Organisation over the last few years. The new Members are mostly from Africa and have all recently achieved political independence.

Nigeria employers are convinced that the tripartite organisation of the I.L.O. has been and will continue to be that which is best suited to its operation and would urge that any recasting of the Organisation which sacrifices its tripartite character should be strongly and vigorously opposed.

The membership of the I.L.O. today represents the whole range of stages of economic growth. In an attempt to set universally applicable standards the I.L.O. has had to frame instruments with really no teeth in them. The majority of these older instruments have been framed with the developed countries in mind. The new nations who are all in the category of developing nations often find that they are unable to accept these standards having regard to their economic and social development.

We therefore feel a great need for increased regional activity. The last African Regional Conference was held in 1960 and we look forward to the next, scheduled for 1964. We feel that the African Regional Conference should be held more frequently, at least once every two years. It may well be that in order to give the Office enough time to deal with the work of these Conferences either the frequency of Geneva Conferences or the size of the Office itself may have to be re-examined.

The decision to establish an African Advisory Committee was warmly received, and the establishment of field offices is of particular importance. We would suggest that the field offices should be extended and their staff increased so as to bring about closer contacts between them and governments, employers and workers, particularly if they are envisaged as centres for the collection and dissemination of information on regional conditions.

We are happy at the decision to expand the Governing Body. Additional seats have been provided to accommodate the new nations, especially from Africa. There is vital need for the African Continent to be more firmly and adequately represented on the Governing Body and I hope that the elections about to take place will result in all the seats thus made available being held by Africans. This is the only way in which the I.L.O. can fully understand the problems of these new nations and give full weight to their views in the legislative work that lies ahead.

As the Director-General has rightly pointed out, the I.L.O. stands at the crossroads; indeed the whole United Nations family is at the crossroads. Whether we go forward into the light towards goals which bring about higher standards of life for all, or whether we turn back into the darkness is a matter for mankind. Let it be borne in mind that we are a family joined together in a common endeavour to serve each other; and let us go forward together in unity, peace and freedom.

Mr. GODJALI (Government delegate, Indonesia)—Mr. President, on behalf of the Indonesian delegation I wish to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by several distinguished delegates, and congratulate you on the election of Dr. Godjali as President of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. This session of the International Labour Conference is very important and will prove to be an historical one, since the I.L.O. has now arrived at its tremendous task of
deliberating on problems and issues regarding its own functions and structure, and it may well be, as is rightly stated in the Director-General's report, that this has brought the I.L.O. to one of those points of its history "where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action". In recognising this, we may assume that this Conference is not to be considered as another routine session. It is a session, indeed, in which basic issues should be discussed, having due regard to the dynamic processes which are taking place the world over and to which, I sincerely hope, future activities and structure of the I.L.O. will be geared in order to meet the rising demands of the working people of the world. But if this Conference is not going to deal with routine problems, then, in my view, its very character will place specific and heavy responsibilities upon the shoulders of all the distinguished members of this highly respected body.

This implies that we all should have the capacity to examine the problems with which we will have to deal with an open mind and review them within their proper historical perspective.

My country has a very special interest in the I.L.O., and it is our wish to see this Organisation, to which we have the honour to belong, flourish and be effective and successful. But it will be effective only in so far as this body follows the course of history and does not make any attempt to dam, divert or delay that course.

To mark the significance of the occasion a most important document has been placed before us—and I would say one of the most important of the series of Reports from the Director-General of the I.L.O. to the Conference. The analysis of a future programme of the I.L.O. commands our fullest respect, and the proposals for a structure of the Organisation which would be able to cope with the five main problem areas reveal a profound insight into the place and functions of the I.L.O. in a changing world.

I now propose to review briefly the proposed programme of the I.L.O. against the needs of a great African Continent, namely the important group of newly emerging countries which have released themselves from the material and mental bondage of the colonial past. My brothers from the great African Continent will agree with me that our common task of decolonialisation and liberation has not yet come to an end, although it will not take long before the last remnants of colonial control and oppression will be removed from this world.

In the meantime the years have not been passed in idleness in these countries. Against the odds of a bankrupt colonial heritage our peoples have been struggling and will continue for some time to struggle to achieve the best living standard possible for their scores of millions. And the results, however modest they may look, are there: these countries have come to stay, and in spite of the criticisms to which they have opened themselves, they have become distinguishable new units of policy which have come to represent new social and economic forces in the world of old. These new social and economic forces are living realities, and their development will bear upon the course of world history.

The five-point social and economic programme which the Director-General has placed before us is a masterly synthesis of the numerous social and economic problems which beset the life of the new nations. We recognise, with anguish, the clear expression of our own needs: first, the improvement of skills and fuller utilisation of the labour force for economic development; second, the distribution of incomes and its relation to general economic and social objectives; third, the growth of trade unions and labour relations in developing countries; fourth, various current issues affecting the status and conditions of the worker.

We are used to fighting a continuous battle at many points simultaneously, and we are, therefore, the first to agree on the necessity of comprehensive social and economic programming.

It is clear that none of the firmly established major types of I.L.O. action is to be discarded, and that, in the words of the Director-General, a new balance among the different methods of I.L.O. action will need to emerge which, in its turn, necessarily entails structural and organisational changes for the I.L.O.

Unfortunately time forbids a fuller discussion of the points raised by the Director-General with respect to standards, technical co-operation, educational action, research and clearing-house functions of the I.L.O., but I could perhaps gain some of our most precious commodity, Conference time, by attaching my brief remarks to one single practical problem area, namely that of labour-management relations.

Now in this field, standards, beyond the mere exhortation that labour-management relations need to be good, are the most difficult to lay down. They will depend in the last instance indeed on what people want. These differ widely for reasons that are mainly of an historical nature. Let me explain.

Our history is as brief as it is intense, if only for our wish and deep-seated urge to catch up with modern contemporary life. In our efforts to cope with the monstrous social and economic problems while only limited resources were available, we have arrived at solutions which we consider to be effective and in full agreement with our own nature. We consider these solutions, without any apostolic intention, to be of value to us, worthy of attainment and worthy of defence.

Most of these approaches to, and solutions of, major problems are, as far as Indonesia is concerned, crystallised in our state philosophy as is laid down in the Pancasila, or Five Principles. These include—one, the recognition of an Almighty Being; two, democracy; three, social justice; four, nationalism; five, humanism.

These principles, general as they may appear, are not hanging in the air like so many slogans, but they embody the accumulation of an intense and telescoped experience, they represent the guiding lines for any of our actions in state and individual affairs, including, for example, labour-management relations. Theoretically and practically there is no place for antagonism between the two functional social
groups of workers and employers, or any other difference of opinion to persist after representation and deliberation in a continuing effort to find a common ground of reconciliation. Add to this the conception that the revolution has still to be carried through and that everybody has to pull his weight in achieving its objectives, and it will be clear to all that the basic principles applied to labour-management relations will give their practical implications, such as collective agreements, works councils as they have been established in the state undertakings, etc., a profile and a colour of their own, in forms which do not necessarily correspond with those accepted elsewhere, but which are dear to us as they have been conceived in our own minds and materialised by our own sweat and toil.

Let us take within this context democracy, which is as dear to us as it is to you, fellow delegates. Ours is, not less than any of yours, a deeply human form, directed towards the well-being of humanity as a whole rather than the prosperity of a group or factions in society. The sense of participation it engenders is permeating our whole society rather than a few of its layers, and it is clear that the outcome of deliberations, negotiations at the industrial or national level, held in an atmosphere of deeply-rooted sentiments of mutual respect and mutual willing, will give results that are different from those achieved in an atmosphere of mutual distrust, antagonism and disrespect. Guided by the Five Principles we have, for example, established a joint secretariat of the most representative trade unions which is chaired by the Minister of Labour—a unique creation if one considers the mere fact that it has proved to be possible in our country to unite bearers of Moslem, Christian, nationalistic, socialist and Marxist ideologies around one single table with the aim of discussing matters concerning the well-being of the entire society.

Let us take free enterprise. Our economy is a socialist economy based on the state ownership of basic resources and depends for its functioning on a greater number of state activities than in most countries. Yet private enterprise finds a common ground and a colour of their own, in forms which do not necessarily correspond with those accepted elsewhere, but which are dear to us as they have been conceived in our own minds and materialised by our own sweat and toil.

The PRESIDENT—I would like now to strike a not very happy note. In my opinion the debate on the Director-General's Report provides an excellent opportunity for the exchange of information and ideas, and I think you will all agree with this. I do not intend to restrict the discussion, but I would hate to interfere with speakers while they are making their speeches. I would, however, appeal to all delegates to confine their speeches to the subject under discussion, which is the Report of the Director-General, and to desist from making references of a political nature. In this way we shall avoid a lot of bitterness. I am sure that all delegates will wish to co-operate with me, thus promoting within this Conference an atmosphere conducive to successful and fruitful work.
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COMMUNICATION OF THE REPORT OF THE APPEALS BOARD

The PRESIDENT—The first item of business of this morning's sitting is a communication from the Appeals Board, the text of which has been circulated this morning. The Conference has before it the report of the Appeals Board concerning the appeals transmitted to it on 7 June 1963. By virtue of the decisions taken by the Conference on 8 June 1959, decisions of the Board concerning these appeals are final and shall be put into effect by the Conference immediately without debate. The Conference will therefore note the decisions, which are not open to debate.

I take it that the decisions are noted.

FOURTH REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE:

SUBMISSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—The next item on this morning's agenda is the fourth report of the Selection Committee. I call on Mr. Weaver, Chairman of the Selection Committee, to submit this report.

Mr. Weaver (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee) — I have the honour to submit to the Conference the fourth report of the Selection Committee, the text of which has been circulated. It deals with changes in the composition of committees and the participation of non-governmental international organisations in the work of certain committees. I ask the Conference to adopt this fourth report of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT—I take it the report is adopted?

(The report is adopted.)

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

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue the discussion of the Director-General's Report.

Mr. Ocampo (Government delegate, Philippines)—Mr. President, before anything else, allow me to express the feeling of satisfaction and elation of the Philippine delegation at your election to the presidency of the 47th Session of this Conference. It is an eloquent recognition of your erudition and capacity that you not only participate in but also preside over an international conference of this magnitude.

The Director-General draws our warmest plaudits for his most enlightening, thought-provoking and vivid Report to the Conference. We of the Philippine delegation cannot but give the deepest admiration for the zeal, providence and wisdom with which he performs his tremendous functions. It is our fervent wish and prayer that he will continue to be blessed with good health and well-being so that the cause of peace and social justice to which he is dedicated and to the furtherance of which we are all committed may flourish, for the lasting benefit of mankind.

We dwell in times and in a place of revolutionary upheavals and crucial vicissitudes. Everywhere the peoples are seized with a passionate resolve to make progress and come closer to a better life under conditions of peace, freedom and justice. Scores of nations are at this very moment going through the crucible of self-determination, economic development and social renaissance in order to alleviate the plight of their famishing millions and pull them out of the rut of abject poverty, squalor and ignorance.

This revolution of so-called "rising expectations" is sweeping many nations of Asia and Africa which have recently broken away from centuries of colonial bondage. The upsurge of nationalism has never reached such a peak of fervour as we witness today in those two continents of the world. Having won their political independence the nations of those continents are hopefully and gallantly facing the challenge of economic emancipation. They are slowly and steadily mellowing to the fundamental and time-honoured aspiration for bread and freedom. In the case of my country, for one, the present administration, like the previous ones, never relaxes in underscoring and stimulating the supreme national effort to live up to the unofficial motto of "food and freedom" or, as we like to emphasise, "food with and not at the price of freedom."

The key to the bright future of these hopeful nations is inevitably economic development. They realise that this must be achieved to a degree which will bring material welfare to the masses of their peoples if they are to endure.

1 See Appendix XI, p. 632.
2 See Appendix I, p. 464.
But economic development depends on a myriad variety of factors. In the Philippines, for example, the foremost factor that our President Diosdado Macapagal first countenanced when he assumed office in 1962 was that of public morality. He set a personal example of integrity and dedication; he enunciated the precept of simple living on the part of government officials; and as a necessary consequence he ordered full economic decontrol, because economic controls presented a fertile breeding-ground for official corruption and high prices. Above all, he restored integrity to free enterprise as the basis of economic development. In bringing about moral regeneration by inspiring confidence in the Government and thus encouraging investment of timid and idle capital, our President fulfilled one major prerequisite of economic development.

Another important factor in economic development is manpower resources. It has become axiomatic to state that manpower is, as it will ever be, the most vital, most important, and most precious of a nation's resources. The proper utilisation and development of idle minds and idle sinews is still the best unpromulgated principle of economics. The idle man on the street corner is the nation's greatest liability, yet he is also the nation's greatest potential. Multiplied by hundreds of thousands, his idleness is the nation's retardation, his activation the nation's progress.

It is gratifying to note that the Report of the Director-General assigns great importance to the evolution of a strategy for the development of human resources. In the Philippines we are engaged in the most challenging task of economic development. Our President has set in motion an ambitious five-year integrated socio-economic programme encompassing all phases of our national life. Just recently our President has brought to the attention of the Congress of the Philippines the extreme need for a revitalised land reform to extricate the Philippine peasants from the century-old bondage of economic serfdom. The proposed land reform envisages a bold and daring step towards the development of Philippine farmers and agricultural workers by allowing them to enjoy the rights of dignified existence as other workers do in many parts of the world.

We have likewise inaugurated a public employment scheme, jointly sponsored by the Philippine Department of Labor and the recently established Emergency Employment Administration. It seeks to provide maximum employment in government-financed economic development projects including, among others, agricultural extension, public works, forest conservation, land clearance, fishery, and cottage industries. Our Government has launched this multi-million peso project in recognition of the gravity of the unemployment and underemployment problem which has plagued our nation over the years.

Employment opportunities have been opened to many college graduates and school-leavers through various regional as well as municipal projects, of which I have mentioned before. There are important social implications in these novel projects. We are able to absorb in the economy thousands of the so-called "educated unemployed" who otherwise would remain in forced idleness and thereby pose a serious threat to social peace; for, more than any other group, the educated unemployed constitute a strong melting against society and the vital forces at work in society. They represent disillusionment, failure and frustration. And because they are generally articulate, sceptical and assertive, they can prove, if left unabsorbed in the economy, a dangerous force in the national community.

We have also introduced in our country a national system of apprenticeship, which is charged with the responsibility for developing and maintaining a reservoir of skilled workers from which industries can draw their manpower requirements. This apprenticeship programme, however, is still in its embryonic stage.

We have similarly revitalised our national employment service by expanding the office of Manpower Services in the Labor Department. The role of our private and public vocational schools in the training of our manpower has likewise notably grown in significance through the years. We are at present in the process of establishing a workers' university, or a labour university, which will enable low-income families to send their children to school and acquire a college degree at nominal fees. It will also seek to effect changes in workers' attitudes and orientation, acquisition of industrial skills, and expansion of personnel management skills.

The area of manpower development is one in which we in the Philippines have made some modest advances, and we shall be most appreciative of what the I.L.O. can do in furthering the promotion of international action and co-operation in this vital field.

Another area in which the Philippines can claim an appreciable degree of success is the field of labour relations. We have scrupulously adhered to the principle of freedom of association, the right to self-organisation, and free collective bargaining. The basic law governing our labour-management relations—the law known as the Industrial Peace Act or the Philippine Magna Carta of Labor—is in itself the guarantee of both management and labour against governmental imposition and interference. This law spells out the national policy of encouraging unions and employers to resolve their differences between themselves.

There are, of course, still many aspects of labour-management relations which continue to pose problems for us. These include problems involving certification of elections, grievance machinery, the controversial character of functions of government-owned or controlled corporations—whether they are governmental or proprietary—and peculiar cases arising from unfair labour practices.

But in the main we claim that in our country we have succeeded in working out an effective pattern of healthy labour-management relations, informed of democratic precepts and equipped with sufficient safeguards to ensure a measure of responsibility on the part of both labour and management in the interest of industrial peace and national welfare. I am happy to say that both worker and employer have been responding to this most commendably.

The problems of unemployment and under-
employment, now only partially solved in our country, still continue to impede the flow of income distribution. Labour standards are hampered by the depressing influence of poverty.

But we have made genuine and rewarding attempts, by legislation, to protect the wage earners from exploitation and privation. We have provided for special protection and special benefits to working women and minors. Recently, we have taken decisive steps to extend to agricultural workers the same benefits enjoyed by industrial labourers.

In the government service, salaries have been standardised to conform to the changing social and economic needs of civil servants.

We have a burgeoning social security system that protects members against the tragic contingencies of disability or death. Inspired by last year's Conference, we are designing a measure to protect workers from the adversity of old age. To accord protection to laid-off workers, two Bills are pending with the Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations (which I have the privilege to head in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the Philippines) which would provide for unemployment insurance, and compensate for the adverse effects of automation and technological change.

To guard against exploitation of labour, the present Administration in the Philippines has committed itself to the "strict implementation of existing labour standards" and will change some of them "to conform with realities of new situations".

Extra-governmentally, and by mere union initiative and resourceful action, wages in some industries have been increased by management. The institution of free collective bargaining is giving unions the opportunity of winning economic concessions from employers without government intervention or regulation.

By citing these gains of my country, I have not intended to indulge in supercilious bench-lifting and self-back-tapping. Nor do I imply that the Philippines, above any other Asian country, has attained a certain peerless degree of Utopia. I simply hope to have manifested the earnest efforts of my country to try to live up to the lofty ideals of this Organisation. In that intent and spirit, and by way of tribute to this Organisation under whose auspices our country has profited to a noticeable extent, we of the Philippine delegation have felt obliged to report that in the uplifting of the common man, in the promotion of peace and social justice in an atmosphere of freedom, the Philippines has not stood still.

We in the Philippines, therefore, rejoice in identifying our ideals with those of the International Labour Organisation. We rejoice that in such identity the human being is supreme, his dignity and well-being paramount. For him, the State exists. Under freedom, he has his "best chance to be his best self".

This, I am sure, is what the I.L.O. stands for. And if there are equivocations as to what we commonly aim to do in that direction, I submit that the following words, penned by a Filipino statesman, nationalist and patriot, may be of help, and I hereby conclude with those words:

"Social justice is neither communism, nor despotism, nor atomism, nor anarchy", but the humanisation of laws and the equalisation of social and economic forces by the State, so that justice in its rational and objectively secular conception may at least be approximated. Social justice means the promotion of the welfare of all the people, the adoption by the Government of measures calculated to ensure the economic stability of all the component elements of society, through the maintenance of a proper economic and social equilibrium in the interrelations of the members of the community, constitutionally, through the adoption of measures legally justifiable; or extra-constitutionally, through the exercise of powers underlying the existence of all governments on the time-honoured principle of salus populi suprema lex esto."

Interpretation from French: Mr. BORNA (Government delegate, Dahomey)—The Republic of Dahomey, which I have the honour to represent, expresses once more its joy and pride on the election of the Honourable Joseph Modupe Johnson, Federal Minister of Labour of Nigeria, to the presidency of this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. At a time when the International Labour Office is faced with a threat to its existence the choice of an African for such a high post to inspire and guide our discussions is undoubtedly a tribute not only to the personal qualities of my dear friend, Mr. Johnson, but also a great honour for Africa as a whole.

May I, before I turn the page, say a few words of thanks to Mr. Parodi, Chairman of the Governing Body, a man of sterling worth who is deeply attached to the cause of the I.L.O., who is an honour both to his country and to the International Labour Organisation, a man who had the responsibility of solemnly opening this session. On behalf of the Government of Dahomey I am happy to tell him from this rostrum how grateful we are to him.

There are times when one is bound to repeat things that have already been said because they express profoundly held beliefs. The honourable speakers who preceded me have already welcomed the new States which are for the first time taking part in our discussions as full Members of our Organisation. Dahomey fully joins in this welcome, while it deplores the absence from this august gathering not only of our brothers in Angola, Kenya, Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Mozambique, so-called Spanish Guinea, so-called Portuguese Guinea, who unfortunately are still victims of the vile and infamous reactionary policy of Franco Spain and Salazar Portugal, but also of those of our brothers who suffer from the policy of apartheid of the segregationist Government of South Africa.

It is with great interest that I read and examined with all the attention it deserves the excellent Report of the Director-General of the International Labour Office. We all know with what care Mr. David Morse deals in his Report with the various problems facing our Organisation. Allow me, before I go into the substance of that Report, to say a few words about my country has for Mr. David Morse, how grateful we are to him for the obvious interest he takes...
in our problems and for the permanent care he devotes to them. That being so, and coming back to the subject of the Report, we know the context in which this very valuable document is submitted to us at a time when the survival of the Organisation is at stake. The Director-General makes a break with the tradition whereby each year a particular subject was considered in the Report, and he asks us instead to meditate in the course of this 47th Session on the vital problem of the programmes and structure of our Organisation. I am happy to note that from the very beginning of his Report the Director-General reafirms the objectives of the International Labour Organisation, namely the maintenance of peace and social justice in the world.

The Republic of Dahomey is very much attached to the ideals of peace and social justice. As soon as we were admitted to this Organisation we stated that we, a small country, would try to do what we could in the international field, our role being above all to help to lessen international tensions, showing wisdom, moderation and chiefly realism in a world which is divided and engaged in an armaments race, a world which seems to condemn itself to suicide. We think, as emphasised by the Director-General, that the considerable sums set free by general disarmament could be used to improve social conditions in industrialised countries and to increase the aid granted to countries in course of development.

There can be no doubt that the I.L.O. has reached a turning point in its existence when technical assistance to countries in course of development should constitute one of our main aims. For its part, the Republic of Dahomey is happy to have received some of this assistance. Over the last few months a number of experts have gone out to my country, and their surveys have dealt with a variety of problems such as employment, vocational training, workers' education, consumer co-operatives in urban areas and social security, which is a field in which I should like the I.L.O. to undertake a long-term programme in my country.

I must thank from this rostrum the International Labour Office for its spirit of co-operation and its valuable action. However, I must regret the time it has taken to communicate the experts' conclusions to governments. It is desirable that missions of experts should fit in with the development plans of each country on the basis of constructive cooperation between the International Labour Office and the governments concerned.

The search for a new programme and a new structure for the I.L.O. raises a number of issues of principle with which I cannot deal as a whole in view of the time available to me. However, some points strike me as essential, and it is on these particular points that I should like to draw the attention of this august gathering. Research for a new programme and a new structure should not make us lose sight of the important role which the Organisation has played and continues to play through its standard-setting activities. The Director-General states that the I.L.O. presents and seeks to give effect within its own sphere to certain principles conceived as of universal value, the most important being freedom of labour, freedom of association and the primacy of social objectives.

The Republic of Dahomey is entirely bound by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Charter and the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation.


In Dahomey the activity of the trade unions is entirely free and is most important not only for the employers and the workers but also for the whole of the nation. The workers of Dahomey are entitled to organise freely and individually, and can engage in any occupation without discrimination.

Nevertheless, I believe that in developing countries like Dahomey only a free and strong trade union movement can ensure stable relations between employers and workers and play an active and effective part in the social and economic development of the nation.

Mr. Morse rightly points out that "Freedom of association for workers is an empty idea where trade unions are too weak to provide real defence of worker interests". Just before that he also says: "Free choice of employment has little practical meaning where unemployment and low incomes prevail and a person is fortunate to find any job."

It is in this general context, of course within the framework of structural reform of the I.L.O., that one must place the fundamental problem of ratified Conventions and Conventions in course of ratification. I have said, and I repeat, that it is necessary to impose standards at the national and international level in order to avoid having the law of the jungle as the only law.

That fundamental principle having been stated, as regards standards, one must recognise that a standard is valuable only to the extent to which it can exceed the theory of the laboratory to withstand the concrete and highly complex test of the facts—the diversity of conditions in the States Members of the Organisation.

It is useless to stress that developing countries cannot afford the same luxuries as can countries where economic and social levels of living are relatively high. We know of developing countries with a population of 2 million which have 21,000 employed persons and 50,000 unemployed. Almost all of the budget, i.e. the resources available from taxation, barely suffice to keep the institutions going, and there is very little available for equipment and investment. This means that the 21,000 employed persons live on the backs of the unemployed and of the 2 million inhabitants. In those circumstances, how can the government not regard as criminal the demagogic manoeuvres of some trade union leaders, still colonialist at heart, who haggle and chaffer at the instigation of the foreign organisations which subsidise and support them and whose cats'-paws they are? This is a substantial problem. In the 1961 report of the
Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. The Committee concluded, regarding the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948, that having regard to the importance of the problem of freedom of association it would have been desirable to proceed to a thorough study of legislation and practice in this field in the different countries whose situation was examined. Unfortunately the Committee stopped at that and did not take its investigations any further.

Now we have the further problem of ratification of Conventions by our countries. And I go further; I would say that jurisprudence in this field proves that most of the industrialised countries are interested in this problem; however, I shall speak only of the newly independent countries. Several of those countries, including Dahomey, when they became independent and joined the I.L.O., took upon themselves the recognition of the validity of the Conventions which had been declared applicable to their territories by France or the United Kingdom. In doing that the States performed a significant act of homage to the United Nations and the I.L.O. However, one must recognise—and three years of experience have borne this out—that a good many of the Conventions thus taken on were not only unadjusted, but were also unadjustable, to our problems. We would point out that at the legal level there are provisions which are in conflict with our Constitutions, i.e. with the juridical framework of our States. At the level of reality the contradictions with the facts are no less flagrant; this has led to a chaotic situation.

The Committee of Experts has realised this and, in its study of many cases of alleged violation, has suffered an evident—and quite understandable—embarrassment. Unfortunately, this is, if I may say so, but the beginning of the beginning. Certain members of the Committee have flatly stated that they are not in agreement with the majority, as there must be regard to the level of development of the countries in question, and to their social and economic systems.

In these circumstances the problem needs to be solved at once. To deny its existence would be a great error. We must not postpone the search for a solution, for unless a change occurs most of our States will be obliged to reconsider their position vis-à-vis the I.L.O. in a field of its activity which they regard with the greatest interest. I suggest that outside the Governing Body a governmental committee should deal with this particular problem, so that after a thorough study a report might be submitted to us next year.

Dahomey attaches great importance to this point. I would go further: we would like to see the question of the composition of the Committee of Experts reconsidered, to avoid having our States judged by experts who, valuable though they may be, do not know anything at all about the facts of Africa and think that Algiers is the capital of Tanganyika and Dahomey the capital of Nigeria.

I should like now to give my opinion on the important problems referred to in the second part of the Director-General’s Report. Experience has proved that the present system for credentials has not given entire satisfaction. We consider, with the Director-General, that credentials have ceased to be a formality and have become a question of substance—of politics.

I will close by expressing our gratitude to the I.L.O. for the work it has done. Certainly our Organisation has reached a critical point in its history, but our common determination to accelerate the development of the peoples and to adjust our instruments to the requirements of the day are, I am sure, a good augury for success. We must have good will, and the future belongs to men of good will.

Interpretation from Japanese: Mr. TAMURA (Government delegate, Japan)—First of all I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Government of Japan, on your election to your high office.

The present age is one of evolution, which is characterised by technological progress in industrialised countries and economic development in emerging countries. Accordingly, the strategy to be adopted by the I.L.O. in this age should be directed to guiding and accelerating such evolution. It is in this respect that I particularly welcome the Director-General’s Report, in which he has very pertinently pointed out some major problem areas to which priority should be given in I.L.O. programmes and elucidated the directions in which I.L.O. action should proceed in each of these problem areas.

The first remark I wish to make in this connection relates to the problem of development and utilisation of human resources. This is a fundamental problem for every country of the world for its economic development, and must be taken up as the ultimate goal of the national policy, as pointed out by the Director-General. This problem has come to assume the utmost significance to all countries—for industrialised countries in relation to the problem of technological progress and labour, for countries in the course of industrialisation as a prerequisite to economic development.

In my country also the task of national development and human development, or the so-called nation-building and character-building, have been adopted as fundamental targets of government policy, and strenuous efforts are being made towards improving the quality of manpower and its better utilisation with a view to attaining social and economic progress under conditions of limited natural resources. From this point of view it is expected that the activities of the I.L.O. will be linked more closely with the over-all development programme of each country. My Government regards the Vocational Training Recommendation adopted by the Conference last year as an important step forward in this direction, and expects to have further useful guidance from the forthcoming Preparatory Technical Conference on Employment Policy. My Government hopes that the I.L.O. will make a greater contribution towards progress by concentrating its technical co-operation activities in this field for the benefit of developing countries.

The social consequences of automation and technological change are a problem that has
increasingly been receiving special attention, and it is indeed very timely that the Director-General should have taken up automation and labour as one of the tasks to which the I.L.O. should give priority. I earnestly hope that the I.L.O. will launch research and study in this field and will serve as an information centre of the world which will provide member States with useful information.

Next I would like to refer to the problem of income policy. This problem, together with that of employment, is not only of prime concern for labour and management but is also of great importance to the nation as a whole in improving national welfare and attenuating social justice. In this regard, I would like to express my wholehearted support of the Director-General's Report, which attempts to take up this problem in the framework of the I.L.O. In my country the Government established a programme in 1961 for doubling the national income in ten years' time and has been making steady progress towards this purpose.

Economic progress and social development are to be achieved keeping pace one with another, and a policy for economic development must have an inseparable relationship with income policy. It is also true that income cannot be expected to increase without improving productivity. As for the problem of determining a reasonable income policy in relation to the national economy, namely the question of maintaining the balance between productivity and income, each country will of course need a somewhat different solution according to their stage of economic and social development. As the Director-General has pointed out, it must be recognised that there are cases (especially in some developing countries) where priority may have to be given to increasing investment or savings in order to solve the unemployment problem through economic development.

To find a conclusive solution to this question of setting up a reasonable formula of income determination will be extremely difficult at the national as well as the international level. However, if the I.L.O. by virtue of its tripartite structure could successfully establish a reasonable basis for the determination of income policy, with a view to stabilising and developing the national economy, this would no doubt serve as a most useful guide for all concerned.

Now I turn to Part II of the Report, namely the part which relates to the structure of the International Labour Organisation. My first remark concerns the procedure for the examination of resolutions and credentials in the Conference. It has often been the case in the past that a great amount of time and energy has been devoted by delegates to questions other than those on the agenda, sometimes of a political nature; and, as a result, the examination of the items on the agenda has been affected. I believe the time has come for such a tendency to be re-examined. From this point of view my Government wishes to support the recommendations on resolution procedures which were adopted by the Governing Body in November of last year. We firmly believe that the Conference procedures when adopted by the delegates, together with the intelligent self-restraint of the representatives of each member State, make a great contribution to the orderly and effective working of the Conference. My Government also appreciates the efforts made by the Director-General to put forward a new suggestion to apply a sort of judicial procedure for the examination of credentials which is worthy of careful study.

The second point I wish to touch upon is concerned with the number and content of the items on the agenda of the Conference. In recent years the Conference has been increasingly overloaded with many items on its agenda, and a number of small delegations find it very difficult to participate in the discussions of all the items in which they are interested. In view of this tendency it is the opinion of my Government that the number of items on the agenda should be reasonably reduced so that the Conference may be able to examine each item with the fullest contribution from all the delegations concerned. In this regard the Director-General's Report contains some alternative suggestions, including a proposal to have heavy and light sessions of the Conference alternating in successive years—which, I believe, is worthy of careful consideration.

Lastly, I should like to refer to the problem of international labour standards. I wish to stress that the I.L.O. should not only try to restore the validity of the International Labour Code by abolishing or reviving Conventions or Recommendations which have become obsolete, but should also realise the new role which international labour standards could play, a role which corresponds to the changing world situation. It would not have been so difficult to formulate relatively high standards to be applied uniformly to all member States when the I.L.O. was a body consisting mainly of nations that had reached a more or less similar economic level. But today it is obvious that the high standards applicable to advanced countries could not be applied uniformly to a number of emerging countries which are overburdened with numerous difficult tasks. In this connection a provision of article 19 of the I.L.O. Constitution requires that due regard should be given to those countries in which economic and social conditions are substantially different when formulating any Convention or Recommendation of general application. From this point of view, I believe that emphasis should be placed on the function of guidance rather than regulatory function with regard to the role which international labour standards should play. In other words, international instruments in a new age should be sufficiently broad and flexible so as to lay down a common basis which will be universally acceptable beyond the national differences existing at a particular stage of economic development.

In concluding my speech, may I express my sincere hope that discussions in the Conference will greatly contribute to determining the direction which the I.L.O. should follow in its march forward.

Interpretation from French: Mr. KHOSROVANY (Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, Iran)—Mr. President, I should like first of all to congratulate you on your election to your presidency. I should like also to express my best wishes to the representatives of the mem-
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matters, particularly the problem of the utilisa-
tion of human resources. The promotion of
economic development programmes in the
underdeveloped countries is considered by the
Director-General as dependent upon the three
following factors: the more complete employ-
ment of available manpower, qualitative im-
provement in the manpower, the transition to vocation-
tional training and education, and, finally,
attaining the support of the population for the
cause of economic development.

I fully approve these views of the Director-
General, but I would like to add that the solu-
tion of these problems depends essentially, for
the developing countries, on the adoption of a
general economic policy adapted to the con-
ditions and circumstances peculiar to those
countries and of programmes which have been
well prepared and established within the
framework of such a policy.

It is only after establishing such programmes,
which embody the potentiality of a balanced
and harmonious economic development, that
it will be possible to solve the problems to which
the Director-General refers.

Such programmes will naturally show the
kind of productive employment which will be
available and its extent, and that will indicate
the vocational training and guidance to be
given to future workers. It is inconceivable
then that the public will fail to give its support
to programmes which will obviously be
likely to raise the general level of economic
and social life.

If programmes of this kind are not adopted,
employment and manpower strategy will not
achieve its essential object. It will merely take
the form of unsystematic, scattered activities,
devoid of a specific objective and able to act
as no more than a palliative.

Exactly the same applies to the structure of
economic authority: reform in the monetary
and fiscal fields and other related problems
including that of agrarian reform, which is one
of the chief means of securing the general
development and economic progress of a
country.

For a given country, one can only judge the
necessity and advisability of measures of this
kind in the light of the whole social situation
and general economic development of the
country and with the aid of firmly and accu-
rately established plans.

The population density of developing coun-
tries and the rapidity of demographic increase
are sometimes presented as being the most
serious obstacles to a country’s economic
development. However, they should not be
seen in the abstract and in isolation; they must
be considered in the context of the plans
adopted and in the light of a general estimate
of possible action.

These countries have a few million people, or
even a few hundred million, and their potential
in terms of financial and natural resources
varies very much from one to the other. Of
course, all these countries have to face more or
less similar economic and social difficulties,
independently of their population density and
individual resources. This is due, I think, to
lack of well-prepared general programmes.

However, I consider also that a programme of
economic development which is not accom-
panied by institutional reforms at the national
level has little chance of success. Therefore my
country has uprooted certain very ancient
institutions, like large landed estates and
inequality between men and women, and has
replaced them by a programme of national
renaissance in harmony with the progress of the
present-day world. This radical suppression of
the past has been achieved in an atmosphere
of peaceful revolution inspired and guided by
His Majesty the Shah-in-Shah.

The objective of this bloodless revolution was
and still is to promote far-reaching reforms and
evolution in many fields of national life: land
ownership, profit-sharing, the elimination of
illiteracy among the peasants and workers, the
grant of political rights to women and the
amendment of the electoral law. These main
provisions, which are designed to consolidate
the social and economic structure of my
country, received the almost unanimous ap-
proval of nearly five-and-a-half million voters
in a national referendum held a few months
ago.

Side by side with these institutional reforms,
special measures have been taken by the
Ministry of Labour to improve the social con-
dition of labour. Among these measures I
would mention new provisions connected with
the social insurance system; the adoption and
implementation of revised programmes of
vocational training; the application of the Act
concerning profit-sharing by workers; the
strengthening of trade union action; the
development of collective bargaining; the
promotion of voluntary arbitration; workers’
housing; and, finally, assistance to the labour
co-operative movement.

This reform in my country’s institutions and
similar undertakings in other countries in
course of development bring me to another
point—namely, that the efforts of these coun-
tries have greater certainty of success if they
have the support of effective international co-
operation in the economic and social fields.

I have learned with great interest and
pleasure of the decisions taken by the Economic
and Social Council of the United Nations which,
at its 34th Session, adopted resolutions con-
cerning the United Nations Development De-
cade and the holding of the International
Conference on Trade and Development. I was
very happy to note that in the resolutions,
which were approved thanks to the co-operative
attitude and co-operation of all the Members
of the Organisation, recommendations and
proposals were made with regard to the pro-
gress and development of world trade, the
promotion of the industrial growth of countries in course of development, the stabilisation of raw material prices, the elimination of restrictions on the sale and export of raw materials and the elimination of monopoly purchasing in international markets. These are matters of capital importance, for the application of these recommendations can to a large extent reduce the economic and social difficulties of many countries.

I hope that the United Nations Development Decade will not merely provide an opportunity for putting forward recommendations and suggestions, but that through appropriate international compromises it will lead to positive action in relation to world conditions and political problems.

The gap which divides the world into two groups of countries—the developed and the underdeveloped—constitutes, as is often stated from this rostrum, a really serious danger for the development of social justice and the establishment of universal peace. It is quite evident that this gap can only be eliminated through united action and a co-ordinated and constructive effort by the economic and social organs of the United Nations, and also through measures of a general character which they will take in all fields to supplement the economic programmes of institutions that are adapted to the stage of economic development reached by individual countries.

The lessening and abolition of poverty in underdeveloped countries as a result of economic development programmes, and the effects of that on the consolidation of world peace, are set out in a very interesting manner in a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its 17th Session. In that resolution member States are asked to make the necessary plans, particularly in the light of the urgent needs of countries in course of development, with a view to a gradual transition from a policy of preparation for war to a policy of peace and disarmament, so that those countries may profit by the enormous sums thus released to speed up their rate of economic and social development.

In these circumstances I am firmly convinced that every effort along these lines that is based on the respect of national and international interests will constitute a further step along the road towards the maintenance of human dignity, and we give such action our entire approval in advance.

In conclusion, I shall only express the hope that the activities of international organisations in the United Nations family may permit the achievement of the noble human objectives at which we all aim together—namely, the development of social justice, the progress and the raising of the material standard of living of the nations and the strengthening of the foundations of universal peace.

Mr. Weaver (Government delegate, United States)—Mr. President, may I at the outset join my colleagues from each group who have expressed appreciation and congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of this Conference. We believe that this is another manifestation of the I.L.O.'s recognition of the vast changes that have taken place in our world over the past decade.

The Director-General is to be congratulated on the scope and depth of his Report. We believe it to be in the finest traditions of the I.L.O., and it comes to us at a period when the world is in an unprecedented state of change. Therefore this is an appropriate time for the I.L.O. to reaffirm its commitments to peace and freedom and equality of opportunity. As a member of the United Nations family this Organisation has a duty to promote world peace based upon social justice. This grand objective, of course, has been at the heart of the I.L.O. since its formation. It must promote and continue to promote these principles regardless of political considerations. In its commitment to freedom, the I.L.O. has a major responsibility as regards equality of opportunity and freedom of association, and all I.L.O. Members share this responsibility equally by virtue of the solemn obligation they undertake when assuming I.L.O. membership. We believe that this fact of today's world can be summed up in one word: "change". This change encompasses all areas—technological, demographic, political, economic and social. It is universal in scope, and the problems it creates must be faced both by the developing countries and the industrialised countries. The Director-General's Report reflects this fact of universal change. To cope with it he is suggesting challenging guidelines which, of all the United Nations family of specialised agencies, can best be met by the I.L.O.

A month ago I participated in an inter-American conference of labour ministers at Bogotá, Colombia, where the programmes and philosophy of the I.L.O. were utilised as a basis for future programmes for that area of the world. From this conference came a mandate for labour ministers and trade unions to assume a more active role and responsibility in their countries' development plans. There was particular emphasis on the need for trade union participation in the nation's economic and social development. Many of the I.L.O. concepts and Conventions, including those dealing with the right to organise and freedom of association, formed the basis of the ministers' report. We believe that the conclusions of this meeting can serve as an inspiration to labour ministers and trade unionists in other continents.

The Director-General's Report asks whether the I.L.O. is too burdened with tradition and procedures, too preoccupied with the past, successfully to contend with the fact of change. His answer to this question is "no", and his reply suggests a course of action based on an examination of the I.L.O.'s structure and capacities.

The Director-General has set forth "five constellations of problems challenging the I.L.O. and its constituent Members". We in the United States are no strangers to these problems. In recent years they have become part and parcel of our dialogue and of our everyday life. We have been committed to their solution. Therefore, we endorse the suggestion of the Director-General that these are the major areas in which the energies
and resources of the I.L.O. should be concentrated in the next decade. This does not imply unequivocal endorsement of all his suggestions. Each specific programme must be examined on its own merits and in the light of the financial possibilities at that particular time.

The fact is worth emphasizing that the Director-General’s proposals in the programme area, having to do with human resources and economic development, are made within a voluntary framework, and that the I.L.O. has again explicitly rejected the idea of compulsory labour mobilisation as a concept of sound manpower planning.

Experience has shown us that, to be successful, national development programmes must include worker participation through democratic trade union organisations. We believe the I.L.O. has a responsibility to convey this concept to its Members, for it is vital to successful economic growth, especially in the developing countries.

Concerning incomes, we agree that there is a need for a more equitable distribution. Free workers and employers must participate in decisions affecting income distribution. A country that attempts to leave the decisions affecting income distribution to one party alone—be it government, business or labour—cannot achieve successful economic development.

The Director-General’s Report states, on page 57 of the English text, that the United States Government has “set up a wages policy” in labour-management negotiations. With your kind permission, I would phrase this statement differently. Guidelines to non-inflationary wage and price determination have been set forth, but these are only advisory and not intended to provide a general framework for private decision making. Public concern over wage and price formation, and over large-scale industrial disputes, finds expression in the United States in assistance to labour and management, where necessary, to arrive at practical solutions.

We wish to make it clear that the principle of wages fixed by government is not acceptable in the United States. An exception may occur in time of war, however, when such controls must be exercised even in a free and democratic society.

We agree with the Director-General that the problem described in the chapter on trade unions and labour relations is a sensitive one. Are the autonomous growth of unions and the development of procedures for accommodation between unions, employers and the State desirable in themselves? Are they desirable as a means of strengthening the process of economic growth? The Director-General states on page 67 of the English text: “It must be admitted that the superiority of this approach in terms of economic results remains to be proven”. He seeks proof of the superiority of democratic methods in economic development. We submit that there is abundant proof of the superiority. Time and time again free collective bargaining and related institutions have proved their effectiveness and superiority in both peace and war.

My Government views the problems of automation and technological change as one of the great challenges facing the world. We are all confronted with this phenomenon, regardless of the status of our country’s economic development. This rapid spread of new technology has contributed to the slowing-down of expanded employment in my country. Some observers believe it is a definite hindrance to our economic and social growth. We agree that the I.L.O. should concern itself with the increasing problems in this area, and should develop programmes accordingly.

As the Director-General makes clear, it is necessary to create a public awareness of the nature and speed of impending technological change, and the social and economic problems it generates. Technological progress, we believe, is indispensible to social progress. Change can, however, create problems for particular localities, industries and individuals. In general, the basic problem is labour mobility in the broadest sense which, in turn, involves appropriate training and retraining programmes, adequate employment services and other measures calculated to improve the functioning of the labour market. The more information, intelligence and experience that can be accumulated on this whole range of problems, the easier it will be for mankind continuously to adjust to the changes which economic growth makes imperative, and I submit that the I.L.O.’s competence in this area is accepted by all.

There are other sections of the Director-General’s Report deserving comment.

In regard to the recommendations pertaining to credentials procedure, my Government disagrees with the idea of an independent judicial body to determine violations of the credentials provisions of our Constitution before such objections are submitted to the duly created Credentials Committee. The problems involving credentials are constitutional problems. We believe, therefore, that they must be resolved by the duly created body of the Conference to rule on credentials questions.

This Organisation has managed over the years to maintain an effective working relationship between the Governing Body and the General Conference. There is a clear demarcation of functions and responsibilities of the two bodies. We submit that each has special objectives to serve, each has procedures suitable for these purposes. They are not perfect; but they do work, and the newly elected members of the Governing Body, we are convinced, will bring wider experience to bear upon these problems. In general we see no reason for disturbing the relationship merely for the sake of change.

Within the Conference it is suggested that the procedures of the Resolutions Committee can be improved, and specific proposals to this end are set forth. We endorse these proposals. We also support the proposals to strengthen the Conference machinery by establishing a standing committee to keep the status of Conventions and recommendations under continuing examination.

Outside the Conference area, attention is directed in the Report to Industrial Committee activity and regional activities. We feel that we must seriously examine the place of In-
and regional activities in the work of the I.L.O. We believe, however, that this examination can be done more effectively in a smaller group, such as the Governing Body Committee on Industrial Committees and a committee of experts on regional activities.

The tasks before us are difficult but not insoluble. The problems involved in achieving economic and social progress will require all of our combined resources. This will include a concerted international effort of the whole United Nations family.

I hope that in our deliberations we will give priority to the broader purposes of the manpower goals set forth in the Director-General’s Report. We must never view our goals in narrow terms, because there is a temptation to think of full employment as an end in itself. Yet if this were the purpose it could be served by curtailing productivity.

And finally, in the broader context of our I.L.O. mandate in the field of human rights, we wholeheartedly endorse the Director-General’s contentions on the basic legality of our involvement in this area. We support and have anticipated the suggested extension of this Organisation’s concern for individual expression, the right of the individual to petition his government and in particular the right of collective protest.

Because my country is an open society and hides nothing it is no secret that a struggle for basic human rights is now being waged by American negroes in the last section of the United States where there has been large-scale denial of these rights. In this they are being supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people and we are proud of this legitimate effort of the American negro to accelerate the attainment of the basic rights guaranteed him by the Constitution of the United States. Our country was established on the principles of freedom and justice and equality of opportunity for all. The inconsistency between the nation’s principles and its practices has diminished over the years. Constitutional amendments, court decisions, Acts of Congress, executive orders, administrative rulings, state and local legislation, the work of private agencies, trade unions, efforts by negroes and other groups—all these have helped remove many of the barriers to full citizenship for all. The whole effort at Oxford, Mississippi, saw the mass and the might of the Government of the United States used to place one man, James Meredith, where he had a right to be. And these collective efforts will continue. I can assure you, until as President Kennedy said, “the standard first forged by the nation’s founders has been reached—and all Americans enjoy equal opportunity and liberty under law”. For these standards to be meaningful and have validity in the eyes of the world we intend to pursue this goal, consistent with the principles and practices of the I.L.O.

Mr. ALLOM (Minister of Labour, Israel)—May I, Sir, first add mine to the many congratulations you have received from previous speakers on your election as President of this Conference. I know this is a well-deserved tribute to you personally and to your country, but in a way it is also a gesture to all the young countries which have in recent years swelled the ranks of the I.L.O. for a pioneering spirit, and as one young country we feel, perhaps immodestly, that we are in a way included in the compliment.

We had the great pleasure of welcoming you in Israel two years ago. We then had occasion to appreciate your sense of perception, your quick grasp of a situation, and your sense of humour. All these are qualities of paramount importance in a presiding office, and if, as I remember, you are also an athlete of skill and renown, you have the physical attributes, too, of keeping us all in order.

Now that I am on the happy ground of congratulations, it gives me no less pleasure to extend them to the Director-General, whose Report this year is surely one of the most stimulating and thought-provoking to have been submitted to an I.L.O. Conference. Israel, as I am sure most other countries represented here, has been seeking ways and means of tackling the social and economic issues raised so compellingly in the Report, and I know that its analyses and conclusions will be of immense value in further clarifying our thinking and action.

The I.L.O., as a world forum of governments, workers and employers, is perhaps best placed to create and arouse greater awareness everywhere of the crying need for equality both within nations and between them.

Without losing sight of the inequalities that persist to this day even in the most highly developed countries, still the glaring inequality today is between what have come to be described as the “have” and the “have-not” nations of our time.

I do not know how our ancestors tolerated the social and economic chasms of their day, but in this age of ours, with so many young countries having come to independence and a heightened sense of national pride and personal dignity, when the world has become so much smaller as a result of modern communications, when the interdependence of nations has grown a hundredfold, when men and women everywhere have a far more acute sense of what they have a right to expect from life, and when science and technology have opened so many new vistas, surely the battle against inequality is not merely a moral issue but the essential prerequisite of stability and peace in the world.

Towards this end it is necessary to expand the volume of constructive investment, so as to provide the financial means of economic development. It is equally vital to expand the network of assistance, particularly in the field of education and vocational training, so as to provide the skilled manpower and brainpower without which even the finest plant will lie idle. To provide this massive aid with a view to bridging the existing gap will call for a sense of moral obligation, for generosity, for a readiness to make sacrifices on the part of the more developed nations; it will no less call for a pioneering spirit on the part of the developing countries, and for their steadfast resolve to use constructively what means they can thus mobilise—in finances and human resources—in order to give real meaning to their new national independence by using it as
an instrument towards economic development, greater equality and social emancipation.

We in Israel have tried to take this road. In our development we have sought to fit into the general national plan the resources of public, co-operative and private enterprise; we greatly accepted the know-how and assistance offered us by international organisations and friendly countries; all this in the setting of a people determined to spare no effort, however difficult the circumstances, to build a new and dignified life for themselves. I should like to use this opportunity and this forum to express to the I.L.O. and the United Nations the sincere thanks of my country for the technical assistance extended to us.

May I venture to say that the best proof that the international assistance given to us has been put to good effect lies in the fact that the institutions developed in our country now extend technical assistance to other developing countries. May I say on behalf of my Government and the people of Israel that we are resolved to continue this effort in the future as we have done so far.

The Director-General referred in his Report to the role of trade unions and employers' organisations in national and social planning as well as to the participation of trade unions in decision-making at plant level. From my own experience I am aware of the importance of a strong and responsible trade union and of co-operation between it and the employers at all levels. We, too, are facing the problem of extending this co-operation from the level of trade union bargaining to that of the participation of workers in management. We therefore wholeheartedly support the views expressed by the Director-General concerning the need for the I.L.O. to study the participation of trade unions and employers in national economic and social programming and to pay special attention to the efforts of the trade unions to secure greater participation in management.

Turning to another point, I feel that, with the great expansion in the membership of the I.L.O. and the intensification of its work, increasing importance will attach to regional frameworks so as to decentralise the volume of work and make it more effective, and to allow discussion and consideration of specific problems particularly relevant to one area or another.

I was therefore sorry to see from the Director-General's Report that efforts to hold a regional conference in our area have not so far borne fruit. I am glad to note, however, that he is resolved to persist in his endeavours. The I.L.O., and any conference it holds, are after all concerned with raising labour standards and other social and economic questions, and surely no political considerations should be allowed to interfere with the discussion of issues so vital to the welfare of the people in all the countries of the area. We in Israel would be only too glad to make what contribution we can to the success of such a conference.

After all, we sit together here in this Conference and its committees, as in the United Nations and its agencies and other international bodies; why cannot the same be done regionally?

Furthermore, I would say that we are all agreed on the importance of regional representation on the Governing Body of the I.L.O. But perhaps the time has come to consider a system of rotational representation, with due regard to region, merit and tradition, so that every country will have its turn.

I should like to conclude by extending a most heartfelt and sincere welcome to all member States which have joined this Organisation of late, and to express the wish that those which are not yet full Members of this Organisation will soon become fully-fledged Members in this family of ours. May I wish every success to the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference and to the I.L.O. in its efforts to promote the welfare of the working people of the world and peace and co-operation among nations.

Interpretation from French: Mr. GRIS (Government delegate, Ivory Coast)—I would like to associate myself also with what has been said by previous speakers regarding your election, Mr. President, and in the name of my Government and on my own behalf I congratulate you most warmly. Your unanimous election was a sincere tribute to yourself, to your country and to the whole of Africa. I wish you the greatest success in your responsible task.

The Director-General's Report suggests a group of objectives which seem to him most calculated to enable the I.L.O. to play a new role that is certain to benefit the young States which have recently entered the international scene, including my own country.

I was with growing interest that I read the Director-General's remarkable Report and I noted particularly the stress he placed on the urgency of solving the essential, and indeed the most striking, problems of our age—that of the countries with low incomes. This is a world problem, for it is the daily preoccupation of three-quarters of mankind. It is the problem of populations suffering from hunger, following an insufficiently productive system of agriculture, having a critically low standard of living—people who through lack of trained senior personnel, technicians and investment resources cannot industrialise to an adequate degree.

Prosperity and the future of mankind depend on the solution of this problem, the great victory of man over nature—in a word, the peace of the world. The great international organisations and the nations themselves, particularly those best equipped, have understood the urgency of a solution for this problem and are seeking to make their contribution to it.

It is therefore a particular pleasure to me to congratulate and thank the Director-General for including in the programme of the I.L.O. the obligation on each member State to contribute to maintaining peace and defending liberty, in better international co-operation, for the solution of the social problems common to the industrialised countries and in a search for the best means of helping the poorer countries in the economic and technical fields.

As some other speakers have done, I would have liked to describe how my country intends to play an active part in seeking adequate solutions to the problems of the latter group. Recently independent, still adjusting to its new
situation, engaged in establishing new economic, political and social institutions, and faced with incessant problems calling for solution, my country unfortunately cannot yet make the contribution it would have wished to make.

Moreover, conscious of the solidarity of peoples and their interdependence, my Government and those of other independent African countries have wished to participate at continental level in the achievement of the unity to which all the peoples of our continent aspire and which all our governments wish to establish. That would be the contribution of Africa to peace, to present to the world a continent decided to regulate by negotiation any difficulties which may arise and to engage in the fullest possible economic and social cooperation for a better future of our peoples, despite the unequal heritages bequeathed them by history.

Confident in the expressions of solidarity of which the I.L.O., under the guidance of the Director-General, will determine the main objectives, my Government will do all it can at the domestic level to make our country better able to benefit usefully from external aid and to forge its own destiny.

It intends to continue to promote, as means become available, the social security measures as outlined by this Organisation.

Following the establishment in 1956 of family benefits for employed persons and their families, involving expenditure at the end of 1962 of 454 millions of francs C.F.A. (pre-natal allowances for workers’ households, maternity allowances, family allowances and maternity grants and care); the establishment of a health, family and social fund involving expenditure on dispensaries, crèches, kindergartens, holiday homes, housing maintenance and provision of low-cost housing amounting to nearly 163 million francs C.F.A. in 1962; following the introduction in 1958 of general coverage of employment injury and occupational illness risks and the setting up of a fund to increase pensions and provide assistance for those disabled by occupational injuries (a scheme which now covers over 200 people and had distributed, by the end of 1962, more than 7 million francs C.F.A. in pension supplements and special allowances for persons injured in occupational accidents); and following the setting up in 1960 of a pensions fund for wage earners which covered 1,809 undertakings and had 67,000 contributors in 1962, over 6 million francs C.F.A. being also distributed in pensions and solidarity payments during the same year, my Government has now submitted to the Economic and Social Council a Bill to introduce a subsidised home ownership scheme to enable workers’ families with three to six children to secure the ownership of their homes in eight years. My Government considers that, thanks to these provisions, it will be possible to allocate 1,000 homes a year to workers’ families.

The drafting of national labour legislation is now complete. The Labour Code is shortly to be adopted by the National Assembly. It reproduces the provisions of the Code of 1952, particularly with regard to freedom of association, collective bargaining, maternity protection, protection of women and young persons, wage protection and the participation of trade unions in the drafting of labour legislation and the establishment of the minimum living wage. It adapts the provisions of the 1952 Code to existing national political institutions and introduces a few basic amendments the aim of which is: to overcome the difficulties and the shortcomings which have emerged since the 1952 Code came into force, particularly with regard to proceedings before the Labour Tribunal and before the Labour Congress; to institute a statutory termination allowance, which was previously a contractual matter; to eliminate from the law any particular rights established in 1952 in favour of certain workers by reason of their non-national origin and to make the indemnifying of workers in respect of the additional hazards and costs involved in employment on the national territory a matter solely for the agreement drawn up between the parties themselves; and, finally, to establish methods of settling collective disputes which are compatible both with freedom and the higher interests of the nation.

The codification of these laws and regulations will then be undertaken.

My country has entered a phase of profound change. In the economic field the task of stabilisation undertaken three years ago is now beginning to bear fruit. Its stimulating effect has been seen in the modernisation of means of production and the establishment of new industries which have enabled many new jobs to be provided. The trend will become more marked with the implementation of the ten-year development plan now being prepared and which the I.L.O. has helped to draft by providing my Government with highly skilled experts in the training of agricultural cooperative leaders, and in manpower and vocational training questions. Through me my Government expresses all its gratitude for this generous assistance.

Within the limitations of its resources my country has offered, and will continue to offer, to act as host to meetings organised by the I.L.O. under regional information and training programmes.

On the other points of the programme put forward by the Director-General my Government is persuaded that the advice and standards provided by the Organisation are bound to help bring nearer the achievement of our essential aim, namely the true economic and social independence of our country.

On behalf of my Government, I lend the fullest and most confident support to the various proposed reforms of the structure of the International Labour Organisation; we do so because of the competence, breadth of vision and practical outlook of those who have prepared those proposals. I, for my part, am persuaded that the resulting simplification in the programme for the revision of international standards will provide our young States, which are often unsure of the means available to them, with a possibility of giving the Organisation more extensive and more sincere support.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. SOLOV- YOV (Workers' delegate, U.S.S.R.)—The Re-
I.L.O. should struggle positively against all tasks of the I.L.O. must be to carry into freedom of association and the rights of the form of declarations; it must be concrete, and fact, work to serve the interests of the workers, of the trade unions. In this connection the own trade unions, and respect for the rights effect the right that is enshrined in its Constitution plans. That is why one of the primary are able to participate actively in the drafting organisations and, above all, the trade unions
effective and without any conditions restricting purposes of the I.L.O., therefore, must be to tries, however, remain hard because the pro-
sation. The living conditions in those coun-
try is determined decisively according to national independence, have joined the Organi-
ions and that is why it must carefully and ob-
jectively study those matters which are of concern to the workers, with a view to helping them to improve their living conditions. During the past few years a large number of new States, whose peoples have achieved national independence, have joined the Organisa-
tion. The living conditions in those coun-
tries, however, remain hard because the pro-
longed domination of the colonialists prevented them from engaging in normal economic and cultural development. One of the principal purposes of the I.L.O., therefore, must be to give assistance to the developing countries in building up their national economies and in raising the standard of living of their workers. This assistance should not merely take the form of declarations; it must be concrete and effective and without any conditions restricting the sovereignty of the beneficiary nations. The The report of the Director-General mentions freedom of association and the rights of the trade unions. However, the report does not suggest any concrete steps which could contribute to the strengthening of the trade union organisations and to the enhancing of their role in public and economic life. The social and economic progress of each country is determined decisively according to the extent to which the workers and the organisations and, above all, the trade unions are able to participate actively in the drafting and the implementation of national development plans. That is why one of the primary tasks of the I.L.O. must be to carry into effect the right that is enshrined in its Constitution, the right of the workers to set up their own trade unions, and respect for the rights of the trade unions. In this connection the I.L.O. should struggle positively against all anti-socialist and anti-trade union leaders, and any restriction of the freedom of activities or other restriction of the rights of trade unions. The world trade union movement now numbers more than 200 million members and it represents a major force that is able to exert a serious influence on the solution of contemporary problems. Unfortunately, the trade union movement is not today a unified movement. It is weakened by the fact that the monopolies, and many governments reflecting the interests of the monopolies, are obstructing the free association of the workers in trade unions and are restricting and slowing down the activities of these unions. To this effect various restrictions of a legislative nature are enacted and reprisals carried out against trade union leaders, and pressure is exercised against the workers that may even lead to the unions being split. The trade unions are in a particularly difficult position in those countries in which arbitrary rule and lawlessness prevails, above all in Spain, Portugal and the Republic of South Africa, and the trade unions in the colonial countries are undergoing even worse hardship.

A sound basis for the I.L.O. in protecting the rights of the trade unionists would be the programme of activities adopted at the Fifth World Trade Union Congress. In this document, which was adopted by the representatives of 150 million organised workers, we find many cases of violation of trade union rights, and it also points to measures for their protection. It is essential that trade union rights should be applied to all undertakings and the unions enabled to engage freely in their activities. We approve of the initiative taken by the I.L.O. in studying the trade union situation in various countries. Such a mission visited the Soviet Union. Its report confirmed the far-reaching rights, the democratic nature and the effectiveness of the activities of the Soviet trade unions. The unit responsible for these inquiries should not have been closed down. In fact, such activities ought to be intensified so as to give effective aid to the trade union movement as a whole wherever necessary.

Past experience has shown that a major role in the strengthening and developing of the trade union movement is played by the exchange of trade union and workers' delegations, international seminars and meetings of workers in the relevant fields. The I.L.O. could make broader use of this type of work and it should consider the possibility of subsidising educational journeys by workers and trade union officials. The first such facilities should be made available to the representatives of the workers of Venezuela and Argentina who spoke here earlier, so that they may participate in such a journey to the socialist countries. We would help them to meet not only the workers but also our school-children, who would tell them and show them what a socialist society is like and how it is building a better life for the working people, because the remarks made by the delegates from those countries were incorrect and unrealistic, either because they did not know the facts or because they were consciously distorting them.

The report of the Director-General states that the basic principles underlying the activities of the I.L.O. are the right to work, freedom of association and the struggle for social justice. The I.L.O. should certainly seek to pursue
these principles, for which the whole working class is now striving. However, while noting these noble and exalted principles, the Report should also point out the reasons, which give birth to social injustice, unemployment, starvation and persecution of the trade unions, and should indicate how these phenomena should be eliminated. The reason for these social ills lies in the moribund capitalist system.

Ignoring realities, the monopolies continue to propound the principles of "class cooperation", "social partnership" between workers and employers. This is designed to create the illusion of the possibility of class peace with the monopolies, in order thereby to intensify the exploitation of the workers by them. The working classes in all capitalist countries are decisively rejecting these bourgeois reformist theories. The class struggle is becoming ever more acute. The participation of more than 70 million workers in strikes in 1962 shows how the working people now prefer to defend their interests. The recent heroic strike of 200,000 French miners, which evoked the sympathy and support of the workers of the whole world, showed clearly that the working class had chosen to fight for its rights and demands, not for "cooperation between labour and capital" as desired by the monopolies.

The I.L.O. should engage in a serious study of such acute problems as unemployment, worsening working conditions and the impact of automation on production and working conditions, and it should try to secure a reduction in working hours, equal pay for equal work and improved standards of social security.

As regards the Soviet Union, we have been able to settle all these problems satisfactorily thanks to the socialist system, which has abolished social inequality and the exploitation of man by man, and has established all the necessary conditions for a free and prosperous life for the working masses.

Like many speakers who have preceded me, I cannot fail to note that one of the important ways of improving the living standards of the workers would be to end the armaments race, which robs the productive apparatus of capital, and in its place, the establishment of a lasting peace. That is why it should be one of the basic tasks of the I.L.O. to take decisive action against the armaments race and towards the reconversion of economies to a peace-time pattern, which would have a very favourable effect on the material conditions of the workers and on their living and working conditions.

There is no doubt that the solution of all these important problems which the Organisation has to face would be greatly facilitated by improving the organisational principles underlying the structure of the I.L.O. In particular, the work of the I.L.O. would be greatly assisted by a fair representation of the workers in the Governing Body which we are about to elect. The situation now governing the organs of the I.L.O. does not reflect the existing balance of forces on the international scene, nor does it take into account the changes that have taken place in the world. The Workers' group in the Governing Body does not include a single representative of the trade unions affiliated to the W.F.T.U. The Workers' group in the Governing Body is composed essentially of representatives of those unions which are members of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which numbers only 55 million members throughout the world, whereas the Soviet trade unions, which alone number more than 66 million members and are the largest trade unions in the world, have not a single representative on the Governing Body. Nor does the Governing Body include any representatives from the other socialist countries, and the trade unions of the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America are not properly represented either.

The lack of balance in the composition of the Governing Body reflects policies designed to continue the split in the world trade union movement and to weaken the forces of the workers. We demand that an end be put to this anomalous situation. In the Workers' group of the Governing Body, as in other leading organs of the I.L.O., there should be a fair number of places for the representatives of the trade unions of the socialist, capitalist and developing nations, and all areas of the world should be properly represented. Such a situation would make it possible to avoid discrimination in the various organs of our Organisation in favour of representatives of a single trend in the trade union movement.

We hope that the proposals designed to improve the activities and the structure of the I.L.O. will be discussed in the most democratic manner, so that the I.L.O. may become an effective instrument in implementing the strivings and interests of the workers.

Mr. GJAEREVOLL (Minister of Social Affairs, Norway)—I am glad to have the opportunity to convey to the I.L.O. and its leaders the Norwegian Government's greetings and thanks for the work which the Organisation has carried out through 43 years in order to create better and more secure social conditions all over the world.

The Director-General has, in his Report to this Conference, given a challenging and at the same time realistic and constructive outline as the basis for a debate on the I.L.O.'s future programme and structure.

The Report carries us directly into the manifold social problems prevailing in the world today. It is therefore natural that the present tremendous difference between poor and rich countries is to some extent central to the Report.

As far as I know the International Labour Conference has not, since the first years after the Second World War, discussed the I.L.O.'s programme and structure in its entirety. I think there is good reason for expressing our appreciation to the Director-General for his willingness to take up, against the background of the totally changed situation, the challenge embodied in the idea of presenting an up-to-date programme of the I.L.O., a programme which meets the demands presented today by international co-operation.

I am glad to say that I find myself in agreement with the main features of the Director-General's conclusions, that is, both the basis
for the programme drawn up, and the indicated priority of the measures envisaged. With the rapid development taking place today, the situation, however, may change quickly. That means that measures which now seem to deserve a high priority may have to be replaced by other efforts.

In Chapter I the Director-General underlines the supreme importance of social objectives in the work of the I.L.O., and he points out that improvement of social conditions and promotion of social equality must be achieved through a well-planned policy. I feel that this principle is essential, because here we assert the marked responsibility which we all have for the social welfare of every human being.

The new feature in the situation of today is that we can no longer limit this responsibility to the country in which we live. The responsibility for a development towards greater social security and greater social equality is a collective responsibility of human beings, irrespective of national boundaries. Consequently we must aim at implementing a policy through which we openly endeavour to abolish class distinctions within each nation as well as class distinctions between the nations. It is of great value that the Director-General has so emphatically underlined this fact and indicated so many constructive measures to promote more secure and more equal social conditions on an international scale.

The output of our economic activity forms the basis of good social conditions. From society's point of view, economic activity is not an aim in itself, but a means to attain a better social standard. Economic growth does not always create better social conditions. We all know from the history of industrialised countries that economic growth occasionally led to increased economic inequality. Therefore income distribution policy is as decisive a factor in the efforts towards greater social equality as the economic activity itself.

But it is obvious that when the I.L.O. accentuates income distribution issues the Organisation will enter into a field in which political tension prevails. I assume that in a large number of countries the very question of how to distribute national income is the most burning one. This applies to poor as well as to rich countries.

The Director-General mentions in his Report cases in which income disparities originate from difference in economic strength between different industries. There is in my view also reason to point out that we still find countries in which the income disproportions are due to racial discrimination. There is every reason to take this problem seriously since it arises from no other cause than from degradation of fellow human beings.

The Director-General states, when introducing in Chapter I the problem of income disparities within countries: "Finally, there are the seemingly intractable problems of the especially weak groups: the outcasts, the maligned and the deformed, the beggars." At this point I think it is in the future with greater optimism than the Director-General has done. To solve the problems of the handicapped is a long-term and difficult task, but I feel that the solving of it is a realistic possibility. In Norway the right to employment for all is embodied in our Constitution. To make this right a reality also for the handicapped is, in my opinion, an important task.

In many countries great efforts are made to enable this group of fellow-citizens to gain employment and be self-supporting. But in many countries—as in mine—much remains to be done. We must reach a stage at which everyone enjoys the right to use his or her creative potentialities, even if they are so small that they do not offer economic profit for the individual or the society. Work was previously regarded as heavy duty. Today it is accepted that work—the right to create—is a fundamental human right. In my view it is possible to promote sheltered employment and special employment arrangements and thereby realise this right also for those who are severely handicapped, socially, physically and mentally.

I will not use my time at this rostrum to speak about Norwegian conditions, but I think it would be relevant just to mention that in Norway we have attained an income distribution implying a very high degree of social equality. Our policy of equalisation has not only been applied through regulation of personal incomes, but also to a large extent through general measures such as taxation, social insurance, subsidies to municipalities with a weak economy, etc. But even if we have advanced far in this field, much still remains to be done, and we have increasingly realised that future development largely depends upon a co-ordinated national, regional and local planning—not a planning by dictate, but a planning by co-operation between State, municipalities and industries, and between workers and employers.

I want in this connection to draw attention to the significant point in the Report of the Director-General where he underlines that a mutually committing co-operation should also imply the right to have an influence upon the decisions. We should strive towards a situation in which human beings enjoy as far as possible equal right to freedom, equal right to security and equal right to contribute in the formation of their own and their children's future. This embodies the accepted democratic rights—to have influence upon the political development of the society. But the right to form our own future also depends upon whether we have influence where we invest our working potential. It is on this basis that the issue of industrial democracy has been raised in Norway. Although the Director-General in his Report is chiefly concerned with the possibilities of workers and employers participating in social and economic planning, the same arguments will of course strongly apply to the workers' rights to participate in and exercise influence upon the planning activities of the undertaking to which they belong.

The Director-General is largely concerned with conditions in the developing countries. I would like to express my satisfaction with the fact that he has underlined the principle of help to self-help. It is, moreover, of paramount importance that we attach no political conditions to the assistance which we render to
developing countries. We should agree that this is a duty of solidarity and that in the same way as it is the duty of the single nation to reduce class distinctions within its boundaries, it is the duty of our world to work actively for abolishing class distinctions between countries.

Norway has recently increased substantially its economic support to developing countries. We are of the opinion that it is a step forward of basic importance when we this year for the first time levy a development tax, thus requiring everybody to pay his share of the support.

At the same time, we have established a central agency to deal with Norway's entire contribution to developing countries. I hope it will be possible to co-ordinate our efforts with those which are made under the auspices of the United Nations, and of course we will maintain a close co-operation with the other Nordic countries. I also hope that the increased resources in the future will give us greater opportunities before for strengthening the co-operation with the I.L.O. in this field.

From Chapter I of the Report, under the heading "The Commitment to Freedom", we can draw a direct line to Chapter IV, "Trade Unions and Labour Relations". It should be unnecessary in relation to the International Labour Conference, which to such a great extent has contributed to asserting the right of association as a general human right, to underline that free trade unions are one of the most important assumptions for the free and democratic development of a society. I wish, therefore, to give my support to the Director-General's proposal with regard to efforts towards a strengthening of the trade union movement in the new States. The I.L.O.'s task to support and stimulate the newly formed trade union movement in developing countries is to some extent limited. I would express my agreement with the Director-General's caution on that point. It is clear that the I.L.O.'s function here will be support and guidance, whilst the trade union movement itself in the country concerned should freely choose its own way. Such assistance will be of particular value where the I.L.O. engages experts with practical knowledge of trade union practice. While the trade union movement in the industrialised countries enjoyed a long process of development towards the strength which it has today, it is necessary to accelerate considerably the process of development of the trade unions of the new States.

The General Confederation of Trade Unions in Norway takes an active part in the programmes of technical assistance of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, both by economic support and by making its experts available. I have a strong feeling that the work carried out by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in that sector gives good results and that this helps to form a strong movement which is characterised by the ideals of freedom and equality common for the free trade union movement throughout the world. In its work in this field, the I.L.O. ought to maintain a close contact and co-ordination with the trade union organisations.

May I finally say that if we today are able to concern ourselves with problems in countries which are geographically very distant from our own, if we today are aware of an international obligation of solidarity, this is to a great extent the result of having had an organisation like the I.L.O. for such a long time. The Report of the Director-General gives promise that the I.L.O. will continue its mission in the same spirit as before, but by means and methods adjusted to meet a new world situation.

Interpretation from French: Mr. KEIRO (Government delegate, Chad)—A year ago I outlined from this rostrum the main principles of the social policy followed by the Republic of Chad. I stressed the will of our State to spare no effort to improve living conditions and achieve a fairer distribution of incomes. In stating our intentions in this regard I also emphasised the difficulties connected with our position in the centre of a continent, the lack of basic facilities, our agricultural problems and, more generally, the gap between the few advanced sectors of our economy and the whole range of its traditional activities.

I advocated a joint study of economic and social questions in accordance with a realistic and balanced approach whereby the wage-earning population could lead the way as it should. My primary aims also included the Sundering of the bonds that hampered our economy, in order to enable it to expand along natural lines. This reflected a national choice which we really still consider essential to the march of our people towards a truly better life.

We are happy that the importance of this choice, the reasons for it and above all our sincerity, bring us today to welcome the clear and far-sighted boldness which so largely animates the Director-General's Report.

We welcome this for more than one reason: firstly, it undermines the platform of those who attack the Organisation for ulterior motives; and, secondly, it gives us the feeling that there is more international understanding.

We also consider, in the light of the documents submitted for discussion by the Office that the discussions at this session will lead the States to commit themselves further, since it seems so evident that the Conference cannot confine itself to formal resolutions without undermining the support it receives from the young nations.

In this connection we once more pledge our full support for the fundamental objectives of the I.L.O., the ideals of peace and freedom in our Constitution, for which we continue to fight.

From the peace of villages and workplaces to universal peace, to which every human being aspires, from the freedom of the individual to the freedom of groups, we shall pursue our search for the changing balance between the rights of the individual and those of the community, a balance upheld by the humanity which ennobles sacrifice and opens the road to progress and freedom.

This effort presupposes the participation of all at every level of public life and of labour.
relations, in all classes of the population and in each individual conscience. It calls for a mass movement in which the people, springing from the people will prompt, guide and catalyse the national will. It calls for permanent consultation, incentives, and the reasoned participation of trade unions; and is not conceivable under a system in which limited interests might hamper the general interest.

At the point which our State has reached, priority for social objectives depends on this. If it were not so we could secure only short-range benefits for the privileged classes.

I know that such an attitude can give rise to certain fears. One need only read the Director-General's observations on the incidence of development plans. In fact, the light shed on certain reservations suggests that the more prosperous States would like to assess the intentions of young nations in accordance with criteria derived from a long period of steady progress, for which the price has already been paid. On the contrary, we should look first at the least-favoured countries and ascertain their needs, and then—and only then—should we proceed jointly to work out the methods of action required for the advancement of those countries on the basis of their present situation.

In that light the Director-General's suggestions would come up to our requirements. The body of standards built up by the Organisation until now could then be consolidated and supplemented in various aspects so as to provide a framework which would give member States a series of steps on the ladder towards the ideal. This framework would govern or condition the practical work and the structure of the I.L.O.

Until this is done the priorities already defined in various fields could be clarified and amplified; they themselves would help to ensure better standards.

One of the priorities for many countries seems to be the question of agricultural employment, training and working conditions for people on the land, and new ways of ensuring rural development. On the same plane and in the same order of priority it would also be of the greatest value of course to evolve an effective strategy for the utilisation of human resources; though it would be necessary to define clearly the priorities to know, for example, whether mass support or mobilisation is not in certain cases an essential preliminary or whether, in other words, it is not advisable to start with a realistic policy of human investment subject to the usual limitations.

Such a policy would naturally lead to an all-round approach to vocational training and full employment. The working population would be involved, whether on the land or in the towns and whether working in a traditional or a modern economy. The disparities would be bound to be reduced, and the system would reconcile two methods of development: firstly, that of islands of prosperity growing under the impetus of advanced techniques, and, secondly, that of action covering a whole region through a general awakening of hidden forces and their application to simple tasks the profitability of which has been proved.

It is conceivable, for example, that one might have a form of civic service associated with military service, which would give young people a strong feeling of economic and social solidarity. The system would involve the selection and training of an élite and would lead to an extended scheme of vocational training for persons over school-leaving age. We would devote particular attention to studies on this question which might be made by the Conference.

With regard to the distribution of income, the lack of equality between the workers and the peasants will continue as long as development has not made sufficient headway; but it is at any rate our duty to see the seriousness of this problem by rash actions, though that does not mean that the government should have recourse to force.

Trade union action, collective bargaining and labour relations in the undertaking are still regulators on which the public authorities do not wish to lay emphasis before they have decided on the general development plan. Besides their strictly trade union actions, our trade union organisations participate in the elaboration of the development plan and are represented on the Economic and Social Council. It is therefore necessary to improve workers' education and the training of leaders as soon as possible.

With regard to the priorities which I have just mentioned, the basic importance of which I should like to assert, questions relating to the individual protection of the workers can be favourably viewed, but this must be done by stages in order to facilitate the mobilisation of our forces and to help to obtain outside support. The International Labour Office knows all about our concern in this connection, and the rural development operation which the experts have just begun in Chad has been entirely satisfactory to us and fully justifies our arguments and our caution. In fact, the difficulties encountered confirm the rightness of the desire which we expressed in 1962 to see the Organisation take more concrete and direct action, although, of course, we recognise the limited resources available. However, it seems that international action would be more effective if it were on a world-wide scale.

Along the same lines we should like to see greater flexibility in the structural reform of the I.L.O., as well as a reduction in membership costs and the cost of participating in its activities. In expressing this wish we should like particularly to see the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations informed, by the appropriate organs of the International Labour Office, of the fact that we are temporarily unable to devote much time or money to our periodical reports since this is relatively unimportant as compared with our national problems.

It seems to us that that is particularly desirable, because certain observations could be interpreted in such a manner as to seem to challenge the sincerity of our Government. We are sure that that is not the intention of the experts, but we would like to be informed.

In the transitional period which we are now passing through we would like to have our minds clear to deal with our internal problems and to concentrate on the final liberation of Africa.
Mings and sincere wishes of the people of the Sudan.

I have the honour to convey to you, Sir, and to the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces of the Sudan—I, on behalf of His Excellency the Minister of Information and Labour, OSMAN—"Programme and Structure of the I.L.O. "—is a comprehensive document for what the I.L.O. should do in the carrying out of I.L.O. programmes, we should have to assess the country's resources for preparation of the next plan.

The ten-year plan consists of over 260 projects, distributed all over the country, which individually and collectively aim at the reform and development of every aspect of Sudanese society. It has been roughly estimated that the total planned investment will create about 600,000 jobs in the modern sector, excluding the need for replacing old and retiring workers. The number of 600,000 new jobs lies substantially above the natural growth of the population already engaged in the modern sector, and it is therefore very probable that a considerable shift in labour from the traditional sector into the modern part of the economy will have to take place.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasise the hard tasks facing the Organisation. At the same time I want to state that we look with satisfaction to the efforts of the I.L.O. in our country, while hoping for more co-operation. In a world torn with strife, poverty and insufficient knowledge, we must seek more peaceful and stable avenues for ensuring man's destiny. Under the inspiring guidance of our President and the Director-General I wish this Conference, on behalf of the Republic of the Sudan, every success in its noble task.

Interpretation from German: Mr. KINZEL (Employers' adviser, Austria)—As the Austrian Employers' delegate, Mr. Mautner-Markhof, who had intended to speak on the debate here, has unfortunately had to return home owing to a death in his family, I have been asked to communicate his speech to you.

I would like first of all to thank the Director-General very sincerely for having placed this excellent Report before us at such an opportune time.

Part I deals in a clear and often illuminating way with the objects of this world-wide Organisation, while Part II discusses—and this is worth emphasising—the really burning problems of its methods of work with a great deal of courage.

However, the Report is so extensive that it would be a hopeless task to try in 15 minutes even to mention all the important matters contained in it, let alone discuss them in detail. I will therefore restrict myself to a few points which I regard as particularly important.

On general policy regarding the setting of new international standards the Director-General has said much which I welcome, as will no doubt all those who attach importance to successful future work by the Organisation in this field. I am thinking particularly of the statement that Conventions should be confined to the essential, should avoid detail and should be so flexible that they can be adjusted to the various domestic conditions in the different States.

I hope I shall not be hurting the feelings of my Worker colleagues if I urge them to do what they can to abolish an attitude still fairly prevalent among their friends—I mean the view that at the Conference they should, as they do, for example, in collective bargaining, aim at making provisions as absolute, as inflexible and as detailed as possible, even if they have to proceed by majority vote to do so.

The advocates of this view, which I hope is obsolescent, have often been supported by many Government delegates. I hope that members of the Government group will forgive
me if I criticise this approach. One often has the impression that some Government representatives, at the cost of neglecting realities, aim above all at avoiding any possible reproach that their attitude was insufficiently progressive or social. As could be expected, the consequence was that many member countries could not ratify Conventions drawn up in this way although their own Government delegates had voted in favour.

The position is still worse if governments do ratify but then encounter great or even insuperable difficulties in the necessary adjustment of national law to the binding provisions of the Convention.

Accordingly, future policy in standard-setting must aim at replacing majority decisions by the product of honest joint effort to secure a generally acceptable text, which must be sufficiently flexible and not contain too much detail.

I would like to call particular attention to Mr. Morse’s very timely statement that a Recommendation is by no means a less important or less effective instrument than a Convention. There can certainly be no doubt that a Recommendation applied by many States is more effective than an inflexible obligation that only a few can accept. There are still many wrong ideas in this regard which the Report will do much to dissipate.

I now come to a question closely related to that of setting new standards, namely the adjustment of existing standards to the altered circumstances of today—a very proper concern of this Organisation. The Report provides a good basis for objective consideration of this group of questions. It points out that the adjustment of international instruments to new conditions—either their abrogation because they are out of date, or their redrafting to make them more flexible and so facilitate ratification, or again their adaptation to more up-to-date objectives—is also standard-setting and must, therefore, be subject to the principles governing standard-setting if one is to avoid the danger that these principles will be adulterated, even on points which may seem of minor importance, as a time may come, on the contrary, consideration should be given to introducing higher standards.

Abrogation of existing instruments can certainly be desirable in some cases, and the Director-General gives some instances of this. This action will certainly be proper if a Convention has become purposeless because it never came into force, or can no longer be ratified. In such a case the desirability of abrogation will have to be carefully considered, for instance in cases where a Convention has still not received a sufficient number of ratifications after an appropriate period of time.

I should like to say that, in principle, I favour the elimination from the International Labour Code of what is really dead-wood. However, it must also be realised—and here I turn particularly to the Government and Workers’ groups—that it is not desirable, and may indeed seriously harm the prestige of the Organisation, to put forward at the international level and force through the Conference excessive demands which, for some good reason, are unacceptable at the national level.

Where abrogation is advisable a simplified procedure seems to me to be available. On the proposal of the Secretariat, the Conference or the Governing Body, a motion could be moved to abrogate a given instrument, usually a Convention but perhaps also an out-of-date Recommendation, and this would have to be carried by the usual two-thirds majority in plenary sitting of the Conference. Perhaps the time-consuming record vote could be dispensed with.

The problem of amending Conventions and Recommendations is a more difficult one. Here it is not just a question of yes or no, and accordingly a simplified procedure will be hardly applicable. The Director-General evidently feels that out-of-date provisions should be replaced by new ones taking altered circumstances into account. However, it might be questionable whether a given provision were really out of date, and secondly there would no doubt be various alternatives for the new text. The only way would be to place revision of the instrument on the agenda of the Conference and discuss and decide upon it in the traditional manner.

I must mention here that the amendment of provisions described as technical or administrative is also standard-setting work and must be handled in the usual way. One cannot introduce the idea of “minor provisions” which could be amended in a simpler way: for who would decide what was minor, and what criteria would be used for the purpose?

I now reach the ideas expressed by the Director-General regarding the continuous examination of existing instruments by a proposed new revision committee. I think these ideas are rather problematical. It is suggested that this new permanent committee would consider a given Convention or group of related Conventions every year to see whether a revision seemed indicated to facilitate ratification or promote social policy. This revision would thus be an additional function for the Conference and one cannot but fear that the agenda of future Conferences would be even more overloaded than is now the case.

My reservations regarding any simplifications of the standard-setting work of the Conference apply also to the proposed revision committee. Furthermore, whereas the present technical committees can be manned by experts on the particular subject, a permanent revision committee would have to deal with all sorts of subjects and its membership could hardly handle the whole range of them.

The present procedure is perhaps sufficient to perform this legitimate function of the Organisation, namely the adjustment of international labour standards to a constantly changing world with particular regard for conditions in the developing countries.

This function can be, and I believe should be, undertaken without delay. It is important, and if we do undertake it, we shall have to give it priority over the other standard-setting work of the Conference, which would perhaps have to be deferred for a time. Such a moratorium might be justified because of the great importance of bringing the extensive International Labour Code up to the requirements of today and rendering it more completely applicable.
I should like to conclude by referring to the very first paragraph of the Report under discussion. It says that the I.L.O.'s present opportunity can be realised only through the concerted wills of the membership, and that common agreement on basic objectives is required. These remarks are only too true. A common will and a common effort means, in a word, co-operation. That is the decisive factor, and the weak point becomes immediately apparent.

The I.L.O. is a tripartite organisation and the Director-General and all of us regard this as an important advantage. However, the advantage can only be fully effective if the three groups and indeed all delegates show mutual respect one for another and work honestly together. But there are a number of delegates who take every opportunity to present the employers as people whose only object is to exploit the workers. Of course this is no good basis for successful co-operation. I feel like the unfortunate doctor who can make a diagnosis but has no effective cure to recommend. However, if one is optimistic one may perhaps feel that signs of a relaxation in international tensions are perceptible, and if this continues it may bring advantage for the I.L.O. In any case it is to be desired that the few delegates who regard the Conference mainly as a welcome channel for propaganda will recognise in the future that there is a higher objective, namely to work earnestly for the well-being of all mankind. I should like to close by expressing the hope that this recognition will be forthcoming.

(The Conference adjourned at 1.15 p.m.)
Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.)

The President: We will now continue discussion of the Director-General's Report.

The Honourable Lynden G. NEWLAND (Government delegate, Jamaica)—Mr. President, it is my desire to extend to you the warmest congratulations of the Jamaican delegation on your election to the high office of President of this great Conference. I should like also to convey to the delegates assembled here, and particularly to the Director-General, the sincere greetings and best wishes of the people and Government of Jamaica.

I feel very honoured that I have the privilege of addressing the 47th Session of the Conference for the first time as the Jamaican representative of the newly independent Jamaica, freed from colonialism, as a consequence of which we have been able to gain admission to membership of this illustrious and august Organisation. The decision of my country to become a Member of this Organisation was inspired by the sincere belief that the Organisation is an agency united to work for lasting peace based on social justice. To this end Jamaica is anxious to contribute its fair share to and to participate actively in the work of the Organisation, not only for the benefit of all Jamaica but for the ultimate good of the world as a whole. In this respect Jamaica is particularly fortunate in having a strong Prime Minister, Sir Alexander Bustamante, who believes in the rights of every citizen.

I now wish to refer to the excellent Report of the Director-General, a Report which reflects the vast knowledge and wealth of experience he has acquired over the period of 15 years during which he has served as Director-General, which he still continues to do.

While my country covers only 4,200 square miles and is not as rich in physical resources as some of its neighbours, it supports a population of approximately 1.7 million, which has been increasing steadily. Of this number about 40.2 per cent. comprises the labour force, leaving an overwhelming percentage of dependent population. Restrictions on migration to the United Kingdom have been imposed since 1962, with the immediate effect of increasing the rate of growth of the labour force. This situation, coupled with a comparatively low annual per head income and the disturbing percentage of the labour force unemployed, creates grave social and economic problems.

There is a high rate of unemployment and underemployment. In addition, there is low productivity in certain sectors of the economy. Practically all the unemployed part of the labour force falls within the category of unskilled workers. At the same time, many of those classified in the skilled category are frequently lacking in a sufficiently high level of skills which are required if efficiency and high productivity are to be achieved. These problems underline the need for effective, comprehensive and rapid development of vocational training facilities.

We in Jamaica recognise that vocational training is essential in the programme for economic progress through development of our human resources. My Government's development programme must necessarily include measures designed to improve manpower supply, both numerically and qualitatively. It must also include measures for stimulating job-creating investment and the expansion of manpower services which rationalise the labour market and provide for orderly development. In order to plan these measures effectively, it is necessary to know a great deal about human resources, and about the nature and composition of the demand for manpower. The suggestion put forward by the Director-General that the I.L.O. should be prepared to undertake research in these fields and to disseminate more widely the fruits of its experience and research is particularly welcomed.

In 1959, with the assistance of the I.L.O., a manpower research unit was set up in Jamaica, and in 1961 a fellowship was provided to enable a Jamaican to receive training abroad in this type of work, for which Jamaica is grateful. Already the work of the unit has been useful in the formulation of our economic development policies, but it is recognised that much more remains to be done by way of providing the basic information necessary for detailed manpower planning.

The work which the I.L.O. is doing to promote methods of expanding rural employment is relevant to the Jamaican situation and its experience in this field should be particularly useful to those countries with similar employment problems, all of which are no doubt fully conscious of the need for rural development of
the kind which will induce young people to remain in those areas.

As the Director-General observes, the first priority in the objective of a human resources development strategy is a higher level of productive employment. This involves a national training programme, particularly in under-developed countries. In Jamaica we have recently increased the facilities for institutional training. For example the number of technical high schools has been greatly increased. A vocational agricultural school and a college of arts, science and technology have been opened, and by the provision of scholarships and free places the number of students able to attend a secondary school has been significantly increased, and teacher-training facilities have been expanded. Further expansions are being planned. At the same time, short courses for management and supervisory personnel have been instituted, and an apprenticeship programme is in operation. Consideration is also being given to other ways and means of raising the level of efficiency of our workers, and in this connection the report of an expert whose services were made available to Jamaica last year by the I.L.O. should be useful.

In Jamaica most wage earners are engaged in agriculture, and this occupation reflects the lowest rate of growth in total income from wages and salaries. By contrast, mining and manufacturing, among others, both of which employ a substantially smaller number of wage earners, have all registered a substantial rate of growth. There is no doubt that a suitable incomes policy for developing countries involves many complex problems and it is doubtful whether any one combination of solutions will be universally suitable. It is for these reasons that the suggestion that more research should be undertaken in this matter deserves hearty approval and the widest possible support.

In Jamaica the trade union has come to be regarded as a part of the social structure. It has been instrumental in securing improvements in the living standards of workers and, though relatively young, some 30 per cent. of the work force today enjoy vigorous trade union protection. We believe that the trade union movement can play an important role in economic development, especially in a country such as ours where great emphasis is laid on collective bargaining and where the policy of the Ministry of Labour is “self-government” in industry. It is in keeping with this policy that the Ministry encourages the formation of Joint Industrial Councils where representatives of employers and trade unions can settle terms and conditions of employment on an industry-wide basis. Whilst the pattern is to encourage collective bargaining, it will be appreciated that there are certain areas of industry and commerce where workers are not fully organised and where wages are low, and it is in these areas that minimum-wage legislation operates. It is to be noted, however, that minimum rates of wages are not fixed arbitrarily but in accordance with the Minimum Wage-Fixing Machinery Convention, on the recommendation of a Minimum Wage Advisory Board to which employers in the trade, trade union representa-

tives of the workers affected and independent members are appointed.

It is recognised that the participation of trade unions in economic planning will place great pressures on the movement, which can only be met by intensive training of trade union personnel to equip them first of all to set an even better pattern for good employer/employee relations as a basis for industrial peace on which economic progress depends, and to provide them with the requisite knowledge to enable them to make a worthwhile contribution to such planning. The Government of Jamaica has established courses for trade union officers and delegates and these courses are conducted by the Extra-Mural Department of the University of the West Indies.

The proposal by the Director-General to institute greater research into conditions affecting the growth of trade unions and labour relations in developing countries to pave the way for expansion of I.L.O. activities in the field of labour relations, management training and education is indeed welcome and demands every support. It may be of interest to note that in this connection it is proposed to set up in Jamaica a Trade Union Education Institute. This is being made possible by joint financing of the United States Agency for International Development and the Jamaica Government. It is further hoped that this will be of benefit not only to trade unions and employers in Jamaica, but in due course to other parts of the Caribbean area.

Jamaica is fortunate in being one of those new nations where peoples of different religions and races have integrated happily into one family backed by stable government, which the Director-General rightly points out is an essential prerequisite for economic development and for the planning of social improvement.

In his Report in his Report refers to Conventions and Recommendations concerning discrimination in employment and occupation. I am indeed happy to say that in the Jamaican Constitution are enshrined the fundamental rights and freedom of every citizen, irrespective of race, colour, creed, sex and political opinion. Our Constitution emphasises the principle of protection against discrimination, in that it provides also that no law shall contain any clause which is discriminatory either of itself or in its effect.

It is noted that the Director-General proposes to convene a meeting of experts, probably in 1964, to discuss certain problems of personnel policy and human relations, particularly communication. One cannot stress too strongly the importance of communication in reducing the incidence of disputes. Although it is the practice of employers, where workers are organised, to consult with trade unions, there seems to be scope for the development of more joint consultation at the factory level, whether formally by means of works councils or committees, or by less formal avenues. Such consultations should not be considered to constitute an infringement of trade union rights, as the items for discussion could be matters in which ordinarily are not subject to collective bargaining.

As I turn to the subject of automation and
technological change, no one can deny that increased production which comes from automation and technological change makes a valuable contribution to the national economy. However, in a developing country one has to take into consideration such matters as the large force of unemployed, the high birth rate, the shortage of skilled workers and the lack of social security. All these problems are common to Jamaica.

Mechanisation has been most noticeable in the sugar industry where the introduction of bulk loading of sugar and of mechanical methods has taken a large number of workers out of employment. In addition, there is the threat of retrenchment in the banana industry consequent on the proposal to ship fruit in boxes.

My Government is of the strong opinion that such changes, wherever necessary, should be gradual, so as not to disrupt the economy, and has accordingly placed on specific licence the importation of labour-saving devices and has exhorted employers to give long notice of their intention to mechanise and to discuss these proposals with the trade unions. A decision has also been taken by the Government to appoint a committee to consider and make recommendations regarding the whole question of redundancy. The Labour Advisory Council currently has under study the preparation of a severance pay plan to curtail the impact of the loss of jobs.

Concerning the regional activities of the Organisation, I must say that the Jamaica Government has in the past found the Mexico headquarters of the regional branch most helpful. The annual visit of a representative to discuss projects for inclusion in the technical assistance programme, the interest shown in specific undertakings and the technical literature which has been provided have all been welcome. Particular mention should be made of the Regional Conference on Manpower Research held at the University of the West Indies in 1960.

The Director-General made mention of the mission of the I.L.O. not only to serve as a bridge but also to build bridges. There is indeed need for action of this sort in Latin America and the Caribbean. Gradually, the consciousness of themselves as neighbours with common problems and reciprocal needs is awakening, and it is hoped that with I.L.O. help practical measures can be found for fostering closer co-operation among the countries of this area, as is being done among the European Members of the Organisation.

Mr. Tabor (Workers' delegate, Yugoslavia) — In the extensive and comprehensive Report of Mr. Morse, we have a document which, despite the inevitable differences in evaluation of individual manifestations and trends in the world, undoubtedly opens up broad prospects of positively extending the activities of this Organisation of ours. That is why this year's debate is of first-rate significance to us all, so that I too shall on this occasion concentrate on some questions on which, in my view, increased effectiveness of the International Labour Organisation depends.

In the world of today, in contrast to the past, different forms of social ownership of the means of production are becoming increasingly prevalent. Therefore workers' organisations are particularly interested, because these changes in the structure of ownership of the means of production in different countries necessarily find expression, also, within the I.L.O. To neglect this cannot but have negative consequences on the efficiency of our Organisation as well as on relations between trade unions in different countries, and cannot but retard the development and maturity of the international trade union movement.

Another very important fact is that the recently liberated countries, which in different ways have got rid of the pressure of the metropolitan countries, underdeveloped countries from the vast expanses of the Asian, African and Latin American areas, are playing a growing role in world developments. Notwithstanding the enormous economic potential concentrated in a small number of industrially highly developed capitalist countries of the world, which have achieved their high economic potential partly thanks to exploitation of the wealth of their colonies, their relative share in world economy and trade is shrinking compared with the growing share of other countries. It would therefore be natural and normal to expect these changes to find stronger expression also in the International Labour Organisation, both in its representative bodies and in its activities as a whole. That is why the I.L.O.'s orientation and growing assistance to the developing countries, and the increasing awareness of their problems at various meetings and in various activities of our Organisation, are worthy of our full support.

The gradual elimination of the enormous differences existing between the developed and underdeveloped countries is in the interest of the whole world. At the same time, the development of the underdeveloped countries is undoubtedly in the interest of the developed countries and of their working classes. The example of my country provides the best proof. The volume of Yugoslavia's economic co-operation with other countries, both developed and developing, has been expanding along with her economic strength.

The working class and the trade unions of the developed countries may count, under existing conditions, on a successful struggle against unemployment, for higher earnings and for expanding sales, only in conditions of an expanding market in developing countries and an increase in their capacity for absorption, stabilisation of raw material prices, liquidation of the monocultural character of the economy of the new countries and their position as raw materials appendages to industrially developed countries, and extension of aid aimed at the industrialisation and diversification of the economies of those countries in which the remnants of colonial economy are still serious and whose economic emancipation is being prevented by various manoeuvres of neo-colonialism.

The I.L.O. projects for developing countries certainly deserve our support — naturally on condition that there is full respect of the autonomy of each beneficiary country and of its sovereign right to dispose of the aid received
according to its own will. It is equally important to assure to each trade union movement the right to choose ways and means of solving its problems in the best possible manner according to its own ideas and under its own conditions. In practice this means that the trade union organisations receiving aid from the I.L.O. under any programme mentioned in the Report should themselves decide on its content, orientation, etc.

The fact is that there are neither uniform patterns for trade unions nor uniform views on their role and function in the modern world. In the developing countries it is in the interest not only of the trade union movement but also of the nation as a whole that unions do not confine themselves to their traditional role but take an active part in the rapid economic emancipation, the accelerated creation of expanding national income and the equal participation of the working class in the distribution of income.

I should like to add that in my country, with its huge workforce, the trade unions directly manage the enterprises and decide by themselves on the distribution of newly created values, the trade unions have an extremely important role to play and new tasks to carry out which enable the working classes to participate much more effectively in the settlement of key social and economic problems of the country as well as in the settlement of their own interests and affairs.

The recently adopted new Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a document in which the workers' right to self-government has been confirmed and enlarged to an even greater extent, and in which the concept of socialist society and the affirmation of the working man have found full expression.

The third aspect I should like to stress concerns the changes in the development of the international trade union movement. The fact is that the international trade union movement is no longer assembled only in the existing international trade union organisations. The maturity of the working class and the different conditions under which it lives and struggles have enriched the international trade union movement with new ideas and experience on the place and role of the trade unions. Many trade unions which are not internationally affiliated have found their own way and are working actively for the establishment of the constructive co-operation of all trade unions on the basis of equality of rights. All these facts should of necessity find stronger expression in the I.L.O.'s work, in the methods of election to its representative bodies and in the ways in which different actions are carried out. This would, in our view, contribute to expanding international trade union co-operation as a whole.

The Yugoslav trade unions have striven and continue to strive for the establishment of the widest possible international co-operation among trade unions. Our attitude in this regard is the more determined because we are convinced that there are many questions in which the trade unions of all parts of the world are interested irrespective of their affiliation and on which mutual support and solidarity can be achieved.

The lack of understanding and respect for trade unions of all countries is reflected, for instance, in the anti-communism of a part of the trade union movement, which brings the cold war into the international trade union movement as well, with detrimental effects to the interests of the working class as a whole.

We are convinced that the contemporary trade union movement needs fresh initiatives for rapprochement and the settlement of existing problems of common interest. The Yugoslav trade unions are ready to take part in such initiatives and to respond to them, on the assumption that the actions involved aim at serving the interests of the working class, the interests of peace and progress.

Finally I would like to stress, in the light of these remarks, that I deem it indispensable for our Organisation to adopt in its work the following principles:

(1) That the working class of the whole world is vitally interested in the peaceful solution of the most important international problems of today, and, first of all, in the maintenance of peace in the world, total and general disarmament, the final liquidation of colonialism, the hampering of neo-colonialist manoeuvring, assistance to developing countries and the establishment of extensive economic and political co-operation between all nations on the basis of the principle of mutual respect. The whole activity of the I.L.O. should thus be directed towards contributing to the solution of these problems.

(2) That the trade unions and the working class of today not only are a powerful factor in the production of income but are gradually becoming an all-important element in the planning of social and economic development of their respective countries.

(3) That the successful implementation of I.L.O. programmes requires the full co-operation of all trade unions, irrespective of their ideological orientation or organisational affiliation.

(4) That the planning and realisation of the assistance granted by the I.L.O. to a country or an organisation should be founded on the right of that country or that organisation to decide on its own on the content, character and form of such aid.

(5) That it is indispensable for our Organisation to adjust itself to the change in the world by ensuring in its representative bodies and its administration a fair representation of representatives of all forms of ownership of the means of production, of representatives of African, Asian and Latin American countries; and of representatives of all trade union movements, whether internationally affiliated or autonomous.

I thank you for your attention and I take this opportunity to stress once more the readiness of the Yugoslav trade unions to cooperate with and to support and participate in all constructive and positive action by the International Labour Organisation.

Interpretation from French: Mr. CAMPA-NELLA (Employers' delegate, Italy)—The Director-General's Report for this year marks
a new stage in the history of our Organisation, its development and the penetration of its principles which, being drawn from the perpetual spring of natural law, cannot change with the lapse of time.

In his Report the Director-General examines both the future programme and the structure of the I.L.O. In 15 minutes it is not possible to examine the very numerous proposals he makes and so I shall confine myself to stressing the importance of our objectives and of their practical application in countries which, by joining the International Labour Organisation, have solemnly undertaken to respect them when they accepted the Constitution.

The ideals of the I.L.O. as stated in the Preamble to the Constitution and in the Declaration of Philadelphia, are in fact freedom and dignity for human labour in its many forms and the reconciliation of the two fundamental forms it must take, namely the work of the entrepreneur and the work of the operative.

At the 34th Session of the ECOSOC, our Director-General rightly insisted in connection with the United Nations resolution on the United Nations Development Decade, that the most important factor of all is the opportunity for individuals to give of their best, and also that institutions should develop within which men may decide in full freedom and awareness on the aims which their work is to serve. In this case, freedom for both employer and worker to accept and choose a job must obviously be fully respected.

In free societies where human enterprise has a role to play, great importance attaches today not only to handicraft undertakings and cooperatives but also to small, medium-size and large undertakings employing workers, and the two groups, workers and employers, are the two pillars of a free and democratic economic order in the modern world.

Public authorities act as co-ordinators and intermediaries and the existence of these three parties gives rise to a tripartite structure the importance of which is proclaimed throughout the world by our Organisation. It ensures flexibility and originality in the economic process, and hence its essential freedom.

This implies that any factor to be taken into account will be assessed in accordance with I.L.O. standards and therefore it is not the principles of the I.L.O. which must be adjusted to the contrary requirements of its Members but rather, that those who wish to belong to the Organisation will have to observe its standards.

Very important consequences flow from this. First of all, it is of fundamental importance that the I.L.O. should be master in its own house. The provision of the Constitution whereby would-be Members are divided into two categories according to whether they belong to the United Nations or not, enables the Conference to pass judgment on the suitability only of States not Members of the United Nations. This is of particular importance because of the structure of our Organisation. Nobody in the United Nations asks a country whether it can meet the constitutional requirements, or whom apply a policy which is absolutely contrary to the fundamental principles of the Organisation, or who do not apply the Conventions they have ratified.

We come now to the three basic problems of credentials, the autonomy of groups, and the supervision of the application of Conventions and Recommendations. With regard to credentials it seems to me the position has become paradoxical to say the least, not only because the decisions of the Credentials Committee are almost always taken at the end of the Conference but also because they now have no substance at all. In the discussion on credentials, questions of internal politics in member countries are admittedly touched upon, but not to a greater extent than is the case when considering the suitability of applicants not Members of the United Nations for admission to this Organisation, or when checking the application of fundamental Conventions such as those concerning freedom of association, forced labour, and discrimination.

Consequently, if the respect of Members for the principles of freedom of association and the tripartite structure of the I.L.O. is to continue to have meaning it is necessary to re-establish the full authority of the Credentials Committee. Any proposal to change existing procedure should necessarily respect the tripartite character of the I.L.O. and the sovereignty of the Conference.

Next, respect for the autonomy of the groups calls for the elimination of this "foreign body" in our Conference—I mean the procedure of the Appeals Board which, under the Standing Orders, brooks no argument and whose reports are final, again in accordance with Standing Orders. The decisions of the Board have often influenced the results of the voting and its automatic operation also violates the proclaimed aim of ensuring equal treatment of all delegates to the Conference, since some of them can even vote without having been elected.

The third point relates to better supervision of the application of Conventions and Recommendations. It should be repeated that no State is bound to ratify the Conventions adopted by the Conference even if that State has given them its support. Its only obligation is to bring them before its own legislature and before public opinion in its own country. But this freedom regarding ratification makes it absolutely essential that if ratification does take place there should be a sincere and complete application of both the letter and the spirit of the provisions of the ratified instrument, in accordance with the fundamental principles underlying the Organisation and its activities. Consideration should be given, as I think has already been suggested in the past, to a declaration of principles of non-application of a ratified Convention to be made by the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, if after a certain number of
years this Committee finds there is still a divergence between the country's legislation and the provisions of the international instrument concerned.

As I said at the beginning, it is absolutely impossible for me to give detailed consideration to all the points discussed by the Director-General. I shall confine myself to adding a remark relating to the workers in particular. Admittedly, the meaning of terms varies from country to country and language to language, but I cannot refrain from saying that the expression "manpower planning" which often occurs in reports is particularly unpleasant for those who consider that absolute freedom of choice of job is of prime importance. Even if the term "planning" is used in a different sense it evokes all too clearly the coercive methods applied in countries with economies which are precisely described as "planned economies", methods which go so far as the erection of walls designed to prevent the exodus of labour in a search for better conditions and for greater freedom. It seems to me better to speak of manpower survey programmes, vocational training plans, and the gathering of background information.

I should like to add that it is unthinkable that the existing composition or terms of reference of the Conference could be altered. It has been very rightly stressed that the role of the International Labour Conference is very different from that of the sovereign assemblies of other international organisations whose task is exclusively of an administrative character. The Conference is already too overloaded with work to be able to do any more, and the tremendous increase in the number of member States makes it unsuited to take over the work now done by the Governing Body. In any case, the free elections to the Governing Body by the three groups of the Conference and the fairly extensive membership of the Governing Body are sufficient guarantee that all will be able to take part in its discussions and its decisions.
to create a condition of industrial peace with justice and with this end in view to encourage the development of trade unions free from the pull of political forces. As a result of the development of trade unions free from the Government's policy, a strong independent and democratic trade union movement has now emerged and, with responsible and wise leadership, it is expected to play an effective role in the changing economic pattern of the State. There is already in existence an Industrial Relations Ordinance and two Industrial Arbitration Courts created within the meaning of the Ordinance. The Industrial Arbitration Courts have been responsible for numerous collective agreements and arbitration awards which have contributed to the stabilisation of labour-management relations.

The Director-General has in his Report discussed the possibilities of the assistance which may be given by the I.L.O. towards the better organisation and education of the trade union movement. The Government of Singapore was, of course, anxious, as means of assisting it in its deliberations on the Director-General's recommendations, information relating to an institution which we have in Singapore and which we believe to be unique. I refer to the Labour Research Unit which was recently set up on the joint initiative of the Government and the National Trades Union Congress of Singapore.

The Singapore Government is professedly a pro-labour Government, anxious to ensure that workers should get a fair share of the fruits of the Government's industrialisation policy. Towards this end, the Government listened with considerable sympathy to representations from trade unions to the effect that trade unions were unable, because of the lack of trained personnel, to meet employers on equal terms in the successive processes of negotiation, conciliation and arbitration provided for under the Industrial Relations Ordinance.

The consequence was that the Government recently set up, with the approval of the National Trade Union Centre, a Labour Research Unit the root aim of which is to aid the trade union movement to find the plane on which it can meet managements on equal terms—an essential prerequisite to the creation of norms in the field of labour-management relations and the road to industrial stability in the State's march towards a brighter economic and social future. It is necessary to emphasise that the Labour Research Unit is a purely advisory body, whose functions are to assist trade unions which approach the Unit with advice on the formulation of union claims on employers, the justification of those claims in negotiations, and the advocacy of union claims before the Industrial Arbitration Court. All the consultants and officers of this Unit are appointed only with the approval and consent of the National Trade Union Centre in Singapore. In this respect, the Government will be asking the I.L.O. for the assistance of an expert to help organise and enhance the research facilities of the Labour Research Unit.

The Government of Singapore believes that this would help towards the achievement of the I.L.O.'s goal of social justice and industrial peace if it decided to recommend to all governments the setting up of institutions like the Labour Research Unit we have in Singapore. The success of such institutions will depend on close understanding, sympathy and co-operation between governments on the one hand and trade unions on the other. The Singapore Government is not so anxious about employers, who are able to look after themselves in the matter of meeting their employees on equal terms.

In his Report the Director-General has discussed the desirability of reviewing I.L.O. Conventions in the light of the fact that several countries, for good as well as bad reasons, have failed to ratify or to act in the spirit of those Conventions. May I say on behalf of the State of Singapore that we are prepared to bring our legislation into line with all I.L.O. Conventions provided those Conventions do not put us at a disadvantage in relation to our paramount interest in preserving the national integrity and independence of our people against foreign encroachment.

Let us recall the Right of Association (Non-Metropolitan Territories) Convention, 1947 (No. 84). The Singapore Trade Unions (Amendment) Ordinance No. 53 of 1959 does not provide for an appeal to the courts against refusal or cancellation of the registration of a trade union, but only for an appeal to the Minister.

I desire to state categorically, on behalf of the Government of Singapore, that we are not in the least ashamed of the legislation in Singapore as it stands. By way of justification, I need only quote from page 25 of the Director-General's Report, which states, under the heading "Political Conditions": "The first imperative for government is the preservation of the State, of public order, and of the political conditions for carrying out any policy, whether in economic, social or other fields. The problems of maintaining political stability are a greater claim upon the attention and the resources of leaders in many newly emerging nations, and in other countries as well, than they may be in certain of the historically longer-established States." This statement of the Director-General fits us to perfection. The Government of Singapore is a patriotic government, but it finds itself in a situation in which it has to deal with dangerous anti-national elements. Some of these foreign-inspired elements happen to be trade unionists who have allowed themselves to become subservient tools of foreign powers. I may state here that, until such time as the threat to our national security is completely removed, it is not the intention of the Government of Singapore to amend its legislation to conform to Convention No. 84.

All law-abiding States deny rights of association to criminals. Similarly, all States which value their national integrity and independence must of necessity deny rights of association to anti-patriotic elements who look for inspiration to foreign sources. I would ask this Conference to remember that in this as in all other matters the Government of Singapore derives its authority from the elected representatives of the people, who constitute the Legislative Assembly, and not from foreign sources. How, then, can the Government of Singapore can give to this Conference, and that is that for all practical purposes Convention No. 84 is in fact implo-
mented in the State of Singapore in respect of the free, independent and democratic trade union movement in the State. The Conference might do well to remember that the democratic trade union movement in Singapore is very often at odds with the Government, but as regards them the I.L.O. Convention is observed, for they do not endanger national security.

I would like to say that this is probably the last time Singapore will be represented at this Conference by an observer delegation. The logic of history, of a common economic, administrative, social and ethnic fabric and of common colonial antecedents will bring Singapore, on 31 August this year, into the wider political unit of an independent Federation of Malaysia, comprising the Federation of Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, North Borneo and Brunei.

The Government and people of Singapore have always stood against colonialism, and they welcome Malaysia for the good reason that it will mean the final liquidation of colonial control in south-east Asia. However, as a component part of the Federation of Malaysia, Singapore will retain autonomy in labour matters, as the Government and people of Singapore desire to maintain what we believe to be the most progressive labour legislation and practices in south-east Asia.

In conclusion, I assure the Director-General and this Conference that the Government of Singapore will continue to give, as in the past, full co-operation and support to the aims of the I.L.O. to enhance international standards in respect of social and industrial justice.

Interpretation from Czech: Mr. PASEK (Workers' delegate, Czechoslovakia)—I have read with great attention the Report of the Director-General and am of the opinion that it contains a number of interesting ideas which have a close bearing on the solution of problems concerning world peace and social progress throughout the world. However, I have to state with regret that the Report does not devote sufficient attention to all problems demanding solution. On a number of issues it would be desirable to seek a more suitable and effective solution than the one proposed in the Report.

The I.L.O. has a certain responsibility in relation to efforts for the preservation of peace and the achievement of general and complete disarmament. So far its initiative in dealing with these world problems has been comparatively small. It is a fault that neither the Constitution of the I.L.O. nor the Declaration of Philadelphia mentions the duty of the Organisation to participate in dealing with these issues. The I.L.O. programme for the coming period should propose that the Organisation intensify its efforts on behalf of the preservation of peace, promotion of the peaceful coexistence of States having different social systems, and achievement of general and complete disarmament. In this way the best conditions will be created for the attainment of those goals of which the Preamble to the Constitution speaks. The Organisation should work more closely to bring to the last remains of colonialism and its economic and social consequences. The Governing Body should finally take concrete and effective measures for the implementation of the resolution on these problems which was adopted by the 46th Session of the International Labour Conference.

In the United Nations the question is being considered of the economic programme for the period when general and complete disarmament has been accomplished. It would be well if the I.L.O. also studied the economic and social consequences of disarmament, particularly from the point of view of its significance for the further development of the developing countries. In the past, resolutions bearing on this problem have not been well received by some groups of delegates.

In my opinion, Chapter IV of the Report on trade unions and labour relations should make more resolute criticism of the activities of the Organisation to date, particularly in dealing with standards, in the field of protection of trade union rights. However, the Director-General puts forward the opinion that in this respect no new Conventions need be drawn up, nor need the existing ones be revised.

There are several serious shortcomings as regards protection against violation of trade union rights. The Director-General says in his Report that "there are certain limits to the effectiveness of these procedures" of the Committee on Freedom of Association, which was entrusted with the task of investigating allegations of violation of trade union rights. Actually it was found that the Committee was incapable of taking effective measures if trade union rights are violated. The work of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission is likewise unsatisfactory and ineffective. In my opinion the protection of trade union rights should be accomplished in a much more effective manner than it has been thus far, and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organisation or one of its organs should deal with the problem.

In some member States, delegates to the International Labour Conference were appointed from trade union organisations which are in no way representative, or some delegates come from countries where real trade union organisations do not exist (such as Spain and Portugal). Some governments do not respect the agreements arrived at by trade unions representing the majority of the working people. In this respect the I.L.O. should request governments to ensure that the delegations which are appointed to the Conference should be representing those trade union organisations which are the real spokesmen for the workers in the respective countries.

In the field of technical assistance, the I.L.O. should take into account the experience of all countries. Likewise, when dealing with requests for experts it should apply more frequently to socialist countries. We are ready and willing to give the I.L.O. a number of outstanding experts, to communicate valuable experience from the field of the education of trade union officials, vocational training, and to provide a wide variety of seminars suitable for the developing countries, etc.

In my opinion the Report of the Director-General a far too prominent place is given to the problems of industrial relations while, as I have already mentioned, the problems of the
rights of the working people and their protection are insufficiently analysed.

I agreed that one of the aspects on which the I.L.O. should concentrate is the study of the influence of automation on work. In this respect we can contribute by co-operation in the study of a number of problems—for instance the influence of automation on workers' qualifications, changes in the structure of employment, forms of vocational training and education, etc.

In the sphere of social and labour problems, the I.L.O. should intensify its standard-setting activity in the sense that a survey should be made of all Conventions and Recommendations thus far adopted, and revision of those no longer corresponding to present world development should be recommended—also in the sense that all those problems for which standards have not yet been formulated should be included in the new Conventions and Recommendations. I have no doubt whether the solutions suggested by the Director-General in his Report could change the present unsatisfactory situation. The programme of trade union action adopted by the Fifth World Trade Union Congress, convened in December 1961 by the World Federation of Trade Unions, fixed the main demands which the working class and the working people are fighting for today. The I.L.O. should take this document into account in its standard-setting activities.

In this connection I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the application of the resolution on the convening of the Second European Regional Conference which was transmitted to the Governing Body by the 44th Session of the International Labour Conference. I find that even in the appendix to the Report of the Director-General there is no mention of the application of this resolution. It is my opinion that in Europe there are at the moment a number of urgent problems—for instance the problems connected with integration—which should be dealt with, and therefore the above-mentioned Conference should be convened. It is regrettable that so far such a Regional Conference has been held only once (in 1955). Similarly, the provisions of the resolution on paid holidays, the proposal for which was presented at the 45th Session of the International Labour Conference by the Czechoslovak Workers' delegate, and which was adopted at that session, is not being applied satisfactorily. In spite of the urgency of the matter the process of application of this resolution is rather slow, as is evident from the mere fact that the whole matter is only now being studied by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, and that the final report on the proposed measures is to be presented as late as in 1964. Such a situation cannot be regarded as satisfactory.

With regret I find that the Report of the Director-General hardly contains any concrete proposals for changes in the structure of the Organisation which would contribute to the democratisation of its activities. In my opinion a number of changes in the Constitution of the I.L.O. should be effected. In the interests of the further democratisation of the Constitution of the I.L.O., the relations between the General Conference, the Governing Body and the Director-General should be changed in such a way as to strengthen the authority of the General Conference, to which the Director-General would be directly responsible, and on the other hand the authority of the Governing Body should be limited to that of an executive organ responsible to the Conference. At the same time it is necessary to bear in mind that the present situation is not satisfactory, for even with its increased number of members the Governing Body is not a representative organ. While at present the Governing Body determines the agenda of the General Conference, in the future it should merely prepare a proposal for this agenda, which should be subject to the approval of the General Conference.

The composition of the Governing Body, with reference to the places of elected members, cannot be regarded as just or democratic. The same applies to the administrative body of the International Labour Office, among whose top officials there is not a single representative of the socialist countries. Neither is there a single representative of socialist countries in the Workers' group of the Governing Body. This is not a sound state of affairs, and the Organisation should find a more equitable and more justified distribution of places in the groups of the Governing Body among the representatives of member States belonging to the different parts of the world and to the different social and economic systems. At the same time a justified representation of all the groups in the international trade union movement must be kept in view. A provision on justified and equitable representation should be included in the Constitution of the I.L.O. and should be regarded as the guiding principle for the composition of all the organs and bodies of the I.L.O.

Conditions for a wide and democratic discussion of the resolutions should be secured, so that by submitting these resolutions delegates may have an influence on the general policy of the I.L.O. We are, therefore, strongly against all proposals, whether already accepted or in the preparatory stage, the purpose of which is to limit this democratic discussion of resolutions submitted.

I hope that this Conference will take a positive attitude towards the principles which I have mentioned in my address, which would certainly contribute to the democratisation of the structure and activity of the I.L.O. in such a way as to bring them in line with present world developments, and at the same time the effectiveness of the work of all the organs and bodies of the I.L.O. would be increased so as to ensure the effective protection of all the rights of the workers.

Mr. GREVE (Employers' delegate, Ceylon)—The Report of the Director-General covers so wide a field that it is not possible in a short address to deal adequately with all aspects of the work of the I.L.O. to which it makes reference. I shall confine myself, therefore, to a few of these aspects which strike me as being of particular importance to the developing countries.

The International Labour Conference has been frequently described as a World Parlia-
ment. To my mind, however, such an analogy is inappropriate and is, perhaps, a misconception which has contributed in some measure to many of its instruments being unrealistic and difficult to accept. A true parliament is a body whose edicts are of automatic application to its subjects, usually under threat of penal sanctions. This is not so with the I.L.O., whose constituent Members are free to ratify or not the various instruments which are adopted by the Conference. It is imperative, therefore, that the instruments adopted should be so framed as to be generally, if not universally, acceptable. That they are in fact demonstrated by the paucity of ratification and implementation of the instruments which have hitherto been adopted by the Organisation.

This aspect, in so far as it relates to Asia, has recently come under examination by the Asian Advisory Committee. The unanimous conclusion arrived at was that most Asian governments were anxious to live up to their obligations to the I.L.O. but were prevented from doing so until the international labour standards were drawn up in such a way as to make it possible for them to implement the corresponding legislation. A particular instance is the Plantations Convention, 1958. The importance of this Convention to the Asian region cannot be overemphasised. In Ceylon, as in many of the other countries, much has been done towards implementing several of the standards set out in the Convention but the fact remains that not one single country in Asia has found it possible to ratify the Convention, due mainly to the hurried inclusion of an unrealistic definition given to the term "plantation" which in effect makes little distinction between a plantation and a small-holding. The continued adoption of rigid instruments overburdened with detail and unrealistic in approach can serve but small purpose in the context of the present framework of the I.L.O. What are the factors which contribute to the current situation?

One such factor is the procedure which is adopted in bringing a subject before the Conference. The present practice is for the Office to undertake a study of the subject in question and on the basis of such study to present the Conference with a report which includes suggested Conclusions. My experience of such reports leaves me with the impression that these studies are largely handled by Office staff whose experience of the subject has been in the main pedagogic and theoretical. Lack of practical experience in a labour inspector's seat or on a negotiator's bench leads, perchance through an abundance of caution or an excess of enthusiasm, to the presentation to this Conference of Proposed Conclusions burdened with detail and lacking in appreciation of the need for sufficient flexibility which makes allowance for regional or local environmental conditions. Presented with such reports, employers and workers are naturally very loth to contemplate alterations which prima facie remove apparent advantage in matters of detail whilst governments find themselves very often embarrassed into supporting provisions of popular appeal even though inclusion of such material will render ratification of the instrument difficult or impossible. All this quite apart from an understandable reluctance on the part of the Office to look with favour on any major change in the Conclusions proposed by them. In the result, even before a matter comes before the Conference, the stage is already set for the adoption of an instrument burdened with detail which should be more appropriately left to national conception and determination in the light of national circumstances.

The situation is further aggravated by the hurried and somewhat perfunctory consideration which a Conference is able to give to the proposals, and in cumulative effect a large number of the instruments adopted have proved to be difficult of universal acceptance, as is evidenced by the paucity of ratification of a large number of these instruments. I would like to suggest for consideration by the Governing Body that the defects to which I have alluded could be ameliorated partly by a marked increase in emphasis on practical experience in the various fields when the recruitment of Office staff is undertaken. However, a major improvement could be effected through the adoption of the practice of having the Proposed Conclusions presented to the Conference drafted by a sufficiently representative tripartite committee of experts who may work on the basis of the Office studies. Such a step would ensure a practical approach to the problem rather than presenting the Conference with proposals based on a largely theoretical appraisal. The committees could also be greatly assisted in their work if governments were invited to indicate difficulties in the way of ratification or implementation which they anticipated when reporting on proposals.

Consideration may also be given to the possibility of amending the Constitution to provide that a government voting in favour of an instrument which is adopted by the Conference shall be deemed to have ratified such instrument and must complete implementation thereof within a period of, say, two years.

Apart from the considerations which I have already mentioned I would like to suggest that the question whether the present types of instruments are outmoded should receive careful examination. These instruments were conceived some 40 years ago in the background of a membership which was in the main industrialised and European. I feel that in the context of the present heterogeneous membership Conventions certainly are too rigid and outmoded. Would it not more satisfactorily meet present-day emergencies and circumstances if Conventions were strictly limited to the coverage of basic rights such as, for example, freedom of association, and standard-setting were done by Recommendations only? If such a practice was considered feasible, existing instruments could be reviewed and categorised by a tripartite committee of experts for approval of the Conference.

I would now like to refer to the question posed by the Director-General in regard to the periodicity of the Conference. It is my firm conviction that the holding of an annual Conference to consider submission of the present magnitude is an extremely heavy burden on the time of member countries and that the practice does not permit sufficient time for adequate examination and study of the technical sub-
undertake both by way of budgetary provision of the I.L.O. as well as the cost of sending delegations. These items could be a serious consideration to distant and developing countries. In the circumstances I welcome the suggestion that the Conference should be held once in each period of two years.

The further suggestion that the I.L.O. should assist member countries with the cost of sending delegations to the Conference is also worthy of serious consideration. This is a factor of importance in determining the size of delegations, particularly from the smaller and developing countries. In many instances it is not merely the amount of money involved; the question of availability of foreign exchange has a much more serious effect. In all the circumstances the adoption of this proposal would, I feel, materially contribute to the efficiency of the Conference and I would strongly urge its early implementation.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. MICHEV (Government delegate, Bulgaria)—May we congratulate the Director-General, who in his Report has mentioned the major problems of our time connected with the maintenance of peace throughout the world and disarmament as well as questions connected with the programme, future activities and structure of the I.L.O.

Principles and rules which may have been topical in 1919, when our Organisation came into being, and also the principles and rules of 1944, when the Declaration of Philadelphia was proclaimed, are now in many respects obsolete. Since then major changes have occurred in the world which compel us to take a big step forward in order to bring the style and methods of our Organisation into line with the requirements of our age. We consider that the proposals that have been advanced by the Soviet representatives at this session are designed to focus attention on the basic, most important issues. Adoption of these proposals would play an enormous part in the future work of the I.L.O. The Soviet delegation has presented a memorandum on this subject. We would like to acquaint ourselves with its contents. Moreover, a number of delegates have shown interest in this memorandum. We think, therefore, that the document should be communicated to the Conference as soon as possible.

I wish to deal with three main problems. First of all, we consider that the I.L.O. should concentrate its efforts on problems connected with the maintenance of peace and with disarmament as one of the most important conditions for the preservation of the lives of millions of persons, the maintenance of a higher standard of living, and economic and cultural progress. We have to face the facts. There exists the threat of a thermonuclear war. The Director-General states that the annual expenditure on armaments exceeds $120,000 million, of which a considerable part is being trained in the so-called art of war. Seventy per cent. of the scientists are working for war. All this frantic armaments race is being pursued at the expense of the lives and the daily bread of millions of workers throughout the world. Mankind may wake up one day and find itself drawn into this monstrous abyss of thermonuclear annihilation. That must not be allowed to happen. The progressive forces of the world, including the I.L.O., must take decisive steps.

Up-to-date military technique has placed in the hands of man weapons of incredible destructive force. According to experts, the total of atom bombs produced up to two years ago, spread over the population of the world, would correspond to approximately 80 tons of explosive per head of the population. The stockpiles that are available would suffice within a few hours to kill off hundreds of millions of persons and to destroy the fruits of thousands of years of civilisation. That is why the struggle for peace and for general disarmament has become the main task of our time.

Only an insignificant handful of monopolists, manufacturers of and traders in these death-carrying weapons, who are accumulating unheard-of profits, and their minions and accomplices are fanning the flames of war hysteria, speeding up the armaments race and sowing distrust among governments. We can see no more important task than the mobilisation of all the resources of the I.L.O. in order to maintain peace and to achieve general and complete disarmament.

What are the social and economic aspects of a comprehensive programme of disarmament? What vast sources and resources could be made available if it were possible to release the hundreds of billions of dollars earmarked for the destruction of the human race—if those billions of dollars were made available for peace, if man's genius, work, science and experience could be turned to this purpose? This would be a major reserve and a powerful instrument to raise the prosperity of the peoples and to put an end to hunger, degeneration and disease. It would open vast perspectives for general prosperity!

On the instructions of the United Nations a group of experts recently published a comprehensive study and recommendations on the economic and social aspects of disarmament. They say, for instance, that only $160,000 million would be needed in order to turn Africa within 20 years into a continent with a level of development equal to that of Europe. What wonderful horizons would open up before the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the economies of the whole world, if only 8 to 10 per cent. of the annual expenditure on armaments were used for the development of those countries?

The triumph of socialism needs not war but peace, and that is why it is the firm policy of our country to promote peaceful co-operation in every respect. Our country warmly supports all initiatives that are designed to achieve the constructive solution of international problems, and will mobilise all its resources in order to maintain peace and to achieve general and complete disarmament.

The I.L.O. should be made to shoulder upon the interests of millions of workers throughout the world. Can there be any more important interests for labour and society than the maintenance of peace on earth and preserving the
lives of the workers? We must say with complete determination that during recent years, when mankind was faced with the dilemma of peaceful coexistence or thermonuclear calamity, the I.L.O. has remained aloof. To date the I.L.O. has not adopted a single standard proclaiming the need for the maintenance of peace and for disarmament. It remained aloof when trade union officials and fighters for peace were being shot, when one of Africa’s greatest sons, Patrice Lumumba, was murdered. It remained aloof during the catastrophe which recently threatened mankind in the Caribbean region. Surely the drafting and adoption of standards regarding the maximum load that can be carried by one man cannot be more important than the preservation of the lives of millions of workers from the horrors of a war of extermination?

Considering the nature of our Organisation and its Constitution we must insist that the main activity its activities should at this stage be placed on the preservation of peace and the achievement of disarmament.

The Director-General devotes a large section of his Report to the labour and social problems in the countries recently emancipated from colonialism, and that is good. However, the Report does not devote sufficient time to those countries which are still under colonial domination. On the African Continent alone there are several countries which are suffering from the most cruel colonial slavery. The condition of the workers in these countries is unbearable; as a result of exploitation, malnutrition and the wide spread of social diseases the life expectancy of African workers is half that of their European or North American colleagues. Out of 1,000 head of population, only half the Africans born in these countries live to the age of 16. This is primarily the result of the low income levels of the working population. The data concerning the average income of the indigenous population in these countries speak for themselves; for instance, the average income of the indigenous inhabitants of Northern Rhodesia is 28 times lower than the average income in England. In Kenya it is 51 times lower and in Nyasaland 92 times lower.

According to the investigations of the United Nations Subcommittee on Angola (Document No. A/4978 of 27 November 1961) manpower recruitment in the Portuguese colonies is undertaken by round-ups, by forcible entry into the homes of the indigenous population by day or night. Such recruitments spare neither pregnant women nor children, who are being mercilessly exploited for the heaviest physical work. The pitifully low pay of $2-$3 a month is not always paid, and indigenous persons are obliged to work without any pay at all for several months a year. The rapacious policy of colonialism is condemning the peoples of whom I speak to a lingering death.

How is the I.L.O. participating in the struggle against colonialism, that infamous blot on the face of our times? At the last session of the International Labour Conference it was said in a resolution that “the I.L.O. must do its utmost to further the freedom and independence of colonial peoples.” We are puzzled by the fact that the I.L.O. has done hardly anything in this field.

In his Report the Director-General expresses the conviction that the Bracquemond Economic Community and the Organisation of American States will come to the assistance of these newly emancipated countries. By such declarations does not the I.L.O. simply pass on its responsibilities to a narrow group of Western countries whose political colouring is only too well known to us?

We were deeply moved by the complaint of the people of Angola which was communicated to all delegates. How can the I.L.O. allow such evil in the second half of the twentieth century?

The question of the final liquidation of the remnants of colonialism should become the centre of the work programme of the I.L.O. It must come to the assistance of the colonial peoples in their just struggle for freedom and independence.

Another important question reflected in the Director-General’s Report is that of the social and labour aspects of land reform. This item has appeared on the agenda of the Governing Body at several successive sessions. The vast majority of the employed population of the world are engaged in agriculture. Unemployment and underemployment of agricultural workers lead to loss of income, impoverishment and hunger among hundreds of millions of people. In many countries the peasant population is not receiving any assistance from the State; only major landowners are getting such aid. The lot of the farm labourers and workers on major estates is even worse. In many countries the question of land reform has acquired dramatic proportions. The I.L.O. has a duty to consider and state its views on the question of land reform.

May I in conclusion dwell on some of the questions that relate to the democratisation of the structure and the improvement of the work of the I.L.O. The Bulgarian delegation considers that the time has come to make certain alterations in the structure of the Organisation and its methods of work. The present anomalous situation whereby the majority of countries are not represented in the leading organs of the I.L.O. cannot continue. In the Governing Body, out of 40 titular members only two represent the socialist countries. In the Workers’ and Employers’ groups there is not a single representative of these countries. In these circumstances it is not difficult to understand why the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada make every effort to transfer all the prerogatives of our Conference to an administration that is subservient to them, in other words to deprive 108 government delegations and trade unions of their rights and transfer those rights to the administration referred to. The nine members of the Directorate do not include a single national of the socialist countries. Out of 29 members of the senior staff only one is a representative of the socialist countries, whereas there are four from France, seven from the United Kingdom, three from the United States and two from Canada. Here we have an acute case of discrimination against the socialist countries.

This unfair distribution of posts both in the Organisation and the Office creates...
difficulties in co-operation between States with regard to economic, social and labour questions. It is quite wrong that one-third of the population of the world should not be represented in the organs of the I.L.O., which claims to be democratic and universal. It is also wholly irregular that such great countries as the Chinese People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist States should remain outside this Organisation.

The Bulgarian delegation suggests that changes be made in some of the obsolete texts of the I.L.O., and that other organisational and functional rules inhibiting the proper work of the I.L.O. be altered. Thus, the role of the General Conference must be expanded by turning it into the real supreme authority of the I.L.O., making its decisions binding on the Governing Body and all other bodies of the I.L.O. It is necessary to regulate the relationship between the Conference and the Governing Body. The Governing Body must become the effective organ of the Conference and be accountable to it. Certain obsolete articles of the Constitution must also be amended, namely articles 7 and 8, and the discriminatory text of article 35, which legalises colonialism and therefore represents an anachronism in our Organisation, should be eliminated. The election of the Director-General must be the responsibility of the Conference. The agenda of the Conference must be planned by the Conference itself.

If we pool our efforts in the struggle for peace, for the final destruction of the colonial system and the betterment of the workers of the world, the I.L.O. will become a powerful international factor towards the progress and highest interests of the workers.

Interpretation from French: Mr. DE BOCK (Workers' delegate, Belgium)—It is clear to all here present that the discussion of this particularly detailed and thorough Report may lead, after the events of the last ten years—which are described by the Director-General in the Introduction—to revision, reorientation and even amplification of the work of the I.L.O., which must adjust itself to the new needs of the world in which we are living.

It would be a real challenge to try to note all the important things we find in the Report and to give expression to all our reactions and reflections upon those points. Not only what might appear essential to one could appear secondary to another, but the limited time at our disposal would preclude any infringement of freedom of association, and although it attaches great importance to the role of the trade union organisations, it has hitherto never defined formally what the role of those organisations should be. The texts of the Conventions and Recommendations on the subject are vague and general.

We all know, however, that every real trade union movement is based on a certain number of fundamental principles and pursues certain objectives, which may be summarised in one: to defend the interests of the workers, cannot escape from this role.

Since the agreement of the national government is necessary for any direct aid by the I.L.O., two kinds of situation may arise: either the trade union movement is sufficiently strong to force the government—then it has no need of aid from the I.L.O.; or a government will give its agreement because it controls, financially or otherwise, the trade union movement—in that case we should have
the courage to say, as trade unionists, that we
are against all aid of that kind because we do
not want such organisations.

The trade union movement must be free; it
is in strife and by strife that it will develop.

In this way it grew in the industrialised coun-
tries and experience has shown that it is in this
way also that it has been able to establish itself
on a solid and lasting basis.

We must add that the fact that in many
cases a trade union organisation must secure
the authorisation of the government would be
resented as an infringement of its independence
and its liberty.

Another awkward question can also arise:
what training can usefully be given by the
I.L.O. to trade union leaders?

Without wishing to deny the increasingly
technological character of the problems facing
us today, we think that an excess of specialisa-
tion may harm the trade union leaders them-

selves and also be prejudicial to the trade
union movement as a whole. No doubt some
people within an organisation should be able
to discuss problems such as productivity or
economic programming, provided they have
all the elements necessary for that purpose.
However one should not attach too much
importance to the technical aspects of certain
problems. The risk appears great that we may
see new social achievements subordinated to
economic or technological requirements. Let
us never forget that social achievements are
not necessarily the result of exceptional eco-

nomic situations, but very often in the past
they have been the starting point for new
 technological progress and for a new phase of
economic expansion.

The place of the trade union leaders is,
primarily, among the workers; the trade union
movement should never become a movement of
leaders; if it wishes to live it must rise from the
ranks.

We consider that the problem of training
trade unionists, which, to my mind, is different
from that of workers' education, is above all a
matter for the trade unions themselves. If any
help is necessary, it is for them, we believe, to
decide which organisation or institution should
give it.

Recourse to the I.L.O., whose tripartite
composition obliges it to be neutral and
objective, is not necessarily the right answer.
It would be idle, particularly here, to blind
one's eyes and not to see that underlying every
trade union movement there is a certain ideol
ogy, to which movement has its own philos
ophy and also a policy which it determines
freely. These are factors which deserve con-

sideration.

It is for these same reasons also that it might
appear ambitious in some respects to wish to
induce certain organisations to amalgamate.

In short, the creation of the organisations,
their possible amalgamation, the training of
their leaders, financial matters, are, in our opinion,
among the matters which should be left to the
free appreciation of the unions themselves.

We recognise that in some countries it would
be difficult to establish a powerful trade union
movement; but, in such a case, the movement
should be able to appeal for help from the
international trade union movement. Further-
more, we should avoid a situation in which
there is any infringement of freedom of associa-
tion and trade union independence by any
person or in any way.

From the very beginning of its existence,
there is no doubt that the trade union move-
ment will find itself at grips with the employers
and government. There is nothing surprising
in that, because, even in countries where the
trade union movements are strong, we still see
today attempts by governments to integrate
those organisations into the system, to put a
brake on their activities and bring them under
control.

Despite the adoption and ratification of
Conventions 87 and 98, few countries enjoy real
freedom of association; the number of com-
plaints submitted to the I.L.O. is clear proof of
this.

We must recognise objectively, however,
that, thanks to the allegations procedure, the
Governing Body Committee on Freedom of
Association has been able, in the past, re-
peatedly to take action which has enabled
lives to be saved, human beings to be set free,
and others, with their families, to emigrate.
Some legislation on the right to strike and its
free exercise has been rendered more flexible.
All this makes it possible to say that even if
the present procedure is not perfect it justifies
the existence of the Committee.

We must also say on behalf of the members
of the Committee that they are not responsible
for the imperfections of the procedure as
indicated by the Director-General. The fault
lies with the governments—those at least
which, defying the moral reprobation of world
public opinion and evading the obligations they
have solemnly undertaken, do not design to
comply in the slightest degree with the re-
peated requests addressed to them. Those
which evade their obligations in this way are
almost always the same ones. Among them,
unfortunately, are countries recently indepen-
dent or countries which declare they have been
through a national revolution.

The governments of those countries thus
show their total lack of respect for the human
person, for the requests of the I.L.O. are, in
general, related to the fate of trade unionists
who are imprisoned or condemned to death.

Besides those countries there are others,
which, without showing the same disdain or
shamelessness, yet seek a way of escape. Their
argument is almost always the same: the trade
unions and their officers against whom they
have taken punitive action are engaged in
political and subversive activities.

For our part, we affirm that we consider it
logical that a trade union organisation should
struggle against the policy of a government,
against the economic and political structure of
a country, even against dictatorship; but is it
not evident that in such a case the government
will always claim that this is subversive
political activity?

Must one then modify the present procedure
of the Committee on Freedom of Association, if
necessary by organising on-the-spot inquiries?
Of course we are not opposed to that, but one
fact is almost certain: there will always be
governments which will wish to escape such
inquiries.
What sanctions can be taken against them? There lies the whole difficulty. Of course, those governments will place themselves "outside the law", but that will only be a moral condemnation.

Whatever the procedure is—and this is my conclusion—the I.L.O. will never be able to give anything but moral support. Its role is nevertheless enviable, for it will be able to awaken the conscience of the world.

Real trade union freedom must be won by struggle, by force, by pressure. For me, that is an evident truth. Employers and government is widely interested in the maintenance of organisations that are sufficiently powerful. If sometimes they accept or even recommend cooperation, one may be assured that they do so in their own interests.

The intervention of the I.L.O., important though it may be, can never be more than moral support for freedom of association, for it is after all at the national level, by struggle, by day-to-day battle, that trade union organisation and their freedom can be born and can flourish.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. OBUKHO-VICH (Workers' delegate, Byelorussia)—We share the Director-General's opinion that "the I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history, at one of those points where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action". Our Organisation does indeed stand at a crossroads: either it will make a sharp turn and will be remodelled in accordance with the growing requirements of life, or it will remain static in its development, and will then find itself at a dead end. In this connection we should like to stress some aspects of its activities to which in our opinion insufficient attention is being paid.

I do not think anybody will deny that mankind is vitally interested in the maintenance and consolidation of peace. It seems to me to be important to draw attention to the fact that it is equally interested in disarmament and in converting the vast means and resources that are at present being expended on armaments, with a view to speeding up the social and economic development of each country, intensifying economic and technical assistance to developing countries, and improving the conditions of work and life of the workers. Indeed, general and complete disarmament under strict international control has become an indispensable condition of rapid social progress throughout the world.

The I.L.O., in its capacity as an international organisation whose aim is to promote social progress and the protection of the workers' interests, is required to be an instrument of peace and peaceful coexistence. It must define clearly its position on the question of disarmament, and contribute to the practical solution of that problem. The satisfactory solution of the problems that are before us necessitates a considerable change inside the I.L.O. itself. It is necessary to make the structure of this Organisation more democratic and to see to it that the I.L.O. can respond to the new social and economic changes and to the new conditions that have come about. It is necessary to formulate clearly in the Constitution of the I.L.O. its purposes and tasks in the struggle for peace, and the practical activities of the I.L.O. and its organs should be designed for the examination of concrete questions connected with the peaceful coexistence of States, disarmament and the strengthening of friendship and mutual understanding between the peoples. This is a pressing demand of our time, and our Organisation cannot ignore this problem.

The importance of our Organisation in contributing to the further extension of the trade union movement is stressed in the Director-General's Report. Indeed, the development of the world tends towards an ever greater participation of the trade unions in solving the problems of labour and other important social problems. The experience of our own country shows clearly that free and vigorous action on the part of the trade unions represents a powerful factor in strengthening economic development and increasing the well-being of the people.

In Byelorussia the income of the workers and their standard of living improve each year. The trade unions play an active and direct part in carrying out measures designed to increase the well-being of the workers.

Through the trade unions the wage earners and salaried employees in my country are able to exercise immediate influence on the settlement of all problems connected with economic development and safeguard the material needs of the workers. Our trade unions enjoy the right of legislative initiative. They manage the social security programme, the budget of which is made up not from contributions on the part of workers but exclusively from allocations by the State, and these involve vast sums of money. The trade unions uphold the legal interests of wage earners and salaried employees, and exercise control over workers' safety and the observance of labour legislation. They play a decisive part in examining labour disputes, and they engage in large-scale cultural and educational work. This was confirmed by the I.L.O. mission which studied the activities of trade unions in Byelorussia.

The horizons before our trade unions are vast. Their activities are becoming ever richer, more varied and effective. In the capitalist countries the workers have to struggle against hostility, and indeed active opposition, on the part of monopolies and governments subservient to them. These seek not only to obstruct progress but to reduce to naught the hard-won achievements of the workers and to curtail trade union freedoms. However, the working class is ever more resolutely defending its social and economic interests. In these circumstances the strengthening and development of the trade union movement is of enormous importance.

All this confirms the need for the I.L.O., in its standard-setting, research and operational activities, to devote considerably more attention to the trade union movement.

Speaking of the growth of the trade union movement, one must not fail to draw attention to that part of the Director-General's Report stating that the Freedom of Association and Protection Against the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), have been ratified by 63 member
States only. This lamentable fact testifies to the truth that more than one-third of the member States of the I.L.O. do not find it possible to recognize the right to freedom of association for workers. These Conventions have not been ratified by the United States either.

We are also alarmed by the fact that in recent years a veritable campaign against trade union freedoms has started in some countries of the West. Laws have been drafted, or even brought into force, which restrict the right of trade unions. The trade union movements in the colonies are also in a difficult situation. We would like to express our warmest sympathy to the workers of Angola, Mozambique, Aden and other countries, who are conducting a heroic struggle for their freedom and independence.

Numerous complaints concerning violation of trade union rights and restriction of trade union activities and of such fundamental rights of the workers as the rights of association, publication and demonstration are coming into the I.L.O. from many countries. This also shows that the trade unions find themselves in a very difficult position in many countries, and indeed in some cases are deprived of any real action. The I.L.O. is not paying sufficient attention to these problems, and sometimes the most flagrant violations of trade union rights are passed over in silence.

The I.L.O. should review the procedure for examination of complaints of violations of trade union rights with a view to settling each case decisively.

Related to the problem of trade union rights are not only various legal standards but also the material conditions for the implementation of these rights. How can there be any real basis for the implementation of the legitimate rights of the workers in the countries of so-called free enterprise, where there is always unemployment, where the workers are constantly threatened with the loss of their jobs and thereby of the means of subsistence, and where the trade unions have been prevented from participating in solving employment problems? Trade union freedoms cannot be respected, even if they are proclaimed, when there is racial discrimination as in the case of certain countries. That is why the I.L.O. must take into account the actual situation and the social and economic conditions in which the trade unions in any given country find themselves. Extension and consolidation of the trade unions' activities and of such fundamental rights as the right to freedom of association, publication and demonstration are coming into the I.L.O. from many countries. This also shows that the trade unions find themselves in a very difficult position in many countries, and indeed in some cases are deprived of any real action. The I.L.O. is not paying sufficient attention to these problems, and sometimes the most flagrant violations of trade union rights are passed over in silence.

The I.L.O. should review the procedure for examination of complaints of violations of trade union rights with a view to settling each case decisively.

Related to the problem of trade union rights are not only various legal standards but also the material conditions for the implementation of these rights. How can there be any real basis for the implementation of the legitimate rights of the workers in the countries of so-called free enterprise, where there is always unemployment, where the workers are constantly threatened with the loss of their jobs and thereby of the means of subsistence, and where the trade unions have been prevented from participating in solving employment problems? Trade union freedoms cannot be respected, even if they are proclaimed, when there is racial discrimination as in the case of certain countries. That is why the I.L.O. must take into account the actual situation and the social and economic conditions in which the trade unions in any given country find themselves. Extension and consolidation of the trade unions' activities and of such fundamental rights as the right to freedom of association, publication and demonstration are coming into the I.L.O. from many countries. This also shows that the trade unions find themselves in a very difficult position in many countries, and indeed in some cases are deprived of any real action. The I.L.O. is not paying sufficient attention to these problems, and sometimes the most flagrant violations of trade union rights are passed over in silence.

The I.L.O. should review the procedure for examination of complaints of violations of trade union rights with a view to settling each case decisively.

At the same time, I agree with those who say that the time has long since come when we should do away with such obsolete provisions as the infamous article 35, which is a shameful vestige of colonialism.

I would also support the views expressed by several delegates regarding the need to strengthen the trade unions, as this would contribute to economic and social progress and improve the living conditions of workers.

The problems connected with the trade union movement must be reflected in the practical activities of the I.L.O. Unfortunately, some programmes have been dropped which have helped, to some extent, to ascertain the real situation of the trade unions and to study their practical problems.

In order that the I.L.O. may be in a position to draft comprehensive recommendations on the development of the trade union movement, it is necessary that the representatives of all trade union movements be brought into the work of the Governing Body and the other organs of the I.L.O., including those of the W.F.T.U. Unfortunately, the Report of the Director-General does not make any suggestions to this effect.

The constructive proposals which delegates are making here should be carefully examined by a committee of this Conference, and should be reflected in the practical activities of the I.L.O.

Mr. SOLOMON (Employers' delegate, Sierra Leone)—I should first of all thank the Director-General for his remarkable and inspiring Report. This year he has dealt with the programme and structure of the I.L.O. It is impossible for anyone to speak on all the aspects of this Report in any detail within the limit of 15 minutes allocated to him. I have therefore decided to concentrate on that aspect of it which deals with the formation of standards and the general discussions not leading to standards.

Anyone who has followed the development of the I.L.O. understands that the time has come, after such a long course, for the Members of this great Organisation to look around and find out what adjustments are necessary for the increased vigour which is required to endure the great task which lies ahead towards justice, peace and fair play between man and man.

The I.L.O. has for over 40 years guided its Members towards discussions on social problems which are concluded with the establishing of either international labour Conventions or Recommendations. During this long period, changes have taken place. The wind of change has blown not only hard but extremely fast. The membership of the I.L.O. has increased from 62 to 108 within the last ten years. This increase in the number of its Members has not been the only change: there has been great diversity in membership also. Countries which a few years ago had to toe the line and obey the dictates of the great nations have recently gained their independence and have taken their rightful places as Members of this Organisation. Economic, social and educational standards vary between these newly emerging nations— and more, between them and the older and greater nations. At this Conference, I represent the employers of one of those new nations but I am sure I am voicing the opinion of all free employers when I say that they all welcome the progress that is being made in our developing countries and that all free employers give every support to the work that is being done by our representatives in the international organisations of the world. There is ample evidence of this in the fact that the President of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference is a son of the soil of the great
The free employers are appreciative of the varying conditions existing among the Members of the I.L.O. The President in his opening speech said “The economic problems of and assistance to the underdeveloped countries have been considered of late in the world context, and it is my belief that this is the right approach”. Later in his speech, he said “I need hardly stress the point that the scale of economic conditions are obviously unrealistic and there­ put away where they will never more be seen.

The reason for this, in many cases, is that the employers support the view that under present circumstances the operational activities of the I.L.O. are more important today than standard setting. Operational programmes must be designed to meet real needs and meet them in the best possible way. As means are limited, it is necessary to establish priorities. Where standards are desirable, they must be general and flexible so that they can be more easily applied widely. International legislations are particularly dangerous for employers in developing countries in which their applications are unrealistic because of prevailing circumstances in those countries. We therefore support the view that Recommendations are preferable to Conventions, as they serve as guides which are adjustable under varying conditions existing in the world today. Conventions are, of course, imperative where fundamental principles, such as human rights, freedom of association, abolition of forced labour, are involved. These must necessarily impose the same obligations on all States who ratify them. The new nations are referred to as developing nations, but there is no nation that is stagnant. The older nations continue to develop at phenomenal speeds. The gap between the old and new nations is in many fields widening and the problem—and a great one it is—becomes even more complex as the days go by. Outside help to the new nations is the only apparent means of bridging this gap. The bulk of this help must come from the investors, the employers. It is these employers who have to grapple with the many and varying problems. It is the outside investor who, to a great extent, has to fit the standards established at these I.L.O. Conferences with the prevailing educational, social and economic status of the workers in the particular countries. In the face of these inherent difficulties foreign investors, in our developing countries, have the task of exonerating themselves from the natural suspicion with which they are looked upon by both the government and the workers.

A few government delegates, at these Conferences, vote in favour of Conventions without the slightest intention of ratifying them. Some do not even submit them to their legislature for adoption. They are locked up in drawers or put away where they will never more be seen. The reason for this, in many cases, is that the instruments are obviously unrealistic and therefore no attempt can be made towards their ratification. Unless instruments are realistic they tend to be harmful and lower the reputation of the I.L.O.

The free employers believe that the spirit of understanding between all classes, races and peoples must be strengthened not only in theory but also in practice. Therefore they support the view expressed by the Director-General that some old instruments may be cut out in an attempt to have the International Labour Code in line with present-day world conditions. The need for a review of certain existing Conventions and Recommendations in the light of present-day conditions with a view to making them pertinent to prevailing circumstances and facilitating their application cannot be overemphasised. Some of these labour standards were established at a time when the social structures of the member countries of this Organisation were similar. Today the situation is completely different. These standards cannot be adapted to the situation in some of the new member countries and an attempt to implement them will be harmful to the economic development of those countries. Revision of these instruments should be made through normal channels, as an attempt at revision in special committees may be dangerous. We support the view that Conventions which have failed to fulfil their original purpose and those which have already fulfilled the purpose for which they were established should be removed from the International Labour Code.

In conclusion, I should commend to your serious consideration that when you discuss the formulation of international standards you bear in mind the varying economic, social and educational standards in all the member countries of our Organisation.

Independence and recent changes in regimes have not in all cases brought about a transformation in economic and social life. They have not conferred immediate abundance upon the people of our newly independent States.

Mr. KIBUKA (Workers' delegate, Uganda)—I sincerely hope that you all know that Uganda became a Member of the International Labour Organisation on 25 March 1963. Although we sent a Workers' representative as an observer last year, this is the first time that Uganda workers have had the opportunity of participating directly in the work of the Conference.

Our country, Uganda, is low on the alphabetical list of nations and the size of the other nations represented at this 47th Session of the annual Conference of the I.L.O., but we are proud to be in this first official delegation since Uganda was admitted to the I.L.O., the oldest and most extensive of the technical agencies of the United Nations, in which we are proud to be the 107th Member.

The wage-earning section of our over 7 million population is small. Hence the aid we require at first will be mostly for our rural inhabitants. Yet in our country of eternal sunshine, which attained her independence only in 1962, our industry is growing and we hope in the future to be able both to get and to give much to help us and all our fellow nations, large and small, to solve our social problems and successfully overcome poverty, disease and ignorance. We fully accept the view that "poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere."

Even before Uganda joined the I.L.O., as an independent nation our Trades Union Congress had received aid from the Workers' Educational
Division. Two of our officers benefited from the Sixth National Seminar for Trade Union Leaders on Workers’ Education held in Dar-es-Salaam in November 1962. The Director-General’s Report touches on a very important point—education. The workers of Uganda need education. In the period February through April 1963 we had the services of an expert to run classes and train teachers for our Uganda Trades Union Congress. He also had many meetings with employers’ and government representatives, in line with the tripartite character of the I.L.O. We hope that this assistance will be continued until our Uganda Congress will have an extensive and self-supporting educational department.

We need this education, because trade unionists especially cannot afford to be both free and ignorant. We believe that trade unions play a unique and necessary role in our free society. The Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948, which embodies “the freedom of association”, may sometimes seem slow and cumbersome to those who think they know best what the workers want and lack the patience to await the slow but sure process of self-maturity. But we in the Uganda Trades Union Congress want improvements made in freedom, and not by dictatorship—even benevolent dictatorship claimed to be necessary for the national interest. The trade unions have a work which no political party can do in applying democratic principles to industry. Unions are certainly, through the I.L.O., interested in improving production, but they are also interested in producing free men and women who understand and will shoulder their rights and responsibilities as citizens who are also grouped together in their basic industrial roles. Young governments everywhere in the world are sensitive and nervous to any potential challenge to their power. The trade unionist yields to no one in his loyalty to his country, and indeed labour and management serve their country best when by voluntary agreements they settle the day-to-day problems of industrial administration. By their constant endeavours to improve conditions of life and work and to remedy workers’ grievances, trade unions get on the nerves of certain types of employers and, at times, governments. Hence the desire in some quarters to get rid of the trade unions. However, it is no longer fashionable to disband trade unions by force. Cunning employers and politicians of the fascist brand or otherwise tinged with autocratic aspirations have invented effective methods for converting workers’ organisations into statutory bodies whose officials accept from employers or governments their marching orders together with their salary, assorted with job security and other privileges. Employers in quest of large and quick profits, or governments in a hurry to achieve economic advancement, who resort to such devices, do not serve their best interests. All workers, even the most ignorant and gullible among them, become aware of the deception practised on them. Who imagines that they will not retaliate? They may find it impossible to retaliate collectively by openly challenging or defying the masters, but each one of them will rebel inwardly and retaliate silently by limiting his efforts. Although the economic consequences of anger springing from hostility against holders of power may not be measurable in terms of production and productivity, there can be no doubt that the income of profit earners as well as wage earners will be less than what is achievable with free workers organised in free trade unions.

Surely the I.L.O. way of careful investigation, long and free discussion, voluntary ratification and constant moral pressure on nations which do not live up to the codes of good practices and conditions is better and has already proved so.

I pledge that the Uganda labour movement will exert every effort to see that the I.L.O. Conventions are not only accepted but fully applied. In this we shall, I am sure, have the co-operation of our far-sighted Government and employers.

Our country is going through a transition period which is not easy. Many of our workers do not work where they were born, because the richness of Uganda has always attracted immigrants. We have problems of unemployment, lack of trained technical workers, the need for social security, the utilisation by the unions of various forms of consumer education and, above all, the problem of educating our members in principles and methods of trade unionism. We are rushing into the twentieth century from the days of tribalism. We expect to learn from the mistakes as well as the successes of our fellow delegates and Members of the I.L.O. and through the wisdom and experience which this great Organisation has accumulated since the end of the First World War. I know these hopes will be fulfilled abundantly.

I have a special pride in bringing to your attention the important role played by the Unions of Public Employees in East Africa and particularly in Uganda, where I have been the General Secretary of the Uganda Public Employees Union for nearly three years. In many young countries like Uganda, government is the largest single employer. The Public Employees Union is often the pioneer of unionism in rural areas. We have the right to ask the governments, aided by the advice of the I.L.O., to be model employers in every respect, so that employers in the private sector can follow.

Mr. HAFIZULLAH (Government delegate, Afghanistan)—First of all, at this very late hour of the sitting, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Afghanistan delegation, on your being elected as President of the present session of the Conference.

Afghanistan acquired membership in the International Labour Organisation in 1934 with full confidence in the high aims of that Organisation. We believe that the I.L.O., since its inception, has taken great steps towards the goal of promoting peace through social justice. While our country has benefited from its membership in the Organisation and from technical assistance in related fields, it has never withheld its sincere co-operation for the attainment of the objectives as far as its means permitted.
While we appreciate the great services that this world Organisation has rendered to human beings in the past by improving working conditions, promoting social justice and eliminating poverty, we hope that it will render better services for the peoples and nations of the world in the future.

We congratulate the Director-General and appreciate his task. He has devoted his Report to the problems relating to the structure and programme of the I.L.O. and has made useful suggestions on the desirability of changing, expanding and adapting its future programmes and activities to the world's changing situation. He draws the attention of the International Labour Conference to the important problems that need careful thought in order that, after an exchange of ideas, proper solutions may be found.

We share in the Director-General's view that "the I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history, at one of those points where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action. Such an opportunity now presented by historical circumstances can be realised only through the concerted wills of the I.L.O.'s membership. It requires common agreement on basic objectives; a clear sense of priorities; and the adjustment of the I.L.O.'s methods and of its means to the changing world situation."

In our opinion, common agreement on basic objectives, observation of the principle of priorities and a clear sense thereof, are not only useful, but essential. We, in Afghanistan, are following these principles in the implementation of our national development plans. The lack of balance between the goals to be achieved and the means at our disposal compels us to do so. Since the means of the I.L.O. do not permit it to attain all aims and objectives at the same time, it is therefore necessary that it consider the most important goals first and adjust its means and methods to the world's changing situation.

Afghanistan, as a developing country, notes with great interest the important point mentioned by the Director-General in his Report about the division between north and south, i.e. the division between the industrialised countries who enjoy a relatively high level of income and the developing countries in which income is very low. It is therefore desirable that international co-operation exist and be created between these two categories to eliminate poverty from the world.

In his Report the Director-General suggested that in the future the programme and working methods of the Organisation be adjusted to consider the above points. This is promising and encouraging to the people belonging to the latter category, who have big tasks in developing the economies of their countries and retaining higher standards of living and social well-being. The I.L.O.'s commitment to peace and freedom is the important subject in the Director-General's Report—this has attracted our attention.

Afghanistan is a peace-loving country and follows the traditional positive policy of impartiality and non-alignment. We are in full agreement with the Director-General's view that "the I.L.O. should explore all possibilities of promoting fuller international co-operation towards the solution of social and labour problems common to industrialised nations whatever their political or philosophical complexities". This co-operation will be useful for the well-being of the work force which constitutes the backbone of the developing countries.

We are also aware of the need felt in countries at the same stage of development for technical and financial aid from industrialised nations. I would like to add that, in this connection, the technical and financial resources of these countries are not sufficient to cope with even the most urgent needs. However, they must rely on such assistance. Afghanistan has benefited a great deal from economic assistance received from industrialised countries in the implementation of its development plans. It has to rely on such co-operation and hopes, as Mr. Morse expressed in his Report, that this assistance will be more effectively encouraged in the future.

The obligation that the I.L.O.'s commitment to freedom implies gives effect to three basic principles of universal value, which have been widely recognised in our country. They are freedom of labour, freedom of association and the privacy of social objectives. All laws in Afghanistan recognise the principle of free choice of employment. In practice, the actions which endanger this freedom are prevented.

The Government of Afghanistan, while making every effort towards the material well-being of its people through the implementation of economic plans, is also conscious of the fact that economic progress requires a balanced development in other fields of social life. Effective steps have recently been taken to achieve these objectives.

Introducing basic reforms in the administration of the country with a view to further implementation of democratic principles constitutes the policy of the new Government. One of these aims, pointed out by the Prime Minister of Afghanistan in his speech outlining his Government's policy, is social welfare. This offers the people a greater share in social and civic affairs and in the formulation of laws which would maintain social justice and the rights and security of each individual.

According to this policy, beneficial and constructive steps have already been taken to raise the standard of living of the people through the implementation of economic plans; in addition, measures have been taken to revise the Constitution of the country.

We believe that with the application of the above the freedoms that the Director-General has pointed out will be established and ensured. I have the pleasure of informing the Conference on this occasion that the study of the draft of our new Labour Law has been completed by the assigned committees. This Bill incorporates the right of freedom of association and provides better working conditions for people of the country. It will be submitted to the Parliament of the country for approval and enactment. With the passing of this law, freedom of labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining will not only be recognised but encouraged. On this occasion, I would like
to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the I.L.O., which provided technical assistance in this respect. We hope that the I.L.O. will also provide us with technical assistance in the application and administration of the new law.

We must mention the fact that the people of Afghanistan do not have sufficient experience in organising and administering worker and employer organisations. Furthermore, as Mr. Morse pointed out in his Report, industries in Afghanistan, as in many other developing countries, are mostly developed by the Government. Those parts are owned and directly controlled by the Government. In order that such establishments may function properly, both assistance by qualified specialists and instruction in vocational and technical training are essential. Consequently, the co-operation of the I.L.O. becomes more important. Accordingly, we would like to express our full agreement with the Director-General's opinion that in drawing up future programmes this problem should be given full consideration. We have in mind the five general factors recommended by the Director-General as the bases in establishing social policies. In Afghanistan, we will try to follow these factors as far as possible. We are aware of the importance of international instruments concerning human rights.

The Constitution of Afghanistan strictly prohibits forced labour. According to our constitutional requirements, the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, adopted by the Conference, at its 1957 Session, has been ratified lately by the Afghan authorities. For the vast majority of the rural population, Afghanistan is relying on planned rural development, which has already achieved useful results in the improvement of both the social and economic welfare of rural people. We appreciate the work which the I.L.O. and other international organisations have done in this field, and the assistance they have rendered to Afghanistan.

Afghanistan not only shares the fate of other developing countries in lacking the physical equipment for modern production but also suffers from a deficiency in statistics relating to labour, wages, productivity, levels of skills, etc. We are conscious of the distance we must cover in creating higher levels of productive employment and in improving the quality of our labour force by providing appropriate vocational guidance. Later, we must offer vocational education and training to the young people who receive guidance.

We are grateful to the I.L.O. for providing the technical assistance which has enabled us to collect employment market information in some of the urban areas of Afghanistan. We hope to collect such information in all urban employment markets as well as in the rural areas in the not-too-distant future. It is hoped that the long-felt need for accurate data on population will be fulfilled in the near future, when a population census will be taken in Kabul and other urban areas.

Serious efforts are being made to organise our employment market. We have already opened an employment office in Kabul and hope to expand this service shortly. We have begun to prepare a national standard classification of occupations using the international classification as a guide. We are attempting to identify the key categories of manpower needed to fulfil economic development projects and to assess skill deficiencies and type of supplementary training required by the workers.

Additional employment has been an objective of our economic development. This aspect of planning is receiving ever-increasing attention.

As has been very correctly pointed out by the Director-General in his Report, availability of adequately trained skilled workers is a cornerstone in bringing about economic independence in the developing countries. My country is very conscious of this. We are trying to make more and more facilities available to the people for higher technological, scientific and general education and training. Consequently, more faculties are being opened at Kabul University and more students are being admitted. In fact a new university has been established in Jalalabad. We are sending our scholars and workers to foreign countries to receive training and are importing foreign experts in large numbers in order to make up the deficiency of skill and experience in the country. In the field of training of industrial workers, we have depended mostly upon "on-the-job" training. During the past year we have trained a great number of industrial workers by this method in some of our major projects. However, we realise the importance of institutional training and have not neglected this aspect. Besides expanding the existing institutions, we intend to open three engineering schools and one polytechnic within the current Five-Year Plan. None the less, the main source is "on-the-job" training. We still have a good deal to do in developing our training potential, particularly with regard to supervisors and instructors. The technical assistance rendered by the I.L.O. in this field, however, has not been sufficient.

We have noted the studies that were made by the Director-General in his Report regarding incomes in developing and industrialised countries.

We join in the Director-General's view that an equitable distribution of income in the less developed countries is a criterion which is not easy to apply. Therefore we deem it necessary for the people of these countries to sacrifice a part of their immediate benefits and gain in income for the sustained economic growth of the country and well-being of future generations.

We favour the Director-General's suggestions that the I.L.O. should increase its activities and advise governments in the field of income according to the principle of tripartite discussion. Also we would heartily welcome the consideration of this subject by the Conference at a forthcoming session in order to reach a Recommendation. We hope to use such an instrument as a guide for our national policy.

We are sure that the increased activities of the I.L.O. in all these fields mentioned by the Director-General in his Report will be a great step towards strengthening peace and promoting social justice in the world.

(The Conference adjourned at 6 p.m.)
ReSFORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL:
DISCUSSION (cont.)

The PRESIDENT—We now resume discussion of the Report of the Director-General.

1 Interpretation from French : Mr. ACHOUR (Workers' delegate, Tunisia)—It is a great honour for me to speak at the International Labour Conference in the name of the workers of Tunisia. Permit me, Mr. President, to express to you in the name of the workers of my country and in my own name our congratulations on your election to the Chair of this 47th Session of the Conference. I am sure that, with your advice and guidance, we shall continue our march towards establishing social justice in the world and the preservation of human dignity.

The agenda of this session makes it one of the most important yet held by the Organisation. It may be compared with the 26th Session of the Conference (Philadelphia, 1944), which defined the great principles from which we draw our inspiration and which have hitherto guided the activities of the I.L.O. This session is important because we are today discussing, between Government, Employer and Worker representatives, fundamental problems for which we must find solutions, or at least define policies. As Mr. Morse has said, "the I.L.O. is at one of the critical points in its history, at one of those points where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action".

Thanks to the efforts of the Director-General and his tireless devotion to the I.L.O., for which we must pay him a sincere and well-merited tribute, our Organisation has made a great contribution to the achievement of social peace and the search for the best ways of building a better world.

I should like from this rostrum to pay tribute to the remarkable Report which the Director-General has placed before us and which we have read with keen interest. In addition to bringing out on balance the favourable results of past work and experience, it gives us an opportunity to examine the "problems and opportunities of the Organisation as an influence on social policy throughout the world ".

The Report gives an analysis of economic, political and social currents which agitate the world of today. It highlights social questions in their relationship to problems of economic development and expansion, and it indicates the Organisation's possibilities of action in the framework of the United Nations Development Decade in which the I.L.O. has undertaken to co-operate actively.

Mr. Morse indicates the problems, and proposes for meditation, discussion and criticism solutions which debate may render constructive. The I.L.O., on the basis of respect for the fundamental rights of man, may indeed study all the possibilities of promoting better international co-operation for the solution of the social problems common to industrialised countries. Our Organisation can and may help to bring about conditions favourable to more effective co-operation between industrialised countries. This collaboration must have as its objective economic development and the promotion of mankind.

Whereas in international policy people speak mostly of the East and the West, there is a second economic division, between the North and the South. This places on the one side the highly industrialised countries for which economic development raises problems such as incomes policy and precautions to be taken to face the consequences of automation and economic progress, and on the other side the non-industrialised countries with low incomes, most of which have a colonial past which has kept them in a state of underdevelopment, calling for the aid and interest of the United Nations family.

In my own country the first tasks which the national Government has attacked are economic planning and cultural reform corresponding to the aspirations of the working class.

In his inaugural declaration at the head of the first national Government of independent Tunisia in April 1956 President Bourguiba placed the idea of planning at the head of his programme of economic and social action. He stated: "We are not improvising; our work will be part of a general plan with a precise objective and means whose details are well-defined and will follow a strict calendar."

Planning in my country has four objectives which it regards as fundamental. First of all, to decolonise in order to make the Tunisian economy a national economy; secondly, to train our men and women in order that each Tunisian may be prepared for participation in the collective effort of national development with equal chances of success, in order to flourish
in the new society which we wish to create; thirdly, to reform our institutions so that economic power is placed on a democratic and popular basis and so that we can struggle to redress the various imbalances characteristic of underdeveloped economies; lastly, to free the Tunisian economy from its dependence on foreign countries with a view to achieving self-development.

Before we launched our long-term plan it seemed necessary to establish a three-year preliminary plan, which started off in 1962. The objective is to prepare the infrastructure of our economy by various preliminary reforms in essential fields such as education, agriculture, industry, handicrafts, commerce, taxation, social security, vocational training, etc. During its preparation the preliminary plan was subjected to examination and discussion by the national organisations, the Economic and Social Council and finally Parliament.

The Tunisian General Labour Union has been called upon from the start to co-operate fully in this preliminary plan in defining the policies and objectives of our planning.

To be successful we believe that planning must above all be democratic, i.e. the fruit of broad consultation, and be aimed at promoting mankind and defending its freedoms by restoring human dignity and social justice.

Our preliminary plan has already in the course of one year given results which deserve mention. Ninety thousand new jobs have been created and have absorbed a mass of unemployed who were previously employed on development work sites and are now subject to the general conditions of agricultural workers with all that this represents in terms of social protection and benefit.

With a view to structural preparation for achievement of the economic and social objectives which the Tunisian people has set itself, we have taken two important legislative measures in the social field. One is the establishment of a social security scheme providing family allowances, sickness and maternity benefits, survivors' benefit, hospitalisation and free treatment, supplemented by a blanket Act introducing the principle of invalidity and old-age benefit. A second Act provides for the organisation of labour relations within the undertaking; this sets up work councils which co-operate with the management to improve the condition of work, life and education of the personnel.

In order to accustom workers to an economic approach to their employment, the works council is consulted on questions concerning the undertaking, so that it may be gradually associated in management and development.

My organisation, conscious of the big contribution it can make to achieving economic objectives with beneficial results, has actively co-operated in studies to improve the lot of the worker. It has, in its own framework, established a big co-operative movement ranging from consumer co-operatives to production and service co-operatives. The establishment of a people's bank and of an insurance co-operative is now being studied.

I may point out also that the Tunisian General Labour Union has supported the creation of workers' housing centres, housing co-operatives, rest homes and holiday settlements, and also participates in recreational, artistic and sporting activities. My organisation has also dealt seriously with the question of union leaders. It has established a central training school at Tunis and regional schools in each provincial capital.

We think that the trade unions in developing countries have a part to play which is not the same as in the developed countries. If we are still firmly attached to the general principles of free trade unionism we should, while carrying on our daily struggle, supplement this by promoting and preparing the workers for the new responsibilities arising out of the application of planning and structural reform.

Therefore, we who have the experience of preparing and initiating planning appreciate all the valuable advice which we receive in the Director-General's Report; in its first part, but we would like to stress that if, for the operation of planning, co-operation between the authorities and trade union organisations is necessary and indeed indispensable, it must be based on mutual respect and safeguard of the independence and freedom of action of the trade union movement.

We are particularly aware of the importance of action to strengthen the trade unions and define labour relations. We think that the strengthening of the trade unions in the developing countries raises one particularly important problem. It is a problem the solution of which cannot be found save by the national unions themselves, for frankly we do not see how the I.L.O. can respect the independence of the trade unions if it uses in its relations with them governmental intermediaries and has to obtain governmental consent. In our opinion, the activities of the I.L.O. should deal with relations between the employers and workers, trade union and social legislation, workers' education and the training of higher officers.

The Director-General proposes that we examine the possibilities of replacing the Credentials Committee by an independent judicial body. In our opinion, the Credentials Committee, despite the difficulties which it meets every year, is necessary and of great importance. There are difficulties, but their cause lies outside the control of its members and has nothing to do with the membership of any Employer or Worker delegate in an international trade union federation.

We think that the change proposed is not justified and to take a decision of this kind would mean depriving the Conference of one of its most important prerogatives. We question tripartism, the very basis of our Organisation.

As regards regional conferences, my delegation considers that it would be a good thing to encourage and develop this practice. The conferences have been organised with the support of the I.L.O. external services and have been tested over many years. As the Director-General says on page 133 of his Report, they have been an "appropriate means of action in our work at different stages and for different purposes". We think that the multiplication of external services by an extension of the branch offices and an increase in National Correspondents may be very useful in develop-
ing technical assistance activities in the various fields of action of the I.L.O.

The field offices are also important in this practical work of the I.L.O. In Africa there are two field offices at Lagos and Dar-es-Salaam. We think that a third field office should be established in Africa. This would be in a French-speaking country so that there may be easy contact between the field office and the countries with which it is to co-operate.

In conclusion I should like again to compliment the Director-General on his constant activity in the service of progress and social justice. I should like from this platform to express the hope that the work of this Conference will foreshadow for our Organisation further achievement complementing that of the past and adjusted to a developing world, through the seeking of effective means of overcoming hunger, suffering, violence, injustice and poverty and strengthening freedom, democracy and progress.

Mr. MISHIRO (Employers' delegate, Japan) —Expressing my sincere appreciation of the Report of the Director-General, which is excellent as usual, I shall first make some remarks about the role of the Conference. During the early stages, when the I.L.O. was to all intents and purposes an organisation of the European countries, the Conference itself might have been able to function rather reasonably as a standard-setting body on a genuine tripartite basis, with a background of homogeneity in social, political and economic structure among European countries. Even at that stage, however, it can hardly be said that the standard-setting was completely successful, because of the fact that some Conventions have not yet been ratified, even by some European countries whose responsible delegates voted in favour of them. Since many non-European countries were admitted later, European homogeneity has been gradually replaced by global diversity in the I.L.O. This fundamental change has not only reduced most of the international instruments so far adopted to mere slogans of little practical value to most of the new member States but has also gradually corroded the integrity of tripartism, with the result of damaging group autonomy and bringing about practical imbalance in voting power among the three groups. Furthermore, it has accentuated the atmosphere of irresponsibility, hypocrisy, vanity and even demagogy in the discussion and adoption of international instruments, which have eventually been losing prestige more and more. It seems to us to be unnecessary, for many years to come, to create new international instruments, because even the existing ones are too many for most member States.

I must confess, therefore, that the Japanese employers have serious doubts whether, in view of present conditions, the Conference might not be wasting a tremendous amount of money and time which might be better spent in constructive activity.

These are the main reasons why we propose the reformation of the I.L.O. from a standard-setting body to a service organisation. In other words we support the suggestion that the I.L.O. should now reduce the function, the periodicity and the length of the session of the Conference, and instead expand other services to member States, such as the carrying out of research and the provision of education, publications and technical assistance. If these suggestions were adopted and put into practice they would easily save abundant resources on the part both of the member States and of the I.L.O. and thereby could solve the serious financial problems which confront the Governing Body of the I.L.O. concerning several educational institutions such as the International Centre for Advanced Training, in Furin, the International Institute for Labour Studies, the International Vocational Training Information and Research Centre.

Now I wish to touch upon regional conferences and some other points.

With the resources economised by streamlining the General Conference, standing Industrial Committees and regional conferences could and should be strengthened, not for adopting specific industrial or regional instruments but for the exchange of views, experience and information or for reviewing the arrangements for technical assistance in the region concerned or in each specific industry. In particular, the periodicity of regional conferences should be increased in order to maintain continuity in discussion and in representation. However, if the importance of regional conferences is really recognised, the government of each member State should be strongly urged and encouraged in some way or other to send a tripartite delegation. As a matter of fact, at the last regional conference we regretted the considerable absenteeism or the sending of incomplete delegations on the part of several Asian countries proper, while non-Asian countries were overwhelmingly represented. On the other hand, the I.L.O. should not leave any part of the world out of any regional conference. In this respect I am expecting that something will come of the examination by the Director-General mentioned on page 183 of the English version of his Report.

With reference to the decentralisation of I.L.O. activities, I should like to make a few remarks on specific points. First, I fully endorse the suggestion by the Director-General mentioned on page 187 of his Report to the effect that consideration might be given to additional means of ensuring effective coordination of the I.L.O.'s regional activities with those of other members of the United Nations family. Secondly, the I.L.O. should in future refrain from taking up any problems pertinent only to the advanced regions or areas until such time as other less advanced regions have developed their social standards nearer to the level of other regions; otherwise it will be difficult to narrow down the discrepancy between the regions. This idea does not imply the immediate geographical redistribution of the staff of the International Labour Office, which has so often been advocated by the various regions. Theoretically it may be desirable, but the Office as such the business organisations would need efficiency in its operation. For this reason, drastic redistribution is not practical or desirable for the time being. What the Office must avoid as much as possible is the partiality or bias which might arise due to the predominance
in the Office of staff of a particular nationality or from a particular region.

So far I have pointed out only a few of the many problems which other speakers may have taken up already, or will do. Anyhow, I would urge in conclusion that a complete overhaul of the I.L.O. would result in a drastic change and make it better able to cope satisfactorily with a critical stage in its history.

Mr. BERGENSTRÖM (Employers' delegate, Sweden)—Mr. President, the Danish, Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish Employers, on whose behalf I speak, have read the Report to this year's Conference with great interest. We wish to commend the Director-General for the paper, which seems to be a most useful basis for discussion and subsequent action.

May I first make some comments on Part I of the Report. It is proposed that the I.L.O. should embark on four major comprehensive programmes, summarised on page 201 of the Report. These programmes would cover all fields of activity and all means of action of the I.L.O. The attitudes towards the different major fields may differ but, generally speaking, the Director-General's approach appears to be a realistic one and to enable the Organisation both to concentrate on priority areas and to cut out obsolete or less urgent programmes and activities.

In the present world situation, where the gap between the rich and the poor is seriously widening, the over-all priority within the I.L.O. must be given to activities aiming at redressing the situation of the developing countries.

Commenting first on Chapter II of the Report, concerning human resources and economic development, I would like to stress that the Scandinavian Employers, while expressing some doubt as to the emphasis on planning and programming, fully support the idea of intensifying I.L.O. activities in the vocational training field, which for reasons explained in the Report, deserves highest priority. As to the manpower planning aspect, we are concerned about the explosive population growth in many parts of the world. We would urge the Director-General to consider most seriously ways and means by which the I.L.O. could bring some relief in the present situation where population often grows faster than industrial output.

With regard to Chapter III, dealing with incomes, the Scandinavian Employers concur in the view expressed the other day in this debate, that the I.L.O. must never intrude directly in matters of wage fixing or related matters in the various countries. It is, by the way, particularly important to ensure that wage increases, social policy and raising incomes in general do not hamper productivity development and economic growth, without which no social progress is possible. Account must be taken of the need to stimulate savings and investments, and of the inflationary impact of excessive wage increases. We concur in the view that regard must be had to long-term perspectives in the elaboration of policies. At the same time policies must necessarily be framed in such a way as to protect and promote the freedom and responsibility of the parties in the labour market.

We are aware of the fact that other organisations, and particularly the O.E.C.D., are concerned with questions of productivity and economic growth. The I.L.O. should not duplicate their work but may well take advantage of their studies in so far as they concern matters of interest to our Organisation.

With reference to Chapter IV of the Report—concerning trade unions and labour relations—the Scandinavian Employers wish to have it recorded that we support the suggested programmes for furtherance of labour-management relations. If a country cannot under such circumstances apply a Convention, then it should quite simply be our primary concern. The Office may, however, play a useful role in collecting and spreading strictly objective and unbiased information on conditions of workers.

I now turn to a question of great concern to the Scandinavian Employers. I refer to the problem of the legal effects of international labour Conventions and their ratification. There has been a tendency in recent years to consider that ratified Conventions could be interpreted differently in different countries just because the prevailing conditions vary. Of course there are cases in which an instrument provides for flexibility in the implementation, but that is not the matter that worries us. We what we want to stress is that, if I.L.O. standards are to have any meaning they must be truly international, and this implies identical interpretation everywhere, whether the instruments are framed in a flexible manner or not. If a country cannot under such circumstances apply a Convention, then it should quite simply abstain from ratification. I may add that we are particularly concerned about the strict interpretation of the I.L.O. fundamental human rights Conventions, those concerning freedom of association and the prohibition of discrimination and forced labour.
The difficulties experienced in the application of Conventions should be a reminder to the delegates to the Conference that they vote only in favour of instruments the letter and spirit of which they can implement within the near future.

I now come to the technical assistance activities. As is well known, we are very anxious to see them expanded. By the way, it is gratifying to note the increasing trend towards long-term projects and the efforts to achieve efficient co-ordination within the United Nations family. We feel, however, that more efforts should be made within the I.L.O. to strengthen, in the Governing Body and in the countries where projects are carried out, the tripartite approach to the planning, execution and supervision of technical assistance activities.

Generally speaking proposals for further action in the field of standard-setting are scarce in Part I of the Report. Emphasis is laid rather on research and informational activities. This is a practical and realistic approach. The problems facing the world of today are complex and intricate, and it would generally not be possible to find solutions by means of rigid international standards, stipulating legal obligations. The Director-General rightly points out that flexible recommendations containing general guidelines for national action often appear to be preferable. General discussions would also in many cases seem useful to provide for a confrontation of experiences at this International Labour Conference and within the framework of other tripartite or expert meetings.

Considering the aggregate of I.L.O. activities, I should like to stress again the necessity of establishing firm priorities in the programming. We should bear in mind that the contributions from the member States must be kept at a reasonable level and that the lack of duly qualified experts constitutes a bottleneck which cannot be overlooked.

I would now like to comment on a few formal questions. The Director-General has proposed — and we agree with him — that some older Conventions could be deleted altogether. This could without much difficulty be achieved through a simplified procedure, perhaps channelled through the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. It is furthermore proposed that a considerable number of older Conventions be partly or thoroughly revised. For this second task, it is suggested that new procedures be instituted. The Director-General seems to believe that revision of older Conventions could be achieved as a rather formal and painless matter. On this point, the Scandinavian Employers, bearing the experiences of last year's Conference in mind, in no way share the Director-General's expectation. On the contrary, we believe that modernisation of outdated instruments may well be as painstaking as providing for new standards, and we therefore would not agree to the suggested amendment of the present revision procedure. By the way, we are of the opinion that higher priority should be given to the revision of the present International Labour Code than to the elaboration of standards in new fields. Perhaps a moratorium of standard-setting as to new questions should be provided for.

I have also another remark on the functioning of the Conference. We wholeheartedly agree with the Director-General when he strongly and convincingly urges the delegates to avoid in their interventions all questions of a politically controversial nature, which disturb the orderly procedure and prevent us from dealing in an unbiased atmosphere with the many important social questions for the solution of which we have travelled the long way to Geneva.

It should finally be recorded that the free Employers consider it to be clearly inappropria-te, in any organisation of the magnitude and complexity of the I.L.O., to transfer administrative, financial, legal or other powers from the Governing Body to the highest deliberative organ. In the case of the I.L.O., the Conference can meet only at long intervals and it is already overloaded. On the other hand, the Governing Body, gathering more frequently, is largely representative of the I.L.O. membership and has acquired a remarkable competence in administrative and similar matters. But the Conference could appropriately be better informed of the work of the Governing Body. It would, therefore, be highly desirable that the present time-lag in the presentation of the Governing Body minutes as a matter of urgency should be overcame. Those minutes could then be suitably distributed to the delegates to the Conference for information.

Interpretation from French: Mr. KIKHOUNGA NGOT (Government delegate, Congo (Brazzaville)) — I feel moved and happy, for very good reasons, as I, in turn, address a world audience from this rostrum. My feelings are dictated by the outstanding place which Africa has been recognised to hold throughout this year. The solidarity of the African peoples expressed in such lofty terms in Addis Ababa has been reasserted in the International Labour Conference with the active and generous support of a very large number of countries.

It is therefore my duty, a pleasant duty of solidarity, to congratulate the Right Honourable Minister of Labour of the great country of Nigeria on his election to the presidency of the Conference. It is with equal satisfaction that I welcome the election to the Chair of the group of Government representatives Mr. Camille Gris, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs of the Ivory Coast.

This warm and living feeling of brotherhood amongst the peoples of Africa is bound to make us urge those under the administration of States which refuse to recognise their most fundamental aspirations should be promoted to complete independence, that is to say, national sovereignty, freedom and dignity.

In his remarkable Report the Director-General rightly stresses the decisive importance of the great principles of freedom: freedom to work, freedom of association, freedom of expression. But one should also mention unceasingly and without fear political freedom, which is, after all, the only framework that can assure the advancement of the individual and respect for the rights of man. Resolutions relating to this subject, therefore, cannot be re-
arded as unconnected with the social objectives of the International Labour Organisation, and to establish such things as are making with my colleagues of Africa and of many other countries, for the granting of independence to the peoples of our continent who are still subject to foreign rule is made in a just cause, countries, for the granting of independence to for our country, which is happy to have preserved the most constructive relations with France, which strictly respects its independence. Never have international gatherings been as active and as necessary as they are now, owing to the breakneck speed of technical development, the material strength of the great powers, the conflict of ideologies and systems, and the growing awareness of the aspirations and problems of countries in course of development. It could also be said that never has so much attention had to be devoted to assuring that the scope of these problems will not be too great for effective discussion. This effectiveness calls first of all for fair representation. The Congo therefore ratified the amendment to raise from 40 to 48 the number of members of the Governing Body, in order, in particular, to admit a larger number of African States. I therefore especially welcome the fact that this amendment has been decided by more than the required two-thirds majority of member States. Similarly, we desire, as suggested by the Director-General in his Report, that the regionalisation of the work of the Organisation should be methodically pursued on the basis of existing machinery, namely the African Regional Conference and the African Advisory Committee. We also approve of the strengthening of the field offices, and we regard that suggestion as an additional reason for advocating the opening of a new centre in the French-speaking part of Africa. While we have many special problems, we should not shut ourselves up in a narrow regionalism. Over the ages Africa has suffered too much from its isolation to be insensitive to what is now happening in the rest of the world. We too have material and intellectual contributions to make, and can do so only if there is more scope for international exchange. Such exchange will be all the more fruitful if it is freely established with modern economies in a peaceful atmosphere. I therefore warmly support the Director-General’s views when he calls in his Report for the establishment among the African leaders and labour administrators. We particularly welcome this activity, which is carried on without difficulty within the legal framework of sound labour-management relations in my country. I have spoken as I have in the belief that I was addressing myself to the tasks of the Organisation, which aims at becoming increasingly effective, as it should, in this modern world, where the main concern is to secure steadily improving conditions for all people in all countries. 

Interpretation from Hungarian: Mr. MEKIS (Government delegate, Hungary)—It is a great pleasure for us to greet Mr. Johnson, Federal Minister of Labour of Nigeria, in his high office as President of this Conference. The fact that for the first time in the Organisation’s history the President of the Conference is a representative of an African State may be considered an encouraging sign that the Organisation will reflect more and more in many other respects the changes that have taken place in the world. The Government of the Hungarian People’s Republic is glad to see that the Director-General of the International Labour Office has chosen as the subject of his Report to this year’s Conference the problems of adjusting the Organisation to the requirements of our age. Undoubtedly this is a timely topic and the Organisation, if it wishes to keep pace with the major currents of world affairs and if it wishes to fulfill its great mission, must adjust its programme and structure to the changing world. The Report of the Director-General points out that world affairs today are characterised economic development they reflect, their profitability, and the training and education needed by those who engage in this work, are among our key problems. It should be noted that only quite incidentally do these problems call for assistance from experts who come out on brief missions. In many cases we have carried out enough research and have sufficient information, and only in exceptional cases do we need more. Our development plan has already been prepared, and we now need money to carry it out. Our budgets have this common feature: we have heavy administrative expenses and cannot invest enough. The assistance we need most, that which best meets our needs, is that which directly and immediately lightens the burden of our administrative expenses and increases our investment resources, while leading to the improvement of our productive capacity. I should therefore like the International Labour Office to concern itself less with the elaboration of new schemes than with support for existing social programmes with regard to wage earners, the peasantry, education and vocational training, and to provide us with technicians, instructors and equipment. In this connection the Director-General is quite right in noting in his Report that the International Labour Organisation now devotes most of its attention to social questions that bear the closest relation to the problems of economic development. This applies, for example, to the training of workers, trade union leaders and labour administrators. We particularly welcome this activity, which is carried on without difficulty within the legal framework of sound labour-management relations in my country.
by two developments of great significance: “the consolidation, in the Soviet Union, of a centrally planned economy and the beginnings of the anti-colonial revolution.” The Report also states that: “The system of centrally planned economies now extends beyond the Soviet Union, to include other countries of Eastern Europe and Asia, and Cuba.” This makes it clear that the socialist economic system has become a world system.

We have to agree fully with this characterisation. It is owing to these two developments of universal importance that there exist in the world today three large groups of States: capitalist countries, socialist countries and countries having liberated themselves from colonial oppression and now going their way of independent development. The existence of these three groups is an objective factor which must be reckoned with in the readjustment of the I.L.O.’s programme and structure if we want this long-standing Organisation to discharge its present increasing tasks.

The Report of the Director-General points to the unprecedentedly rapid technical and scientific development of the past few years. This development can also be traced in the sciences of war, wherein the weapons of mass destruction have reached such perfection that a world war in our time would be tantamount to the annihilation of a large part of mankind. It is understandable, then, that the preservation of peace has today become the foremost demand of the working people. Our Government therefore gives its full approval and support to what the Director-General states in connection with the events of last October, giving it as his view that: “We may hope that this proximity to catastrophe has been a turning point in world affairs and that it may lead to steps towards . . . forms of collaboration amongst the industrialised powers of East and West for the solution of problems which transcend their ideological differences.”

It appears from the foregoing that the only realistic policy possible in such conditions is the policy of peaceful coexistence, which starts from the fact that competing systems exist side by side and presupposes the settlement of disputed questions by way of negotiation. Our Government is of the opinion that this policy must be the basic principle in the activities of the International Labour Organisation too. And this does not preclude a confrontation of views and ideologies. We think such debates are useful and even necessary because they help us to formulate reasonable social and economic policies which are not so great as those of numerous larger and richer countries. We feel it our duty, however, to do our best to contribute to the lofty cause of progress, and we are therefore prepared to share our experiences with other countries at any time. In our opinion the International Labour Organisation has by no means exhausted the possibilities existing in this field, and in the programme for the next period it should make greater efforts to this end. Secondly, the programme of the International Labour Organisation should lend greater emphasis to the provision of assistance in the solution of the problems of countries in course of development. In this connection I wish to refer to the resolution adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 1961 Session concerning the eradication of the adverse consequences of colonialism. We are of the opinion that this resolution touches upon many such problems of high significance that should in the future receive greater emphasis in the programme of the I.L.O.

Before coming to the basic points of the Report of the Director-General dealing with the structure of the Organisation, I should like to express the Government’s opinion in connection with two questions. The first relates to the resolutions procedure. There is no doubt that the number of resolutions has increased considerably in the course of the last few years, and this adds to the burdens weighing upon the Resolutions Committee. This is a serious problem. But the solution suggested by the Report of the Director-General—that they be taken should be determined by a ballot without discussion, is certainly no real solution; it is no remedy, and it would only make matters worse. The right to submit resolutions has developed along with the growth of the Organisation. This right is also a safeguard committing governments, employers and workers of the countries which are not Members of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office and which have no way of exerting direct influence upon the shaping of the Conference agenda, to press for the discussion of various—to them highly important—matters upon submitting their own resolu-
tions. The procedure recommended in the Director-General's Report is fraught with the real dangers of the delegating the Conference of one of their fundamental rights, which is the right of initiative by submitting resolutions. On the basis of these considerations, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is unable to accept the proposed procedure.

The other point I wish to make is related to the credentials procedure. My Government is in agreement with the statement made in the Report that many a warranted objection was made to the work of the Credentials Committee. My Government also agrees with the opinion that the procedure of the Credentials Committee should be governed by the provisions of the Constitution of the I.L.O. What is wrong in the matter is accounted for, in our opinion, by the fact that in certain cases the Credentials Committee did not abide by the provisions of the Constitution—as is also stated in the Report—and made decisions by exceeding its powers and even by deliberately violating constitutional provisions. We cannot agree, however, with the conclusions drawn in the Report of the Director-General, namely that the defects can be eliminated only by setting up an independent sort of judicial body. By the way, the proposal fails to specify the composition of this body. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that the provisions of the Constitution and the Standing Orders concerning credentials procedure are clear-cut and unambiguous. There is no need to modify them, or to set up any new body. The solution should be for the Credentials Committee to abide by the provisions of the Constitution, not to go beyond its powers, and to submit its recommendations to the Conference in the spirit of the Constitution, without any bias.

Finally, I wish to expound the view of the Hungarian Government on the basic problems related to the structure of the Organisation.

The Director-General's Report states that "The Conference is the Grand Assize of international social policy. It fulfils in the International Labour Organisation a function generally similar to that of the General Assembly in the United Nations." I think it is hardly possible to give a better description of the function, place and role of the Conference within the International Labour Organisation. The Conference is in session for about four weeks a year, deliberating a large number of proposals. The debate is directed practically by the Governing Body. The Conference should fix its own agenda, and define clearly the functions of the main organs, the Standing Orders concerning credentials procedure are clear-cut and unambiguous. There is no need to modify them, or to set up any new body. The solution should be for the Credentials Committee to abide by the provisions of the Constitution, not to go beyond its powers, and to submit its recommendations to the Conference in the spirit of the Constitution, without any bias.
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Mr. WIIJEWICKEREMA (Government delegate, Ceylon)—Mr. President, let me on my behalf as the Ceylon Government delegate and on behalf of my country, Ceylon, offer you our warmest congratulations on your unanimous election to the high office of President of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. As the Ceylon Government delegate I consider it a proud privilege indeed to have been given this opportunity of addressing this august assembly, this society of nations.

As you indicated to us a little while ago, I propose to make my speech as short as possible, and I propose to make some general observations, nothing controversial. As you already know, my Minister has addressed you this week, and I have already touched on matters relating to Ceylon.

A number of items are on the agenda, and I sincerely hope that during the ensuing days our deliberations will be both constructive and fruitful.

My country, Ceylon, is a small country. It is popularly known as the "Pearl of the Indian Ocean", and back home we also call Ceylon "Shri Lanka". It is a small country, but nevertheless, in the recent past, has made significant contributions to lessening and easing world tension. Ever since it emerged from the colonial status to independence it has been associated with the I.L.O.—a period of 15 years, a considerable period—and with the establishment in Colombo of the Asian Field Office a few months ago, I am sure our association with the I.L.O. is bound to become stronger.

The I.L.O. is an instrument, a powerful instrument indeed, for action on world social and labour problems. The Director-General has placed before us his Report; it is a master-piece, and shows in what direction the I.L.O. programmes need development and what structural and procedural arrangements need to be changed in the context of changing world conditions. I must, however, emphasise that the effectiveness with which the I.L.O. can deliver its goods rests on a very favourable climate of world politics, and as Members of the I.L.O. a heavy responsibility rests on us to ensure the lessening of world tension and the promotion of international co-operation.

To my mind, the biggest problem in so far as Asian countries are concerned is the phenomenal growth of population. Economic development and social progress are not keeping pace with this growth. Even in little Ceylon the population today is 11 million, and, according to our demographic surveys, within the next 20 years we expect the population to double itself. Well, this is a most alarming situation and in its wake the problems are immense—unemployment, underemployment, lower living standards, housing problems. The Government of Ceylon is conscious of these problems, and every attempt has been made and is being made to solve these problems. Our economy is essentially agricultural. Nevertheless, we are attempting to diversify this economy. Our educational policies are being orientated. Large-scale and small-scale industrial projects have been undertaken, and we look forward to the I.L.O. for assistance on a larger measure than we have had in the past. In this connection I am proud to state that Ceylon labour is also conscious of its responsibilities. In community matters in the matter of sinking of village wells or road building, it would surprise you to hear that work has been offered on a free basis in this task of nation-building.

This is not a new movement in the East. I think the concept may be new to my friends from the European countries. This offer of free service is known in my language as "Shrama-dana" and it is in consonance and keeping with the Buddhist traditions of "Shri Lanka".

I do not propose to speak at length. I have taken very much to heart your advice, Mr. President, to keep within the allotted time.

Before I conclude my remarks may I reiterate that our concerted wills must be brought to bear in the solution of the problems of the elimination of unemployment and under-employment, the utilisation of manpower, the raising of living standards and the raising of levels of productivity. Let us, both rich and poor nations, wage relentlessly a war against all these social evils. As the President reminded us in his opening address, "poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere". I thank you for your indulgence in listening to me.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. PRIKHODKO (Employers' delegate, Ukraine)—In discussing the activities of the I.L.O., its programme, structure and methods of work, it is impossible to pass over the role of the groups represented in the Organisation. Unfortunately this question is not properly dealt with in the Report of the Director-General. If we want to solve social problems satisfactorily, both generally and through the I.L.O. in particular, it is necessary to concert the action of governments, employers and trade unions. At the same time each group has its own terms of reference, its area of influence and its share of responsibility.

It is natural that there are certain specific areas in which decisions depend largely on the employers: take such problems, for example, as employment, technical progress, technical assistance to developing countries, or conditions of work.

I should like to dwell in this connection on the status of the Employers in the I.L.O. First of all, I should like to speak about discrimination. One cannot overlook the fact that many capitalist employers, especially those from a number of Western countries, are fairly prone to this disease. Discrimination appears not only in their own undertakings, where the attitude to a worker often depends on sex or on the colour of his skin, but also here inside the walls of this Organisation. After all, right under the temporary majority of the Employers' group has attempted to prevent the leaders of socialist undertakings from participating in the work of the committees of the
Conference with the right to vote, opposing
their legitimate right to proportionate repre-
sentation in the leading bodies of the I.L.O.
It has been said that if the multiplication
number of delegates determined by the I.L.O.
the successful and unprecedented economic
development and technical progress of the
socialist countries (including Ukraine) are
a thorn in the flesh of the champions of
capitalism. A peculiar colour-blindness seems
to affect these persons and make them in-
capable of sober discussion and logical action.
This is nothing recent; in fact, it has become
hereditary and chronic. This can be seen
specifically from the remarks of the Argentine
Employers’ representative, which have for
many years failed to shine with originality
or fresh thinking. Repeating the words of
others, he made out that there were no
trade unions or employers in our country;
but that did not cause them to cease existing
and participate most actively in building a
new communist society. Do the Employers
from the Western countries really think that
member States will continue to reconcile them-
seves to this blatant injustice which has be-
come an unwritten law of the jungle for those
eager to maintain in the I.L.O. the colonialis-
system! We are living in the twentieth cen-
tury, not in the eighteenth. They do not seem
to want to give up their places on the Govern-
ring Body or elsewhere to somebody else. But
I would say to Mr. Waline, Mr. Bergenström
and others that a seat in the Governing Body
is not a hereditary throne.

The Director-General rightly points out in
his Report that protection of the rights of
delegates who are managers of socialist under-
takings through the procedure of recourse to
the Appeals Board is merely experimental, and
he expresses readiness to try out any other
system. The most reasonable and most just
from our point of view would be to establish
such a procedure as would guarantee inside the
Organisation equal treatment for all delegations
to the Conference without exception. This
problem should be settled now, when the Con-
ference is discussing concrete proposals and
when decisions will be taken regarding the
adaptation of the structure and methods of
work of the I.L.O. to contemporary conditions.
These contemporary conditions are such that
the socialist countries account for one-third of
the total population of the globe and 37 per
cent. of total world industrial output. That
cannot be ignored. Can one regard it as normal
that on the Governing Body there is no re-
presentation for the managers of undertakings
from countries accounting for one-third of the
total population of the globe? This must be altered if the I.L.O. wishes to keep pace with
the times.

As early as 1946, at the Conference which
dealt with constitutional matters, one delegate,
referring to representation in the I.L.O. of
managers of socialist undertakings, rightly
pointed out that, whether one liked it or not,
if one refused to consider changing the method
of representation in the I.L.O., an Organisation
which had then existed for a quarter of a cen-
tury, the impression arose that the Organisation
was incapable of breaking away from the rut
into which it had been forced and that it was
turning its back on the realities of our times.
The 17 years that have elapsed since then have
fully confirmed that viewpoint.

That is why I fully support the memorandum
of the Soviet delegation relating to the pro-
gramme of activities and structure of the
I.L.O., in which it is rightly pointed out that
a successful solution of serious social problems
will only be possible if the structure and me-
ths of work of the I.L.O. are made more demo-
cratic and equal participation is assured to all
member countries. Popular democratic methods
in deciding the practical activities of the I.L.O.
and through the creation of an atmosphere of
genuine international co-operation within the
Organisation.

In this connection I should like to deal with
yet another important question. Notwith-
standing the increase in membership of the
Governing Body, that important organ remains
narrow in its composition. Only a restricted
number of representatives of Governor dele-
tates participate in its work and the great majority of delegates to the Conference are not informed about the activities of the Governing Body. Bearing in
mind that the Governing Body plays a very
important part in the life of the I.L.O., it is
indispensable that in future the Conference
should receive a detailed report on the activi-
ties of the Governing Body. That would give
delegates to the Conference the opportunity of
assessing the work of the Governing Body and
realising how the Governing Body is conducting the activities of the I.L.O. On the other hand
it would overcome a basic shortcoming in the
work of the Organisation, namely that the
executive organ does not have to account for
its activities, which is quite unheard of in any
self-respecting international organisation.

We consider that the I.L.O. should take a
clear and unambiguous stand regarding its
participation in the complete liquidation of the
vestiges of colonialism and its consequences
in economic, political and social fields. Unless
this is done it is useless to think about the social
and economic development of young countries.
The I.L.O. should take advantage of its inter-
national prestige in order to demand impera-
tively the immediate granting of independence
to those peoples still lingering under colonial
domination, and so contribute to the political
and economic independence of young sovereign
States and achieve an early elimination of racial
and other forms of discrimination in the social
and labour fields inherited from colonialism.
This most important part of the work of the
I.L.O. should be clearly formulated and become
an integral element in a well-considered pro-
gramme of activities.

It may be objected that what is suggested
in the Report does in fact represent concrete
forms of assistance to developing countries
in the social field. It does indeed include valuable recommendations, such as for semi-
nars, scholarships and inquiries. But that is
not enough. The I.L.O. in its programme
should place the accent on the most important
ting, namely contributing to the industrialisa-
tion of these countries, for that is the most
reliable means of strengthening their political
and economic independence.
Industrialisation will also contribute to the solution of employment problems. In embarking upon a course of independence, economically developing countries encounter a number of difficulties. One is the lack of skilled manpower, and particularly technical personnel. It is the duty of the I.L.O. and the duty of employers to help the young countries overcome these difficulties. Of course, what we are talking about here is the training of engineering personnel and construction and production managers. Certainly not "exports" in "good relations" between the exploiters and the exploited. Experience gained by other countries has shown that a high rate of economic development, which is known to be desired by all the developing countries, can be attained only when the accumulation of capital and technical know-how is accompanied by a growth in national technical personnel such as engineers, technicians and highly skilled workers. The best intentions will remain pious hopes and the best machines will remain useless piles of metal unless trained personnel who can carry out plans and take advantage of the latest technical achievements are available.

The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic at the last session of the General Assembly of the United Nations took the initiative in putting forward a draft resolution—concerning the role of the United Nations in training national technical personnel with a view to speeding up the industrialisation of developing countries. This resolution, co-sponsored by countries from all regions of the world, was unanimously adopted. I would point out that, working in a spirit of co-operation, the co-sponsors took into account a number of amendments by the I.L.O. representative, Mr. Reymond, who pointed out that this draft was of immediate interest to the I.L.O.

The employers can play a very useful role here through the organisation of courses for training, retraining or advanced training. Favourable opportunities for such training in well-equipped modern plant occupying leading positions in the corresponding branches would be of great help to the implementation of this resolution. The Ukrainian employers have considerable experience in this field, including the training of personnel for developing countries, and they are prepared to exchange such experience.

In this connection a useful role could be played by the Industrial Committees of the I.L.O. The machinery of these Committees should be used for the exchange of information regarding the latest progress in organising production and conditions of work. The properly organised exchange of such information through the channels of the I.L.O. could be no less useful than the discussion of this or that issue in sessions of the Industrial Committees. The proper composition of these Committees should also be considered. At this point, the membership of these Committees is restricted and many countries who would like to participate are denied the opportunity. On the other hand, countries are elected to these Committees which do not show sufficient interest in their work. In order to enlarge these Committees it is necessary to review the membership and their work, and to benefit from their great potential also in order to give skilled advice and technical assistance to the developing countries.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. ORTEGA SUÁREZ (Government delegate, Cuba)—Before I comment on the important subjects discussed in the Director-General's Report, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Labour of Nigeria, Mr. Johnson, on his election to the presidency of the Conference. This election is not only a tribute to his personal ability but also constitutes recognition of the role now played by the African nations in the world. We only regret that when we all voted for Mr. Johnson it was not possible also to count the votes of representatives of the nations of Angola and Mozambique. But I do not doubt that the heroism of the combatants and the solidarity of all free peoples will ensure that they will soon be represented here. Colonialism is now in its death-throes and it is our duty to bury it.

I also congratulate our sister nation of Algeria, to which we are bound by so many bonds of admiration and solidarity, on its entry into the I.L.O.; and all the other nations which over the past year have achieved independence and are now seated with us in this hall. It is sad that the representatives of the People's Republic of China do not share in our discussions. We feel that they have been arbitrarily excluded from this Organisation and from the United Nations.

In outlining a programme for the I.L.O. the Director-General's Report speaks about common interest in the maintenance of peace and of the need to expand world trade. Our delegation considers that these are both fundamental points.

The Cuban people know the value of peace. Our only desire is to build a prosperous and educated nation where the value of the man will be measured solely by the work he does. However, we have had to allocate a large part of our resources and labour force to national defence instead of productivity and educational activities, in order to safeguard our sovereignty from the clutches of imperialism. Imperialism has sabotaged our agriculture by dropping inflammable substances from aircraft on to our cane fields; it has sent groups of assassins to sow terror in our country; it has bombarded our ports and financed, trained and armed a band of mercenaries who invaded our country, when they were routed by the people in 72 hours. These imperialistic attacks brought the world to the brink of a catastrophic world war in October of last year. The danger for mankind in the events of last October are stressed in the Report.

Not only that: from the beginning of the revolution imperialism also took every kind of economic measure to upset our international trade—measures such as the refusal to sell us oil, aimed at paralysing our industries and means of transport; an embargo on our sugar; the interruption of all trade with Cuba; and finally a blockade which has reached such a stage that merchant ships which enter our ports are put on a blacklist. All these measures are contrary to the most elementary inter-
national standards governing world trade. For the Cuban people there can be no talk of an expansion of world trade unless the imperialist blockade of our economy is first lifted. The program of peasant of our nation has been expressed in the Five Points put forward by the Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, Fidel Castro. They include the cessation of the economic blockade and of all measures of commercial and economic pressure; the cessation of all the subversive activities promoted from imperialist territories or by accomplices of imperialism; the cessation of piratical attacks from bases in the north of our country; the cessation of all violations of our air space and territorial waters by imperialist aircraft and warships and withdrawal from the Guantánamo naval base.

The achievement of general and complete disarmament would be a fundamental step towards guaranteeing world peace. The Report asserts that today about $120,000 million a year are spent for military purposes. With the existing differences between the industrialised countries and the underdeveloped countries which have just attained independence and are struggling with the terrible legacy of colonialism. How ridiculous the existing technical co-operation plans of the I.L.O. appear when compared with all that mankind could do with those $120,000 million a year. The existing differences between the industrialised countries and the underdeveloped countries could be eliminated in the space of a few years.

We consider that the second part of the I.L.O. programme should be the liquidation of colonialism and of all its remnant in the world. In connection with this we think it is absurd that there should still be in the I.L.O. Constitution articles such as 35 which are an affront to the dignity of the free nations. How can we, at this stage, speak of "the self-governing powers of the territory" or of "local conditions"? These expressions remind us of the language used in the reports of the ministers of colonies at the end of the last century or the beginning of the present one, although we know very well that similar expressions are still being used by countries which hold in subjection some peoples in Africa and deny them independence and the most elementary political and social rights.

However, we realise that this programme cannot be fully applied without structural changes in the I.L.O. The structure of the I.L.O. does not reflect the situation in the modern world. Dozens of countries have acquired political independence over the last 18 years. Those countries now have before them the tremendous task of modernising and expanding their agriculture, establishing industry, eliminating illiteracy and building and equipping thousands of hospitals and dispensaries. We ask ourselves: "Is the I.L.O. able to meet these requirements?" Reference is made to plans for technical co-operation, but we consider that co-operation plans can only attain their objectives if the countries which require assistance, the developing countries, are properly represented on the Governing Body and can, in the Governing Body, influence the application of these plans.

The Governing Body has been enlarged, but it still does not reflect the position in the modern world—the recent independence of nations and the growth of the socialist camp. Its composition cannot continue to be what it was in 1919. The Conference is the highest expression of the States which constitute the International Labour Organisation. In addition to directing the activities of the whole Organisation, it must supervise the way in which they are carried out. We must take steps to ensure that what is discussed in the Conference is immediately put into practice. This would be the logical conclusion to be drawn from this discussion on the structure of the I.L.O. arising out of the Director-General's Report. This discussion must lay the foundations for transforming the I.L.O. and bringing it into line with the changes that have occurred in the world. We therefore think it proper that a committee should be set up to collect all the good ideas that have been put forward here, to study them and to make recommendations concerning the programme and structure of the I.L.O. to the next session of the Conference.

That committee would be an expression of the wishes of the Conference and would submit to it its studies and recommendations.

The changes of structure with which we are concerned have only one objective, namely to ensure that the I.L.O. will provide a suitable means for implementing the programme needed by all the peoples of the world.

The Director-General's Report refers to many aspects on which we should like to be able to comment, because of their tremendous importance. Unfortunately, the brief time allotted to us to address this gathering prevents us from dealing with these subjects as they deserve. However, I should like to emphasise a few points.

The Report states, on page 49 of the English text, that "An incomes policy conceived in support of social objectives would thus need to concern itself with the allocation of consumption between wages, on the one hand, and the provision of essential social services and community facilities, on the other". This has been the policy of the Cuban revolution since it came to power. Not only have we tried to increase the incomes of the workers, but we have also provided them with the schools, hospitals, sports and cultural centres which they need.

A few figures can illustrate what we have done in the brief time which has elapsed since the revolution came to power. In 1958 the budget of the Ministry of Education amounted to 74 millions pesos and it now amounts to 199 million pesos. The budget of the Ministry of Public Health amounted to 22 million pesos in 1958 and for the current year it amounts to 118 million pesos. And how has this benefited the people? There were 87 hospitals in 1958 and now there are 144. We had 21,780 hospital beds in 1958 and now we have 91,100. Before the revolution the hospitals and health facilities were concentrated in the cities but they are now found throughout the whole country, parti-
cularly in the rural areas. The Revolutionary Government has introduced mass vaccination with the Sabin oral vaccine provided by the Soviet Union and we have vaccinated about 2,200,000 children between the ages of one month and 14 years and we have achieved such good results that, since the month of May 1962, not a single case of poliomyelitis has been reported in Cuba. In addition, 1,143,454 people have been vaccinated against tetanus, 515,895 against diphtheria and 246,725 against whooping cough.

In the field of education, the number of classrooms increased from 19,245 in 1956-57 to 31,701 in the academic year 1961-62. Now we can say with pride that all Cuban children and young people of school age have classrooms to go to. This has allowed the number of primary school pupils to rise from 759,800 in the 1956-57 academic year to 1,208,006 in the last term of the year 1961-62.

One hundred thousand young people have received scholarships from the revolutionary Government to study in a great variety of fields—technical, university or art. Those 100,000 scholars now constitute a source of future specialists for our revolution.

Three hundred and twenty-three social centres for workers, young people and pioneers and 1,400 sports camps provide suitable facilities for sports, together with beaches and other leisure facilities for the people.

The great educational work carried out by our revolution is not confined to the new generation. In one year we did away with illiteracy and now, through intensive courses, we are ensuring a massive rise in the cultural and technical standards of the population. Cuba, like all nations in course of development, has a serious problem of vocational training. We need to train rapidly hundreds of thousands of industrial and agricultural workers in order that we may industrialise the country and modernise agriculture, and we are doing so in the only possible way—namely, without taking them away from production. Hundreds of thousands of Cuban workers are receiving on-the-job training in industry and thus working to become skilled technical workers. Today, together with national defence and production, study is one of the main duties of every worker. Cuba has become an enormous school whose classrooms are in the workshops, in the fields and in the mountains. We know that only in this way can we accelerate the transformation of our economy and convert our country into an industrialised State.

Unemployment, which was terrible on the land, has disappeared; so much so that there is now a shortage of labour for agricultural work, and our Revolutionary Government has made it its immediate task to bring about over the next two years the complete mechanisation of all the cutting and harvesting of sugar cane. We hope to achieve this urgent task with the assistance we are receiving from the Soviet Union.

We have listened with interest to the discussions on the termination of employment at the initiative of the employer and on benefits in case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases. We consider that the resulting Conventions or Recommendations will be of great value to many nations, although we believe that our Labour Justice Act, which enables complaints committees in workplaces to settle disputes occurring in such workplaces, and our Social Security Act are more comprehensive and just, and provide greater benefits for the workers.

The Director-General's Report has raised the question of the programme and structure of the I.L.O. If the proposals which are being made here are collected by a committee and properly studied by it with a view to making recommendations to the next session of the Conference, that will ensure a successful outcome to our work and lay the foundations for the transformation of the International Labour Organisation in accordance with the changes that have occurred in the world over the past few years.

Interpretation from Arabic: Mr. SARAWI (Government delegate, Kuwait)—I would like to express my gratitude for and my appreciation of the varied and valuable Report for this year and his comprehensive exposition of all the available means for strengthening, at present or in the future, the activities of the I.L.O., thus enabling it to achieve its human mission to create a better society in which equal opportunities are available to everybody everywhere to enable them to live a peaceful and comfortable life commensurate with human dignity, bequeathed by God to his creatures.

I need hardly emphasise that peace and security are essential prerequisites of further progress, not least for the developing countries. Therefore my country, Kuwait, joins other peace-loving countries in the genuine belief in the necessity for promoting peace and freedom and advancing the social conditions of the various countries, particularly the developing ones.

There is no doubt that the offering of assistance and the affording of help by certain States to others is among the main objectives of the I.L.O., leading to the greater prosperity of human society as a whole. In our belief, assistance should not be confined to the financial side alone but must include experience and studies of the circumstances and potentialities of the developing countries. It is therefore our duty to endeavour to improve those circumstances and facilities and to concentrate our attention upon them when debating the programme submitted by the Director-General.

Social defects can be summarised as follows:
1. low level of national income;
2. mal-distribution of individual incomes;
3. low standards of education and technical capacity;
4. political instability, which affects development projects and their implementation for the realisation of social justice.

It follows from this analysis that the only way to deal with such defects is through policies which aim at the settlement of such problems from their roots. To adopt temporary solutions would not help in the elimination of these social defects.

The low standards of living in certain developing countries which are the basis of most social defects are due, in my opinion, to three
main factors: the prevailing economic-agricultural systems; ignorance and ill-health; low productivity. As a consequence of the above, many problems too numerous to mention lead to weaknesses in the national economy and in the social organisation to the fundamental requirements of the population. I therefore believe that the offer of loans and assistance to developing countries should aim at overcoming these political, economic and social defects, by improving the political and social systems in order that they may be able to respond spontaneously to the main objectives of the Conventions, Recommendations and other instruments which may be discussed by our organisation and adopted by the General Conference year by year.

Proceeding from the foregoing I should like to describe briefly what the State of Kuwait has achieved in the field of socio-economic progress in the course of 15 years. Kuwait now stands in the first rank of nations in the realisation of social justice for its people. The large revenue from oil production and the wise policy followed by my Government have enabled my country not only to flourish but also to help other Arab States. This country, which previously depended principally upon the boat-building industry, fishing, trade and pearl-diving for its income, has now attained a high standard of living and prosperity, thanks to its great resources and potentialities. Medical and educational services are nationalised and are available not only to Kuwaitis but also to non-Kuwaitis, whether they reside in Kuwait or are passing through.

Moreover, the State has promoted both vocational training and university education by the establishment of an industrial college and a university, the latter to open in 1964. In addition, industrialisation is being encouraged, and the Government is now planning the establishment of petro-chemical and other industries to secure economic stability and a prosperous future for the people of Kuwait.

The newly independent State of Kuwait has chosen the system of democracy and has established a Constitution in which justice and equality of citizens at various levels and in different occupations are widely realised. The Constitution, moreover, gives them the right and freedom to organise in trade unions, charitable associations and co-operative societies, to protect their rights and to promote their welfare. In addition, a credit bank has been established to offer loans for private industrial schemes and to lend money to needy citizens in cases of emergency. One of the things of which Kuwait is most proud is that it has been able to establish a development fund to help Arab States and princedoms to undertake development projects and promote their social welfare.

My country also helped the princedoms of the Gulf to establish schools, mosques and dispensaries. Also, assistance is given to those who elected you to such an honourable place, thus expressing their friendship for the new union of African States. I would also like to express a welcome to the new States Members of the Organisation. I am sure the number of new Members will increase despite the obstinacy of some nations who keep in servitude and exploit peoples who are seeking to escape from humiliating and out-of-date dependence.

To come to the Report, I should like to say that we have been most interested in reading it, and are glad to find in it an echo of our own main preoccupations. I will not seek to comment on all the chapters of the Report, but I would like to mention three parts which have particularly had the attention of my delegation.

The first relates to the I.L.O. programmes, particularly Chapter II on "Human Resources and Economic Development".

It is clear that one of the fundamental problems of the developing countries is that of the struggle against underemployment. We freely admit that to improve the conditions of work of employed persons, which is a course we do pursue, is not a sufficient objective for us. We cannot limit our action to improving the standard of living of a group of human beings which comprises less than 5 per cent. of our active population. Our constant concern is to place the whole population on the path to human progress, and particularly the rural population. We seek to extend the scope of progress as much as to increase its intensity.

In some developing countries private initiative at the national level is practically nil, and the State has to give the necessary stimulus to
promote the economy and raise standards of living.

Like certain young countries, particularly Tunisia, we intend by the end of the year to establish special workshops throughout the country. These training and development workshops are a kind of paid investment in human beings; but investment in human beings is sometimes inhuman, and we have therefore surrounded this undertaking with all the necessary safeguards so that the work in question will have no compulsory character and will not involve a low standard. We hope that the I.L.O. will act in this field of rural promotion.

The Development Decade of the 1960s is marked by a world-wide understanding of the imperative need for the development of the non-industrialised countries.

It seems to us desirable that, without abandoning its role of producing international labour standards, the I.L.O. should give priority to helping the developing countries, particularly in the struggle against rural underdevelopment.

A special technical conference on employment is to be held next October, and my country will take part in it. I would like to say now that we hope that the work of this Conference will lead not only towards ingenious studies but also towards the production of a concrete programme for the struggle against rural underemployment.

My second remark relates to the structure of the I.L.O. I should like to remind you, in agreement with my colleagues from other underdeveloped countries, that we are interested in reforms which will express the determination of the Conference to bring the structures of the I.L.O. into harmony with a changing world and with the new aspirations of member countries.

My third remark relates to vocational training. It is clear that this fundamental problem is the key to social and economic progress. We note with pleasure that this is one of the principal problems which concern the I.L.O., but we do urge that, as far as possible, training should be carried out on the spot and be adjusted to the level of the persons concerned and the real needs of the countries. Training abroad has a good many disadvantages: only a few trainees can go abroad, they are not adjusted to their surroundings, and they become too ambitious when they have made a trip to a big country.

Lastly, I should like to offer the I.L.O. our compliments and express our gratitude for the technical aid which is being given to us and which we have received in the past.

I would like to stress the high quality of the work done by I.L.O. officials and experts who, during the past year, have been particularly helpful to us in the field of workers' education and social security.

Three years ago, when we joined the I.L.O., the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania informed the Conference of the very important projects of mining development and industrialisation which are the background of our four-year development plan. Economic development, and particularly industrialisation, which is regarded as the most rapid means of economic expansion, involves a whole series of sweeping changes in the structure of traditional societies, such as mass urbanisation of the population, relaxation of the traditional links of mutual help and solidarity, increased social tension due to the creation of a proletariat made even more aware of social inequalities because it is faced with the new working requirements and living conditions of modern society. The Government of my country asked the I.L.O. at that time for assistance because we realised that the greatest problem of development lay in improving the attitude of the workers towards development and their attitude to contribute to it. These two factors are dependent on the confidence of the workers in the objectives of economic expansion, on their energy, ardour and perseverance and on their confidence in government bodies which should guarantee participation by the workers in increasing the national income through improving conditions of life.

In the effort made to this effect by our Government, particular importance has been given to the problems of social security which are, precisely, the object of the first mission for which we asked the I.L.O. By guaranteeing certain standards of life, removing the causes of individual income fluctuation, and by its educative role, social security may contribute to raising the standard of social and cultural life of the workers. Further, by guaranteeing a livelihood in case of certain social contingencies it frees the people from the fear of poverty, uncertainty as to tomorrow in general, and enables them to participate more boldly in economic expansion.

However, the reform or extension of social security legislation is a long-term programme which depends on a whole series of economic, financial, social and administrative factors. The forms of assistance which the I.L.O. gives to member States should be adjusted to this requirement. It must have enough flexibility, because forecasts are very different in this field, and achievements, to be lasting, require more time and care than appears at the planning stage.

My Government wishes also to congratulate the International Labour Office for the African Study Seminar on Social Security, which evidences the effectiveness of its contribution to the training of the supervisory staff and technicians who are essential for the functioning and development of social security in Africa. We ask the Director-General to organise new study programmes of this kind, adjusted to the needs of our country.

I would not like to close without referring to Mauritania's achievements in the legislative field. Two years after our independence, Mauritania has been able not only to ratify the international Conventions previously applied in our country, but to consider ratification of many other Conventions. This undertaking is now bearing fruit. A Bill is now before our national Parliament providing for the ratification of the following 21 Conventions: Nos. 15, 22, 23, 53, 58, 9, 112, 114, 3, 17, 19, 52, 81, 89, 111, 90, 101, 62, 94, 96 and 116.

In the same period we have worked out a labour code particularly flexible as to conditions for 1963, and have started to operate a general collective agreement and a group of ancillary
agreements relating to the chief branches of the economy.

Furthermore, with the help of the I.L.O., a social security scheme extending to all the usual risks, some of which are now covered by insurance companies, is being prepared.

I would like to thank you for your attention and to close by asking you to regard my speech, which mentions countries of the "third world" and no others, not as a sign of egotistic consideration of our own problems but as an expression of our desire to make a modest contribution as soon as possible to the maintenance of peace and the construction of prosperity throughout the world.

The Hon. Dr. Zammit (Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, Malta)—Allow me first of all to associate myself with previous speakers in congratulating you on your election as President of this important Conference. Your election is no doubt due in the main to your personal qualities and abilities, and to your long and fruitful connection with this Organisation. It reflects also, however, the present-day trend of giving relatively young nations, which have gained independence in recent years, their rightful place in this international body.

I consider it an honour and a privilege for me to be able to address such a distinguished audience. It is an historic moment for my country as it is the first time that a Minister from the State of Malta is addressing the Conference.

Malta has been represented at this Conference by a tripartite observer delegation on five occasions since 1956. However, Malta is now moving towards independence, and great strides have already been made towards the attainment of this goal. I am glad to state that Her Majesty's Government is in full agreement in principle with my Government on this score, and only details remain to be worked out. A conference is being convened for this purpose in London during the second half of next month. It will not be long, it is hoped, before my country will shed its observer status and become a full Member of the International Labour Organisation, whose activities have always been followed with the greatest interest in Malta.

Naturally, the change from a colonial system to independence is bound to raise various problems for the island, but, with good will on all sides—and good will does not seem to be lacking—such problems and teething troubles should not prove insurmountable. During this difficult period, my Government looks to the International Labour Organisation for that technical assistance and co-operation so necessary for the country's economic development, and which was, and still is, being generously given, with such beneficial results to other countries in course of development.

The Director-General is to be congratulated on presenting the Conference with such an exhaustive Report covering the programme and structure of the Organisation and possible reforms thereto. The Report should form the basis of a balanced and interesting discussion, and my delegation will listen with the utmost attention to the various points of view which will be expressed and the useful suggestions which should emerge from the discussion.

True to its democratic ideals, my country upholds the important principles for which the International Labour Organisation stands and which have been set out so aptly in their report, by the Director-General in his Report, namely freedom of labour, freedom of association and primacy of social objectives. Freedom of a worker to choose his occupation is, to my mind, sacrosanct. Forced labour, in whatever form and under whatever guise, is inhuman and repulsive. Again, the worker must be his own master in the choice of the association he wishes to join and which, in his view, is most likely to safeguard his interests. The improvement of social conditions and the advancement of social equity is the aim for the fulfilment of which responsible governments, worthy of their high duties, should set their policies. I am glad to state that Conventions Nos. 11, 29, 82, 87, 98 and 105, concerning forced labour and the abolition thereof, freedom and right of association, right to organise, and social policy, are among the many Conventions which are applied in Malta without modification.

To uphold these principles may not always be easy in a developing country, and this is where international action might be required to assist their full realisation.

Malta, a haven and a fortress since time immemorial, has been hit very badly by the changed pattern of defence strategy brought about by nuclear advancement. A certain amount of unemployment has resulted lately in consequence of reduced spending in the island by defence departments, and the redundant labour is expected to increase in the immediate future.

As the Director-General points out in his Report, free choice of employment has little practical meaning where unemployment prevails and a person is fortunate to find any job. My Government is trying to solve this problem and is doing its utmost to combat it. A second five-year development plan is being drawn up with the assistance of United Nations experts which, when implemented, should, besides diversifying the economy of the island, provide new jobs for several thousand workers. Legislation is in force in the island designed to attract foreign capital for new industries. The law allows a tax-free holiday and free importation of machinery and of raw materials used by the industry. Substantial grants-in-aid are, moreover, made.

In addition, my Government provides generous financial assistance to persons who, of their own free will, express a desire to emigrate to countries where the position is the reverse and where jobs go a begging for lack of workers. It is only by the creation of alternative work on the island itself, coupled with a sustained and planned emigration programme, that the present social standards, which are relatively well advanced, can be maintained and improved.

As regards the making and carrying out of social policy, these would seem to be domestic matters, but the International Labour Organisation can assist, not only by setting standards in the form of Conventions and recommendations after tripartite discussion by the International Labour Conference, but more
so by the technical co-operation activities and educational programmes it provides. The more assistance Malta can in due course get from the I.L.O. in this field, the better and sooner will it be able to stand on its feet. Vocational training, for example, will not only help Malta find the skilled workers for the industries which must be set up if economic viability is to be attained, but it will also be of immense value to those workers who decide to seek their fortune overseas. For the record, I must state that my Government, with the generous help of Her Majesty's Government and of U.N.E.S.C.O., has embarked on an ambitious programme of technical education and training.

It is a fact that in the world today greater emphasis is being given to the concept of human resources development. Such human resources, if effectively utilised, can be a decisive factor for economic expansion. My Government subscribes to the Director-General's view that this human "capital" is not something to be used merely for increasing production, but is also the fulfilment of a right, the natural right of man, for work. There is no doubt that the International Labour Organisation, with its long years of experience behind it, could find a formula for an effective human resources strategy which would, where adopted, contribute immensely to economic and social development.

In Malta, collective bargaining as a means of wage fixing, as also conciliation agreements and arbitration awards, are common practice. The position of unorganised labour in industry is safeguarded by wage-fixing machinery in the form of wages councils, composed of an equal number of employers, workers and independent members, which from time to time issue wage regulation orders setting out minimum standards.

Trade unions in Malta are strong and, once registered according to law, they enjoy special privileges. The organisation of labour is encouraged, as it is only through organised unions that it is possible to bring about good industrial relations, so essential in a developing country. It is my decided view that the I.L.O. could assist organisations both of employers and of workers, especially by providing training for leadership. An untrained leader in any trade union, whether it be an association of employers or of workers, can do much harm to labour-management relations. Also in connection with this part of the Report, I cannot but be in complete agreement with the Director-General's proposal that during the years to come the I.L.O. should develop a coherent and strengthened programme in the labour relations field.

It would perhaps be inappropriate for me, in view of the present status of my delegation here, to comment on the structure of the International Labour Organisation or on the role, organisation and proceedings of the Conference. I may be allowed your indulgence to remark that the amendment to the Constitution introduced last year, whereby the membership of the Governing Body was widened, was a step in the right direction. The Conference itself is marvellously well organised and in my view leaves very little to be desired.

Whatever changes may be introduced from time to time to meet changed circumstances, the International Labour Organisation should preserve jealously its present tripartite composition, as only through the closest co-operation between governments, employers and workers, at both national and international levels, can social justice—the aim of the I.L.O.—be attained.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I would like to convey to your Government my personal greetings and those of my Government, which looks up to your country as a guide on the road that we have started upon towards independence.

I thank you once more for allowing me to take part in the discussion.

(The Conference adjourned at 12.30 p.m.)
President: Mr. Slipchenko

Report of the Director-General:
Discussion (cont.)

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—The discussion of the Director-General's Report will now continue.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. LETTS (Government delegate, Peru)—The Minister of Labour of Peru, General José Gagliardi, has asked me to express to the President and delegates his regret that unavoidable political obligations should have prevented him from attending this Conference. He has had to stay in Lima in accordance with a promise made a year ago by the military Government when it came to power that it would hold free and clean elections. Last Sunday it faithfully and loyally fulfilled its promise.

At the same time, the Minister instructed me to express his appreciation of the Director-General's Report, which I now have the pleasure of doing.

The Report of the Director-General emphasises the permanent value of the tripartite character of this institution which ensures that the structure of the I.L.O. will faithfully reflect the social and economic forces operating in the world. It is obvious—and Peruvian experience confirms this—that only through such tripartite discussion can there be a continual process of definition of principles on which national and international action should be based.

We agree with this statement, the correctness of which is frequently proved by Peruvian tripartite bodies, ranging from the committee set up to consider specific problems to the National Labour Council, a technical co-operation body which assists in the drafting of laws and regulations.

This Council has now been set up on a permanent basis by a Legislative Decree, as have also official committees to study problems of a general or national character. Provision is made that attendance by workers' representatives on these bodies is not to involve them in loss of wages or social benefits.

Tripartite committees now operate in Peru in such fields, among others, as the textile industry, transport, civil engineering, hotels and allied undertakings. Bodies with broader terms of reference include the Advisory Planning Board, the Advisory Board of the Institute of Labour Studies of Peru, the Board of the National Apprenticeship and Industrial Employment Service, the boards which run the social security schemes, the National Minimum Wage Board, and so forth.

In his Report the Director-General regards the I.L.O. not in isolation but as forming part of the United Nations family with which it shares the objective of world peace.

Contact between Ministries of Labour and the I.L.O. provides the essential link in this co-operative process. Its activities are growing steadily through co-operation with the administration. That is the principle we follow.

With a view to laying suitable institutional foundations for the development of labour administration and evolving an effective system for the application of labour legislation, the Government of my country has asked a special committee on which employers are represented to review the Civil Service rules and pay scales. Similarly, a draft of a Labour Bill prepared by a legal committee appointed by the Government has now been made public.

The Conference of American Ministers of Labour which was held in Cundinamarca, Colombia, has led to the establishment of the Inter-American Institute of Labour Administration, which, it is hoped will lead to an improvement, at the technical level, of the Ministries of Labour and increase their capacity for effective action.

The Director-General refers to the gap between the industrialised countries, which enjoy relatively high incomes, and those countries in which incomes are very low. He states that this gap has led to the emergence of an increasingly strong feeling of mutual interdependence among nations, a collective recognition of the international obligation to fight poverty in those parts of the world where it exists.

The Punta del Este meeting and the concept of the Alliance for Progress are recent expressions of this collective recognition, which was given practical expression in the Declaration of Cundinamarca. Therefore, the Peruvian National Planning Institute, with sectoral offices in each ministry, is investigating the possibility of contributing to a fairer distribution of national income. Economic and social development, particularly the general welfare, awaits the necessary contribution of international assistance which will have to be
reflected in the raising of the real incomes of the workers.

The National Plan for the Integration of the Indigenous Population and the Land Reform Scheme (which has already been started in the south of Peru) provide evidence of the progressive application of general principles in matters within our national capacity.

The I.L.O. therefore has an opportunity of extending its co-operation with the Alliance for Progress, which we regard as an inter-American scheme which can lead to basic achievements in the fight against privilege and conservatism.

On this occasion, when it is reviewing its programme and structure, the I.L.O. should give priority to regional programmes and machinery, not only because some regions have made little economic and social progress but also because there is a need for a permanent representation of the various branches of specialisation and technical assistance, in the same proportion as they are to be found at the Headquarters of the Organisation.

The problems of the next few years considered by the Director-General would be better viewed from the regional angle. The problems he mentions, manpower, distribution of incomes, trade unions, conditions of work and automation, would then be examined against the local background so that there would be an immediate understanding of their distinctive features and a more effective elimination of the practical difficulties. It would then be possible to establish in practice many degrees of acceptance of I.L.O. principles and to do so in accordance with an order of priority.

In connection with the United Nations Development Decade the Director-General's Report follows these principles and clearly and accurately outlines the action which could be taken along those lines by the I.L.O.

It is for us to take note of the Director-General's useful suggestions and to decide on the best ways and means of implementing them.

The delegation of Peru sincerely believes that this session of the Conference would not be doing its duty if it did not decide, by a method to be determined, how the Director-General's suggestions are to be implemented.

Mr. President, I should like to thank you and the Conference for your indulgence; for the rest, I would refer you to the publication which is being made available to delegates through their respective delegation boxes and which sets forth the main social achievements of my country in the period July 1962 to March 1963. This publication also gives a detailed account of some matters of interest to the delegation of Peru.

In this connection, and with reference to what the Director-General has to say on the subject, I must say that the armed forces of my country are making a positive contribution to its economic and social progress and are contributing to the general welfare. Since my country is in course of development, the armed forces are co-operating effectively in education, the training of technicians, the building of roads, and development.
against the declared principles embodied in the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation. The resolution was adopted by the Conference and had effect as such.

The Conference also requested the Governing Body to ensure speedy implementation of this resolution. As was stated in the report of the Resolutions Committee at the said 45th Session of the Conference, in which it was stressed that the Constitution of the I.L.O. does not provide for the exclusion of any Member, "the question of actual expulsion was not before the Committee." The Governing Body of the I.L.O., in deference to the wish expressed by the Conference, asked the Director-General, at the autumn 1961 Session of the Governing Body, to communicate the text of the resolution to the Government of the Republic of South Africa, together with the relevant Conference documentation.

In its reply to the Director-General dated 24 March 1962, as has also been recalled to you, the Government of the Republic of South Africa said that the passage of the resolution which I have cited was devoid of constitutional foundation and that it consequently declined to give any further consideration to the matter. The Conference was informed of this situation in the appendix to the Director-General’s Report.

In fact, delegates of the Republic of South Africa took part in the Conference last year as they are taking part this year. Last year, an objection to all the members of the delegation having been submitted to it, the Credentials Committee, referring to the resolution of 1961, could only take note of the presence of the delegation and examine the substance of the protest. It was not in a position to accept the objection, although it stated that it was fully aware of the situation in the country in question.

A delegation from the Republic of South Africa is taking part in the present session of the Conference under the same conditions as last year. However, no objection has been made against the credentials of the South African Employers’ delegate to the present session of the Conference, so that he has, as in 1961, the right to take part in the discussion as any other delegate accredited to the Conference. I would add that, even if an objection had been lodged within the statutory time-limit—and this applies to all delegates whose credentials are challenged—the rule in paragraph 8 of article 26 of the Standing Orders would still be applicable, according to which, pending final decision on the question of his admission, any delegate to whose nomination objection has been taken shall have the same rights as other delegates.

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—I am certainly not satisfied with the explanation given by the Legal Adviser. I consider that the reply of the Republic of South Africa is a direct challenge to this Conference. If a country feels that a resolution adopted by the Conference is unconstitutional, in my opinion it challenges the very authority and existence of this Conference, and is therefore not entitled to be represented in the Conference.

Interpretation from French: Mr. Diarra (Government delegate, Mali)—You have heard the point of order raised by the delegate from the United Arab Republic, and his argumentation is incontestable. We listened with great interest to the statement made by the Legal Adviser, but I think that the Conference is supreme here. It is not simply a question of juridical rights; it is a question here of the International Labour Organisation and the defence of human rights. That is the most important thing of all.

There is no point in saying that the Constitution is for or against any particular thing. The fact is that a country—the Republic of South Africa—is violating the Charter of the United Nations, which condemned apartheid, and the International Labour Conference must give effect to the principles of human rights in the Charter of the United Nations in accordance with its fundamental rules.

We are told that when there is a challenge the country in question can be given the right to speak. Although there was no challenge at the outset, we think that the Conference must have the last word, and that the decision that the Conference took in 1961 should stand. If the Conference should change its mind this year, the African countries, in their desire to uphold human rights—since they were the first victims of the violation of these rights—would take the initiative and ask all democracies, all countries concerned with defending human rights and human dignity, all those who want freedom to have the last word, all those who believe that we are here among democrats who favour human rights, to depart, leaving the floor to those who have violated the rights to which I refer and who wish to impart their experience to us.

We have nothing to learn from them. We know what they are doing. They are defying the peace-loving world, and the time has come to assume our responsibilities and show that we will not accept them, because the world wants peace and human dignity. These are principles which must be accepted universally, once and for all.

Mr. ABID ALI (Workers’ delegate, India)—The subject which is under discussion here pertains not to South Africa or Africa alone. Coming from India, I am just as much interested in this subject as my friends from Africa are. This is not a regional matter; it is a question of humanity, a question of justice and fairness. The decisions have so often been quoted, but this question has been raised here for several years and has been postponed.

Mr. ABOU-ALAM (Government adviser, United Arab Republic)—I am extremely grateful to Mr. Wolf for his explanation. I would now like to ask Mr. Abo-Alam whether he is satisfied with the reply of the Legal Adviser.
However, in 1961 the I.L.O., by means of a resolution, took a very definite decision. That decision was not carried by a small majority; it was not just a question of passing a resolution to be recorded, it was a definite direction to the Governing Body. The Conference is the supreme authority, and the Governing Body has been given a definite direction to act in a practical manner. Now two years have passed, and in spite of the explanations which we have heard here, this period should have been sufficient to allow us to take definite positive steps with regard to the direction which was given.

Of course the legal position has to prevail, but consideration must be given to the temper of delegates here. The existence of this country’s delegation here contradicts the Constitution of the I.L.O., and that must be taken into consideration. Our very Constitution is such as to debar their delegation from coming and sitting in this I.L.O. family.

In the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations we have been considering matters concerning discrimination. That Committee takes great care of discrimination against a small number of persons, persons belonging to some race or sect. But what is South Africa doing about this great discrimination? If we allow the representatives of the South African Government to sit in this Conference and participate in it we will be doing an injustice to ourselves, we will be doing an injustice to our friends for whom this very Organisation exists.

Therefore, I would urge upon the President our request that a more practical view of this situation should be taken, and that we should take the appropriate decision in the light of what the Conference decided in 1961. That must be honoured, not dishonoured.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—Now I have a question for Mr. Geyser, Government delegate, Republic of South Africa. You asked for the floor and you are on my list, but I have not seen you reiterate your request. Do you want to speak?

Mr. Tokunboh, Government adviser of Nigeria has asked for the floor on a point of order.

Mr. TOKUNBOH (Government adviser, Nigeria)—I believe there is some confusion over this matter. I am sure the President will have sensed the feeling of the house. I am sure the whole Conference believes in human dignity and in fundamental human rights, and the question before us is whether the delegate belonging to the Republic of South Africa should be allowed on this rostrum at all. In fact, we believe they should never be allowed in the I.L.O. at all, and if any member of the South African delegation takes the rostrum here the African delegates and all democratic people in this hall will join us in walking out.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—I have a question. Mr. Fennema, are you asking to speak on a point of order?

Mr. FENNEMA (Employers’ delegate, Netherlands)—A point of order has been raised as to whether the Employer of the Republic of South Africa shall be entitled to speak from this rostrum or not. The President has asked the advice of the Legal Adviser and I think it is for the President to decide now on this matter and not to have a debate on the issue, because it is for the President to decide on the basis of the Standing Orders and on the basis of the fact that the credentials of the delegate in question have not been challenged.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—Mr. Pongault, Workers’ delegate, Congo (Brazzaville), has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from French: Mr. PONGAULT (Workers’ delegate, Congo (Brazzaville))—I think we have reached an impasse now because the African States are unanimous in holding that the Republic of South Africa has no place here, as that country is in conflict with the principle of our Organisation. That is why we consider that though it is true that the I.L.O.’s Constitution in this respect does not allow a State to be expelled, it is also true that the Conference is sovereign. It can take a decision in order to assert its own views. It is also true that the Conference must respect the Constitution which has been adopted by a previous Conference, and therefore we think it would be a good thing, so far as we are concerned, for the Conference to take a decision, because this issue is bound to come up over and over again. As long as South Africa has not left this Organisation this issue will arise again at each Conference and it will be a permanent issue. In order to prevent the proceedings of this Conference from being held up by procedural discussions, I ask that the African States should immediately institute proceedings for the revision of the Constitution with regard to the rights of member States, with a view to arriving at a provision which would enable us to exclude the Republic of South Africa.

For the moment, however, we Africans, in particular the African workers, cannot accept that the delegates of the Republic of South Africa speak in our presence, or if they do we shall go out and leave them to speak to those who remain behind. We African workers will be compelled to leave the hall.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—Mr. Camara, Government delegate, Guinea, has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from French: Mr. CAMARA (Government delegate, Guinea)—This debate raises, in my belief, three groups of issues—juridical issues, issues relating to the true facts, and moral issues. As regards law first of all, we know, according to the point of order raised and the remarks of the representative of the United Arab Republic, that an earlier Conference of this Organisation decided in fulfilment of its competence that the Republic of South Africa was illegally represented, that a delegation from that country could not attend Conferences of the I.L.O. We know that the Conference is com-
petent and that the decisions it takes should be respected.

Subsequently the Governing Body, which is our executive and supervisory body, wrote to the Government of South Africa asking it, in view of the decisions taken and the situation of which we are aware, to take the necessary steps so as not to attend the next session of the Conference. Furthermore, the Director-General, fulfilling for his part instructions that were given him, wrote to the Government of the Republic of South Africa, and we know what reply he received from that Government.

The Legal Adviser tells us, interpreting the Constitution of our Organization, that so long as South Africa rejects the instructions that are given it, so long as the Credentials Committee was not seized in good time of a challenge by any delegation here, since South Africa is present here it would seem that legally speaking the delegation of South Africa is entitled to speak.

Now I am raising the following question, namely what must be done when a delegation comes which is no longer admitted, which cannot be admitted, where the whole of the Conference unanimously issued formal instructions that such a delegation should not come, because of the social situation there with which the whole world is acquainted. Once such a decision is taken and instructions carried out by the Governing Body and by the Director-General, can a delegation from such a country on its own authority appear here in our midst? This is the question which I am putting here to the Conference. Have we not the right and the duty to preserve order in these circumstances, and what steps should be taken in order to preserve order? We are told that a delegation cannot be expelled, a delegation which was requested not to come here but none the less came. I think that the instructions that this Conference is therefore null and void. What must be done then? What can we do now and what measures can be adopted by us when our earlier instructions and requests have not been carried out? These are the legal points I wanted to raise.

Then we have the facts. We know, and the whole world knows (and this is not only a case of African delegations) what is happening in South Africa. We know what laws are being applied in South Africa against our brothers in South Africa, all our brothers. Whether white or black, all the populations of South Africa are your brothers. We know that the South African Government is unworthy to sit in our midst: it is unworthy of mankind.

We know that the African populations in South Africa number 11 million whereas 3 million persons who are not indigenous are imposing upon them the most arbitrary, inhuman and unacceptable laws. We know, moreover, that Bantustan is being created in order to expose our brothers to a régime which we cannot accept either juridically or morally.

I think, therefore, that the moral issue is the following: if the Government of South Africa had a modicum of self-respect, whatever its position, it would have done better not to have come here. It would be better if it left this hall, because for the past quarter-of-an-hour the whole hall has turned against the delegates of South Africa, whether Government or Employer delegates.

I am therefore once again requesting the delegation of South Africa to leave this hall.

*Interpretation from Russian*: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—I find myself in a somewhat difficult position, because on my list of speakers on this point of order I have a number of names. That is why I cannot grant the floor to one delegate who has come later out of place, since speakers must all speak to the same issue, the point of order. Therefore I am granting the floor to speakers in the order in which they have put down their names.

I recognize, first, Mr. Cardonel Horruitiner, Workers’ delegate of Cuba, who is also going to speak to the point of order.

*Interpretation from Spanish*: Mr. Carboneill Nell Horruitiner (Workers’ delegate, Cuba).—In connection with the point of order raised by the delegate of the United Arab Republic, I have noticed that some of our colleagues who have spoken in support of the United Arab Republic have given the impression that this is a problem which is merely of importance to our brothers from Africa. I am here to express, in the name of the revolutionary workers of Cuba, our support for the point of order raised by the delegate of the United Arab Republic, as to whether or not the delegates of a country where racial discrimination is a constitutional practice—despite the condemnation of the United Nations and all free men in this world—could take part in this Conference.

In closing, I would say, in the name of the workers of Cuba—and I think I am speaking on behalf of the workers of all the Latin American countries—that this plenary sitting should decide the question. Those who maintain discrimination on the grounds of colour as a fundamental point of their national legislation should no longer remain among us.

*Interpretation from Russian*: Mr. Solovyov (Workers’ delegate, U.S.S.R.).—I, too, could not fail to rise to this point of order in order to join most warmly those speakers who have protested against the presence of delegates from the Republic of South Africa. The presence of this delegation shows that the Republic of South Africa has wilfully ignored the decision of the General Conference taken in 1961. I invite all delegates present in this assembly to oppose this state of affairs, which is a challenge hurled in the face of the Conference.

In addition to that, I think it is a sort of challenge to the Conference bearing in mind that in recent years—in recent months—additional laws have been adopted in the Republic of South Africa which restrict even more the rights and interests of the working man. The representatives of the Republic of South Africa are, I think, at any rate aware of the feelings of this Conference. I should like to appeal to its conscience and to the conscience of mankind for above the Constitution, above the Standing Orders, stands the conscience of mankind. Therefore I protest against the presence of the South African representatives here today.
I think any elected officer of this Conference is vested with powers on the part of the Conference itself, and the Conference is the highest body in any international organisation, including the I.L.O. That is why any action on the part of any elected officer of any conference must be guided and prompted by the conference whose servant the elected officer is. That is why, in, as I have said, these difficult circumstances I place myself entirely at the disposal of the Conference.

I do not think it is indispensable to appeal to our Legal Adviser, because he has already said all he can say in the matter. Therefore I do not think that he can be of any further help. That is why the only will which I intend to take account of—and this is an honour for any President—is your will.

In these difficult circumstances, when many delegations are challenging the credentials of another delegation, I rule that we continue the debate on this issue, since we have not as yet come to a single decision. That is why, since the credentials of this delegation have been questioned, I will recognise the next speaker on the point of order.

Mr. TÁBOR (Workers' delegate, Yugoslavia)—I entirely support the cause of the African people and the whole of democratic humanity against the policy and practice of discrimination carried out in the Republic of South Africa. We must finally take a decision in this Conference which will be welcomed by the whole world and the working class of all nations, and which is the only one in line with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. A country which carries out such a policy of discrimination cannot be represented among us.

Mr. TÁBOR (Workers' delegate, Yugoslavia)—I entirely support the cause of the African people and the whole of democratic humanity against the policy and practice of discrimination carried out in the Republic of South Africa. We must finally take a decision in this Conference which will be welcomed by the whole world and the working class of all nations, and which is the only one in line with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. A country which carries out such a policy of discrimination cannot be represented among us.

Mr. Mori, Workers' delegate, Switzerland, has asked for the floor on a point of order. Since we are now discussing a new situation in connection with the proposal made by Mr. Dao, I recognise Mr. Mori before recognising other speakers.

Mr. Mori has asked for the floor on a point of order. Since we are now discussing a new situation in connection with the proposal made by Mr. Dao, I recognise Mr. Mori before recognising other speakers.

Interpretation from Russian : The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—I would beg you to spare your President. Let us try to examine with a cool head the proposals before the Conference. Practically speaking, we have two proposals. One was moved by the representative of Venezuela and was seconded, and the other (that the matter be referred to the Officers of the Conference) has just been made by Mr. Waline. Does anybody support Mr. Waline's proposal? Mr. Fennema and another delegate support this proposal, and therefore it is seconded. I therefore put these two proposals to the Conference.

Let us first of all agree whether we will discuss them or whether we can take a vote on them right away. Firstly, shall we discuss Mr. Dao's proposal? Those who would like to discuss his proposal kindly raise their hands. Mr. Dao's proposal is that the debate be continued, and it has not been accepted.

Mr. Möri, Workers' delegate, Switzerland, has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from Russian : The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—Before calling upon the next speaker on my list I should like to address a few words to the Conference on my own behalf.

Interpretation from Russian : The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—Before calling upon the next speaker on my list I should like to address a few words to the Conference on my own behalf.

Interpretation from Russian : The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—Before calling upon the next speaker on my list I should like to address a few words to the Conference on my own behalf.
I think that is the best thing he could possibly do in the circumstances. This would no doubt prevent this Conference from entering a rather slippery path. We do not know exactly where the Organisation would then land up.

I myself last year spoke emphatically in favour of the resolution condemning the policy of apartheid or racial segregation in the Republic of South Africa.

I continue to condemn emphatically and wholeheartedly this policy. On the other hand, we do have the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation and we have an essential principle in our Organisation, namely the principle of tripartism. In condemning the South African delegation to silence, shall we condemn the Worker delegate of South Africa to silence if he wishes to speak?

May I remind this distinguished assembly that at certain earlier sessions of our Conference the representative of the workers of South Africa came to this rostrum, courageously, and himself condemned racial segregation.

That is why I suggest that this problem should be made less passionate, if I may use the expression, and that is why I first of all appeal to the representative of the Employers of South Africa to help us avoid such unnecessary debate and to refrain from speaking. The Government and the policy of South Africa have been judged. Let the Employers' representative of South Africa, who is not responsible for that policy, refrain from speaking for the moment, and this may help us more than the continuation of a debate which may well degenerate into a circus.

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—I think we find ourselves in a situation when the continuation of the debate depends actually on the stand taken by Mr. Hamilton. It would therefore be desirable to know how he reacts to the point just raised by Mr. Mori. Depending upon his position, we will then have to decide what we are to do next. He can answer simply "Yes" or "No".

Mr. Hamilton wishes to reply to Mr. Mori from the rostrum and I recognise Mr. Hamilton in order to do so.

Mr. Hamilton (Employers' delegate, Republic of South Africa)—In my capacity as Employers' delegate of the Republic of South Africa.

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—Mr. Hamilton, I must interrupt you, since apparently another point of order is now being raised.

Mr. Tubman, Workers' delegate, Liberia, has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. Tubman (Workers' delegate, Liberia)—The most important point that we are discussing now is whether or not the delegate of South Africa should be allowed to use this rostrum. When governments do not recognise each other and diplomatic necessity requires that they communicate, they usually go through a third party. As such, if the delegate of South Africa is to say whether he renounces his seat (indeed we feel he has no right to renounce what he does not possess), if he wants to renounce his seat we should let him do it through a third party. This is the feeling of the workers of Liberia and I believe that this is the main point that we are debating now: whether or not the South African delegate should come before this Conference to speak.

What I would say is this: I have not asked for the floor to speak on this question of South Africa but, while we maintain that the South African delegate should not get up here to speak, I would appeal to the Conference that whenever any delegate comes up here to speak, whether he agrees with us or not, so long as he is not the South African delegate, at least we should give him the courtesy of listening to him.

So far as South Africa is concerned there is no question but that we oppose the presence of the South African delegation here and we say that a South African delegate should not be allowed on this rostrum for any reason whatever. Indeed, he should not even be at the Conference.

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—Once again, in this new situation, I am faced with a list of speakers which I will read out: Mr. Lubembe, Workers' representative, Kenya; Mr. Diallo, Workers' delegate, Mali; Mr. Ago, Government delegate, Italy. It is in that order that I will recognise them.

Mr. Lubembe (Workers' representative, Kenya)—There are some people who do not understand feelings, who try to force themselves in, in certain matters, despite all the pressure. That has been proved beyond reasonable doubt. This Conference has proved that a delegate from South Africa is not wanted to stand before anybody at this rostrum and open his mouth. He has made a mistake already. He has committed a violation of the Constitution of the I.L.O. by refusing to comply with the letter that was addressed to the South African Government, the criminal South African Government, advising them not to come to this place.

I say this because there are so many innocent people in South Africa being subjected to harsh treatment by a criminal minority group, for crimes which they have not really committed. Faced with this, the African delegations have decided to inform this Conference, and very positively and practically, that at no time will we compromise to allow anybody who has been clearly proved a criminal to stand before us. We think that the South African delegate cannot speak before us because he is a criminal man. We do not want him.

Motion to Adjourn the Sitting

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—Mr. Diallo, Workers' delegate, Mali, has the floor on a motion as to procedure.
Interpretation from French: Mr. DIALLO (Workers' delegate, Mali)—I should like to say that the clamour which has arisen in this hall following the statements made by the various delegates who have preceded me at this rostrum reflects the universal condemnation of the policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. The Government of South Africa did not feel that it should respect the resolution adopted by this Conference and decided to defy the delegates sent to this Conference by all the countries in the world.

The Republic of South Africa has incurred universal condemnation of its policy. In the face of resolutions adopted here or resolutions adopted in the United Nations or the Economic Commission for Africa, the Republic of South Africa, I say, defies the whole of mankind and I do not think that that is proper; it is for mankind to defy the Republic of South Africa.

There has been some talk here about democracy. I think that all the international organisations have taken a democratic attitude towards South Africa. But South Africa does not want to respect the fair play of democracy and have respect for majority decisions. When a minority, which is in the wrong, wants to defy the decision of the majority, then that minority must go the way indicated by the majority. We therefore cannot accept the idea that the delegate of South Africa should come here to this rostrum, contrary to all the resolutions adopted, to insult the conscience of the world. That is why I would not want this discussion to continue, because if one looks at the matter in the proper light it can be said that the representation of South Africa here is not legal, because the great majority of the South African people is not represented. As regards the representatives of the workers, I may say that the real leaders of the working class in South Africa are in prison—in any case, they cannot live in South Africa.

In view of the atmosphere now prevailing and in accordance with the Standing Orders, I ask you, Mr. President, to adjourn the session.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—A formal motion for adjournment has just been moved and I would refer you to subparagraph (2) of paragraph 2 of article 15 of the Standing Orders, which states that: "Motions as to procedure include the following: . . . (e) a motion to adjourn the sitting." Before I put this motion for adjournment to the vote, I must ask if it is seconded.

The motion having been seconded, I will ask the delegates to vote by show of hands.

(A vote is taken by show of hands.)

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—The Conference appears to be unanimous, and the sitting is therefore adjourned. I thank you for your co-operation.

(The Conference adjourned at 4.30 p.m.)
ELEVENTH SITTING

Friday, 14 June 1963, 11.30 a.m.

Presidents: Mr. Johnson and Mr. Faupl

COMMUNICATION TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE RESULTS OF THE ELECTIONS TO THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

The PRESIDENT—I will ask the Clerk of the Conference to inform you of the results of the elections to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

The CLERK OF THE CONFERENCE—The results of the voting in the electoral colleges for the election of members to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office for the period 1963-66 are as follows:

Government members:
- Algeria.
- Australia.
- Brazil.
- Bulgaria.
- Ecuador.
- Gabon.
- Lebanon.
- Liberia.
- Mali.
- Mexico.
- Pakistan.
- Peru.
- Poland.
- Tanganyika.

Deputy members:
- Argentina.
- Congo (Leopoldville).
- Ethiopia.
- Indonesia.
- Morocco.
- Norway.
- Philippines.
- Ukraine.
- Uruguay.
- Venezuela.

Employers’ members:
- Mr. Bergenström (Sweden).
- Mr. Desmaison (Peru).
- Mr. Erdmann (Federal Republic of Germany).
- Mr. Muñoz de Nodal (Argentina).
- Mr. Nasr (Lebanon).
- Mr. Ofurum (Nigeria).
- Sir George Pollock (United Kingdom).

Mr. Rifaat (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Tata (India).
Mr. Wagner (United States).
Mr. Wajid Ali (Pakistan).
Mr. Waline (France).

Deputy members:
- Mr. Andriantsitohaina (Malagasy Republic).
- Sir Lewis Burne (Australia).
- Mr. Campanella (Italy).
- Mr. Fennema (Netherlands).
- Mr. Gaye (Senegal).
- Mr. Kuntschen (Switzerland).
- Mr. Martínez Espino (Venezuela).
- Mr. Mishiro (Japan).
- Mr. Robinson (Canada).
- Mr. Végh-Garzón (Uruguay).

Workers’ members:
- Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan).
- Mr. Ambekar (India).
- Mr. Beermann (Federal Republic of Germany).
- Mr. Borha (Nigeria).
- Mr. Collison (United Kingdom).
- Mr. ben Ezzeddine (Tunisia).
- Mr. Faupl (United States).
- Mr. Kaplansky (Canada).
- Mr. Monk (Australia).
- Mr. Möri (Switzerland).
- Mr. Nielsen (Denmark).
- Mr. Sánchez Madariaga (Mexico).

Deputy members:
- Mr. Becker (Israel).
- Mr. Bothereanu (France).
- Mr. De Bock (Belgium).
- Mr. Faheem (United Arab Republic).
- Mr. Haraguchi (Japan).
- Mr. Hernandez (Philippines).
- Mr. Pongault (Congo (Brazzaville)).
- Mr. Riani (Brazil).
- Mr. Shita (Libya).
- Mr. Storti (Italy).

FIFTH REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE: SUBMISSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—The next item on this morning’s agenda is the fifth report of the Selection Committee. I call on Mr. Weaver,
Chairman of the Selection Committee, to submit this report.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—I have the honour to submit to the Conference the fifth report of the Selection Committee, the text of which has been circulated. It deals with changes in the composition of certain committees. I have nothing further to report to the Conference, and I ask it to adopt this fifth report of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT—I take it the report is adopted?

(The report is adopted.)

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL:

DISCUSSION (cont.)

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue discussion of the Director-General's Report.

At this point I ask your permission to make a statement.

As you will all remember, two years ago I piloted through this Conference the resolution calling for the expulsion of South Africa for its apartheid policy. Last year in my speech I made it plain that my Government was bent on seeing that the Conference carried out that obligation. Through the good will of all members I have been elected President of this august assembly for this year. You will agree with me that it would not be right that the principles that must guide one in the job of President should be allowed to take secondary place to other considerations. Because of this I am asking leave to be excused from presiding over this Conference when a matter over which I feel very strongly indeed is going to be debated. In a word, I refuse to be an accuser and a judge in my own case.

I think I have your permission, and accordingly I am asking one of my Vice-Presidents to take the Chair.

(Mr. Faupl takes the Chair.)

POINT OF ORDER:

QUESTION OF THE PARTICIPATION OF THE DELEGATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA IN THE CONFERENCE

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Faupl)—We shall now proceed with the discussion of the Director-General's Report. First, however, Mr. Abou-Alam, Government adviser, United Arab Republic, has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. ABOU-ALAM (Government adviser, United Arab Republic)—I note that the first speaker on the list for this morning is again the representative of the Republic of South Africa; that is why I am raising this point of order.

The day before yesterday I put a motion asking the Legal Adviser about the legality of the presence of the delegation from South Africa in this Conference and the right of those delegates to speak before this meeting. The Legal Adviser gave his interpretation of the position with which I disagreed. The sentiment of the Conference expressed in the debate that followed supported my disagreement with the Legal Adviser. I think the main difference between the Legal Adviser's interpretation and ours stemmed from the fact that his point of view was based on a narrow interpretation of a few specific articles of the Constitution and Standing Orders, while our interpretation was based on the Constitution as a whole, its spirit and the principles underlying its various articles.

We feel that this whole Organisation and its Constitution came into being to achieve one main objective—that is, the betterment of the conditions of the working class, based on the safeguarding of human dignity and human freedom. For this reason we believe that no country which violates the Constitution can ask for the protection of its provisions; no country that feels that the work and the resolutions of this Conference are unconstitutional can take any place among us or any part in our deliberations.

Yesterday we had no plenary discussion on this matter, and we devoted most of the day to the elections to the Governing Body. We listened to the results of those elections with great pleasure but also with a great sense of responsibility. The fact that Africa got all it wanted—five titular seats and three deputy seats—that its commitments with other blocs were all completely honoured, puts more responsibility on the African Members of this Organisation, and we hope that they, together with the other Members, will ensure that this Organisation functions effectively in the most democratic manner.

Today I am addressing myself to you, Mr. President, on the basis of two articles of our Standing Orders. The first is article 14, paragraph 1, which states: "No delegate shall address the Conference without having asked and obtained permission of the President." The second is article 13, paragraph 2, which states that the President "shall direct the debates, maintain order, enforce the observance of the Standing Orders by such means as circumstances may demand, accord or withdraw the right to address the Conference, put questions to the vote and announce the result of the vote".

These two articles give you the authority to withdraw from any Member the right to address this Conference if, in your opinion, this would result in disorder. Without any further discussion I appeal to you, Mr. President, to use your own judgment for the best interests of this Conference and this Organisation. You have sensed the feelings of this Conference on this particular issue, and I strongly feel that order will never be maintained if the representative of the Republic of South Africa is allowed to speak.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Faupl)—After following closely the specific points raised in the point of order, I must say I do not believe

1 See above, p. 135.
that the point of order is valid. Therefore, I have to rule it out of order.

Mr. Tokunboh, Government adviser, Nigeria, has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. TOKUNBOH (Government adviser, Nigeria)—The subject before the Conference is whether Mr. Hamilton of South Africa should speak. I am therefore proposing a motion on article 15, paragraph 2 (2) (e) of the Standing Orders that the Conference should proceed with the next item on the agenda of this sitting, that is that Mr. Núñez of Honduras should now be called upon to speak.

It has been suggested to us that South Africa is a member State of this Organisation and that, for this reason, its Government should exercise its rights to be heard. In effect, we are told that it is an obligation on us to hear the delegate for the South African Employers and to give him the opportunity to speak. We refuse to accept this advice, in the same way as President Kennedy refused to accept the freedom of Governor Wallace to enforce segregation laws in Alabama.

This is a decent society of men and women who believe with passion in human rights and human dignity. We would allow freedom in our Organisation to be exercised within these principles. This does not mean, however, the gagging of the Government of South Africa. Its representatives could speak among their allies or among people who accept the ideals of apartheid.

I appreciate the efforts being made to get the Conference to conduct its business. No one in this hall wants to see the work of this Conference disrupted. I would like to assure you, Mr. President, that my delegation—and I am sure all the delegations of African States here—will do everything to protect and safeguard the aims of this Conference.

The issue before us is simple and clear. The statement made this morning saying that it will not remove the position of the South African Government in our Organisation, the South African Government itself will not deny the fact—and it is fully aware of it—that it is not wanted by the other Members of this Organisation. Events two days ago showed clearly, beyond any doubt, that the Conference still maintains the stand it took in 1961.

A lot has been said about the legality of the action we are now taking on the South African issue. Our approach has all along been constitutional and legal. The Conference and the Constitution which now guide us. It is the same Conference which, after a most vigorous and critical debate in 1961, condemned the South African Government and called upon it to withdraw from this Organisation. This is the point which speakers who are allied to the South African Government forget. We did not force the 1961 decision on the Conference. It was reached after a free discussion of the issues involved, and the representative of the South African Government abused the freedom, which they now claim, to reply to all the charges. Until the Conference decision is altered, the participation of the delegates of the Republic of South Africa is a brutal challenge to the authority of this Conference which my delegation can never tolerate.

Here is a Government which has been condemned not only by us but by the United Nations and other international bodies. In fact, I challenge anyone in this hall who does not condemn apartheid to come to this rostrum and speak. This Organisation is dedicated to upholding freedom and human dignity, but the Government of the Republic of South Africa has openly declared to the world that it does not believe in them. I will not reiterate the brutality, the inhumanity, the callousness and satanical tendencies of the South African Government. These facts are well known to all of us here. The Conference took note of these facts in 1961, and the position has not changed since.

This Organisation is established—and I quote from the Declaration to which the South African Government subscribed its signature—to ensure that " all human beings, irrespective of race, creed or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity ". The Government of South Africa has declared to the world that it does not believe in these noble objectives which are the basis of any good government.

In view of these facts, the stand of my Government—as was demonstrated also by the initiative which we took in 1961 in this Conference—is that the Government of South Africa is not worthy to be a Member of this decent Organisation. We believe that the presence of the Government of South Africa in this Conference is intolerable. We believe it is an insult to this Conference for any of them to address us. We believe also, that the Conference should assert its authority by a clear demonstration of its disgust over the flagrant disregard of its decision. This is an issue concerning fundamental rights and human dignity,
for which we, in this Conference, have a responsibility to humanity. It is not an issue for black men alone. In fact, we know that we have a large number of friends in this hall.

On behalf of my delegation and all African peoples, and particularly on behalf of the millions of struggling Africans in South Africa who are daily being treated like animals, I appeal to all lovers of democracy, freedom and human dignity to join hands with us in ridding our Organisation of the satanic and criminal Government of the Republic of South Africa.

Mr. President, I propose my motion.

The President (Mr. Faupl)—Let me first of all rule on the motion. The motion has been put to proceed with the next item of the Conference. The next item of the Conference is the discussion of the Director-General's Report. The order of speakers is the chairman's responsibility. The order of speakers has been published in the Daily Bulletin, so, before we get into further confusion, may the Chair make a statement?

I am keenly conscious of the immense gravity of this occasion and the responsibility which rests upon the Conference and necessarily upon me as your presiding Officer as this moment. I have an obligation to you, as delegates to this Conference, to carry through these duties, but I also have a personal obligation, one which springs from deep convictions. I supported the 1961 resolution; I continue to believe in it, because I am deeply committed to the elimination of racial discrimination in every form and wherever it may exist. In this Chair I have one duty, and only one duty—a duty to the whole Conference to ensure that the legal and democratic procedure of this Conference is maintained and respected in its proceedings.

The Constitution, by which we are all bound, sets forth as a fundamental principle freedom of expression. Under these circumstances and in fulfilment of my duty as presiding Officer of this Conference, I have no choice but to rule that Mr. Hamilton, as an unchallenged delegate duly accredited to this Conference, has a right to be heard by those who wish to hear him. But in the I.L.O. there are no captive audiences.

I am sure that this Conference will respect the ruling which I have made, a ruling which is in accordance with the law by which we are all equally bound.

I, as your present presiding Officer, have been authorised by President Johnson, the President of the Conference, and the other Officers of the Conference, to report to you that we are all in unanimous agreement on this. The right of every accredited delegate to speak cannot be denied without destroying the fundamental principles of freedom of speech, which is the very foundation of democracy and the life-blood of this Organisation.

Mr. ABOU-ALAM (Government adviser, United Arab Republic)—Mr. President, I heard your ruling on my motion and on the motion represented by Mr. Tokunboh of Nigeria. I am afraid I am not convinced by it, but as a few minutes ago I spoke about the tremendous responsibility which falls upon us, because of this sense of responsibility and out of a desire to go ahead with our work, I am not challenging your ruling. But I take it only for this time, reserving our full right for any future action as we may see fit.

We have decided in the African group and with many other democracy-loving nations to withdraw from this hall whenever a representative of the Republic of South Africa speaks. We hope that this will be another testimonial to the sentiment and point of view of the Members of this Organisation towards this important issue. I am appealing not only to the African Members represented here but to all of you to withdraw with us. We Africans take this withdrawal as a sign of siding with the defenders of human rights and human freedoms.

Furthermore, the African group is having the matter under serious study with a special committee with a view to finding a permanent solution to this problem.

Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.)

The President (Mr. Faupl)—We now continue the discussion of the Director-General's Report. Mr. Hamilton, will you please speak?

(At this moment a number of delegates leave the hall.)

Mr. HAMILTON (Employers' delegate, Republic of South Africa)—It is a great honour for me to have the opportunity of addressing this Conference and I sincerely hope its discussions will be of lasting benefit to all the nations of the world.

I have studied the Director-General's Report carefully and I wish to congratulate him on the lucid and logical manner in which he has described certain problems facing us. As an employer in free enterprise I appreciate fully the vital necessity of periodically reviewing, reorganising and modernising any organisation. No organisation can hope to survive unless its administrators are prepared to adjust its procedures and, if necessary, its structure to constantly changing conditions.

I am sure that all of us agree with the fundamental principles of the International Labour Organisation but there are details of organisation which, in my humble opinion, require revision. Before dealing with these matters in detail, I would like to give my own views on the achievements and the future of this great Organisation.

Divergence of opinion in the International Labour Organisation is not necessarily a handicap. In our religious pursuits we normally associate only with those who share our beliefs. The idea of the I.L.O., however, is in bringing men of different opinions together. Through our differing opinions, the I.L.O. seeks understanding but the fundamental is not that we necessarily must agree. The intention is that we explore and enrich our minds so that
our service to society may be informed and intelligent service.

The adoption by the I.L.O. of certain standards and the acceptance by many member States of these standards, which are enshrined in our Conventions and Recommendations, is a notable achievement, but I consider that the I.L.O.'s greatest service has been the creation of a core of professional men who specialise in the social and economic problems raised at our Conferences. These men, in all three groups, were already experts in their own countries but the interchange of opinions through the I.L.O. has immeasurably increased their stature and has permitted greater ideas to be developed by them for the benefit of all the nations in the world.

The I.L.O. has been dubbed a talking shop. That I regard as a virtue symptomatic of its democratic nature. It is more constructive to be talking than to be fighting, as was suggested by one or two of the speakers.

Our Director-General and the permanent secretariat are doing a splendid and devoted job, but it is new time that task easier by not burdening them every year with ever increasing and often impractical new duties. To implement more effectively our programmes it seems desirable for this Conference to be held once every two years. In my view too much of our secretariat's time has to be occupied in organising our too-frequent Conferences and summarising their deliberations.

Of course there are difficulties, particularly as far as the Constitution is concerned, but my suggestions should be carefully considered. We could consider holding regional conferences in the intervening year. Alternatively, we might confine agendas to purely technical matters in one year followed the next year by the full agenda as at present. The duration of the technical conference, incidentally, could be reduced to two weeks.

These suggestions will definitely reduce costs and streamline procedure. The continual expansion in the personnel accompanying delegations to meet new items on agendas—an inevitable result of "Parkinson's Law"—is becoming an impossible burden, particularly on the smaller nations. The ever-increasing number of resolutions each year has further reduced the Conference's working time on more vital matters. The moratorium asked for on resolutions has been a welcome relief this year and we must seriously consider our procedure in this respect in the future.

We all remember the ghastly series of over 20 resolutions submitted last year—many of them, incidentally, only distantly related to I.L.O. programmes. It was physically impossible to consider them all and we must introduce some restrictions on their submission in the future.

Resolutions with a constructive relationship to I.L.O. principles are, of course, eminently desirable, but their number should be restricted and their receivability carefully considered by the Governing Body. It may also be possible to group several resolutions on related matters.

In future meetings of the Resolutions Committee delegates might be asked to confine their remarks to five minutes. This, in my opinion, could speed up the work of the Committee. If a point cannot be made in five minutes it is probably not worth making. The work of the Resolutions Committee should, in my opinion, terminate at least a week before the closing of the Conference to enable the conclusions to be presented to the plenary sitting.

These suggestions are clearly in the interests of the Organisation and would allow ample free expression of opinion and avoid the clogging of our machinery. There is no suggestion at all of restricting expression but rather of streamlining it.

We should also in future try to avoid resolutions of a political nature. They harm goodwill among our Members and on this goodwill and friendship the future of the I.L.O. depends.

The regional meetings have so far proved sound in principle and practice but it is essential, I firmly believe, to establish certain principles for the future. These meetings should continue to be technical in aspect, concentrating on economic and social affairs. They should not develop regional instruments of their own and they should remain under the control of the Governing Body at all times. If this is not observed we will end up with four I.L.O.s instead of one and "Parkinson's Law" will be even more evident. Policy decisions must remain the responsibility of our main Conference and the Governing Body and regional meetings should confine themselves to technical matters peculiar to their regions alone.

In Africa vast problems of feeding, housing and manpower training confront the new nations, and the I.L.O. has a vital part to play in assisting to solve them. Our employer group in South Africa has great experience in this field, and planned training schemes over many years have achieved remarkable results. With careful pre-planning and the co-operation of our workers and Government we have built up a "booming economy", never before experienced in the history of South Africa. Our reserves have reached the record figure of £250 million, which figure is equal to 25 per cent. of the reserves of the whole sterling area including Britain. Commenting on these South African reserves Barclays Bank recently stated that this was "a tribute to the resilience and basic soundness of South African economy".

As a result we have full employment and industrial peace.

Our great employer firms in free enterprise conduct business in many countries beyond our borders and they are trusted and respected by the peoples of these countries. This situation could only have been created by a just employer-worker relationship over many years. Our South African economic success also could only have been achieved with the co-operation of all our people.

Our great industrial expansion has meant prosperity for all our people and wage increases and benefits are progressively and continually being introduced, commensurate, of course, with our economic growth. This is an economic fact which cannot be ignored. We are the most industrialised country in Africa and the one with the soundest economy. We are experien-
dining an economic boom which is a tribute to the conservative financial planning and confidence of our private enterprise firms. As a result the spending power of our African people has in five years expanded fourfold, because our reserves by minerals are vast and we could pay our entire foreign national debt with less than four months' gold production. The employers and workers of our country have built up a highly sound economy which is a modern example of what private enterprise can do.

I have stated these facts in order to illustrate clearly the experience and the expert organisations which we possess. We are obviously in a favourable position to assist our friends to the north of our borders. We are trading extensively with them and much goodwill exists. It will be unfortunate if political considerations are allowed to destroy economic links which are of mutual benefit and which have existed for many years. Employers in South Africa are only too willing to co-operate with expert advice on every important social issue for years in Africa. We have the "know-how" and it is available to assist in developing the economy of the new nations in Africa.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. Núñez (Government delegate, Honduras)—After this unpleasant incident which has brought into conflict the forces of freedom and oppression, of equality and inequality, may I start by greeting the delegations most warmly in the name of my country and the delegation over which I have the honour to preside. Let me also wish every success to this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. I would like most particularly to congratulate the President on his election. Knowing his merits we are certain that he will be an admirable President.

To represent a country at an I.L.O. Conference involves a grave responsibility, because the Conference lays down new standards and policies to solve the social problems of the world; this is a difficult task because of the complexity and variety of world conditions. Such a responsibility is all the greater in the case of those persons who are required to give effect, in the form of programmes of action, to the objectives of the Organisation to which our countries belong. The Director-General shows his consciousness of this responsibility when he says, at the very beginning of his Report, that "The I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history, at one of those points where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action."

The Director-General has wished this Conference to devote part of its time to the study and analysis of the position of the I.L.O. in the present social and labour situation throughout the world, so that the changes required in the structure and programmes of the Organisation may be clearly determined. In doing this he has proceeded from the fact that we live in a constantly changing world. That is indeed an entirely scientific statement because there is no society which is not developing, nor is there such a thing as a permanent social structure. The social, like the biological, organism is subject to the law of change. In order to determine the necessary adjustments we must review the programmes and methods followed by the Organisation, and this the Director-General has done in some detail and with considerable skill.

We all realise that the world of today is deeply concerned to solve the social problems of each country. Every State is interested in promoting its economic development and improving the social situation of its people. However, this concern has intensified in recent years as a result of the Second World War, because it has been believed, and still is believed, that only by giving the peoples greater social welfare can peace and freedom be preserved; and because it is thought that in order to reach our objectives we must lay a firm basis of economic development and of social protection for the economically weak classes.

The I.L.O. has been surprised as well as satisfied at the entry of so many new States which have become independent in Africa since 1950; most of these are in Africa. This is a fact of great importance in the life of the International Labour Organisation. It involves the necessity for revising the structure of the I.L.O. in order that the new member States may take a full part in its work, in its representative organs and in the benefit of its operational programmes. This whole body of aspirations requires an economic basis consistent with the chief requirements which the I.L.O. must meet within its field of action. No State enters the I.L.O. merely to become a Member of it. All seek something which they cannot obtain alone, but only within this community of nations; they enter it to strengthen their labour and social relationships and to provide the most needy nations with experience, guidance and technological skill through the programmes of the I.L.O.

Today, the countries which most require this co-operation are the underdeveloped countries, because they urgently need to improve their economic and social conditions. Assistance must be given rapidly, because today is an age of rapid motion. The new nations of Africa are in particular need of it, because their independence would not be much use if it did not lead to civic, economic and social improvement. The Latin American and the new Asian countries make a similar claim because they wish to escape from their present social backwardness. The I.L.O. has to face this problem: how to deal most efficiently with the social problems of the developing countries. I refer to these countries and not to those which are highly developed, because in the former the economic and social imbalance of the world is most pronounced. Technical assistance, the planning and execution of social programmes, are particularly necessary to such countries as a means of fighting poverty, sickness and ignorance.

The Director-General rightly states that "the I.L.O.'s action could be more concentrated and more effective if it were to take shape through a minority of comprehensive programmes, notably: a strategy for human resources development; a strategy for labour relations; a comprehensive policy for incomes; a programme dealing with labour
implications of automation and technological change.

This general scheme deserves our approval, because we consider that it covers the true objectives of the Organisation; each of the suggested programmes aims at the kind of social action and labour development which the I.L.O. should undertake in member countries. The developing countries urgently need better training of their labour force. The industrialised countries, with their highly developed technology, need adjustment of their workers to changes in industrial technology, and particularly automation, which obliges those rendered redundant in one kind of work to acquire new skills or occupations. Human relations are very important in the field of the social authorities of any country, because most labour disputes originate in lack of understanding between employers and workers. Workers' education programmes are particularly important as a means of improving the approach to human relations, the solution of various important matters regarding the right procedure and due tact in handling an individual case to the complex operation of collective bargaining or even to dealing with a strike or lockout.

When one is struggling for the industrial development of a country the intention is to improve the incomes of the workers together with the economic situation. Labour has not the same views as capital, nor does it agree with those who direct national economic policy. The workers rightly believe that programmes aimed at the industrial and economic development of a nation should be parallelled by programmes for assistance to the workers and improvement in their social situation; however, it is not enough for the worker to enjoy an increased income. He must be able to enjoy a real improvement in conditions of life—an improved food, housing, sanitary conditions, clothes, health, and recreation. All these problems involve workers' education. The worker must not only know how to earn but how to spend. He must be a small-scale economist and manage his own finances.

In our American Continent there is a constant concern for the social improvement of the economically less favoured communities. The economic development programmes of the Latin American countries and their social assistance programmes are one of the foundations of American solidarity. The Alliance for Progress plan, traced by the President of the United States, took shape in the Charter of Punta del Este in Uruguay, which was approved by the governments of the Americas. It lays the basis of a vast plan of economic and social development for our countries. In order to define the participation of the ministries of labour and of the workers in the execution of the Alliance for Progress plan, a conference of American Ministers of Labour was held at Bogotá, Colombia, from 5 to 11 May 1963. It was most successful and voted very important resolutions connected with the planning and execution of social programmes in which the workers will play an important part. I mention this in order to stress the importance of the new labour policy which the governments of America are determined to follow on the basis of the Alliance for Progress economic plan: it is by no means inconsistent with the programmes of the I.L.O.

I shall not say very much to this Conference about the present structure of the I.L.O., because an analysis of its composition, methods and procedures should be made with a greater knowledge and a longer experience than I have of the life of the Organisation. I respect what is said by the Director-General in the relevant part of the Report. Nevertheless, I should like to express my support for a longer period, perhaps two years, between successive sessions of the General Conference, as a means of saving money for the Organisation and its member States. The money so saved might be spent on social programmes. This idea has been expressed by several delegates in previous years. However, to reach such a decision, it would be necessary to modify present procedures for the preparation, discussion and adoption of Conventions and Recommendations, that in various cases a shorter period would be required. In this way the time lost between one Conference and the next would be gained by more rapid procedures. Having regard to the change in the numbers of member States, the Conference of 1962 approved an instrument increasing the number of members of the Governing Body from 40 to 48 in order that the new member States might be better represented there. My country was pleased to associate itself with this instrument, which has already been ratified by Congress. I would like to take this opportunity of telling you that my Government has also ratified, in the present year, the following Conventions: the Final Articles Revision Convention, 1961; the Weekly Rest (Industry) Convention, 1921; the Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention (Revised), 1934; the Safety Provisions (Building) Convention, 1937; the Protection against Accidents (Dockers) Convention (Revised), 1932. Formal notification will be made in accordance with the prescribed procedure.

In ratifying the Conventions I have mentioned, Honduras wished to show its concern to improve the statutory situation regarding labour-management relations; we realise that one of the ways of making the I.L.O. effective is by converting its Conventions into domestic legislation.

In conclusion, I would merely like to repeat my hope that as much comprehension as possible will be present in our discussion of the Conference's agenda and that the decisions taken will be most appropriate to the objectives of the Organisation and to the economic and social interests of the nations which we represent.

Interpretation from French: Mr. LEVI SAN-DRI (Representative of the European Economic Community)—It is with renewed interest that, each year, the Commission of the European Economic Community replies to the invitation to take part in the International Labour Conference. This is particularly so this year, when the Director-General's remarkable Report calls upon us to reflect on what the main objectives of the I.L.O. should be if it is to be adapted to
the present-day world. This provides our Community with an opportunity of comparing our goals, our European goals, with the ideas which your Director-General can draw from his incomparable experience and transmit to the Conference.

Freedom to work, freedom of association, primacy of social objectives, those are the main principles which are upheld and defended by the I.L.O., upheld and defended also by the six countries of the European Economic Community, and which are fully recognised also in the organisation of the Community. What is the purpose of the free movement of workers, which we have already achieved in our Community and thanks to which the workers of our countries are all on the same footstep, almost as though they were members of a single State—not what is the purpose of this if not to strengthen the principle of freedom to work and of the right to work? And the new forms of association which have appeared in Europe, by which representative of employers and workers contribute, with those of governments, to form atripartite foundation for many of our Community organs, are not those manifestations of freedom of association? The primacy of social objectives has been clearly and specifically recognised in the Community, both in the provisions of the Treaty and in practical measures to implement it. In truth, the operation of the Common Market is a way of promoting equal progress in living and working conditions and of bringing social systems into harmony, but it is not the only means by which this fundamental objective can be achieved. Provision is also made for a series of autonomous procedures aimed at securing greater uniformity of progress in the provisions in force in the six countries, or, at least, to institute close co-operation among them in labour matters.

Allow me to speak very briefly about certain action taken recently by the Community in the labour field and which relates to the main problems so rightly raised in the Director-General's Report.

When it is remembered that from 1 January 1958 to 31 December 1962 average annual employment in the Community rose from 60.5 million to 72.5 million that the annual average number of unemployed fell from 2.8 million to 1.5 million, it can well be said that in the field of employment remarkable progress has been made. There are, however, certain regions where there are still manpower surpluses, and there is also a shortage of highly skilled workers. On 31 December 1962 almost 600,000 vacancies had not been filled, and that is why the Commission of the Community has stressed the development of an employment policy reflecting economic conditions. Such a policy takes the form of establishing at regular intervals, with the assistance of the governments and the participation of employers and workers, forecasts relating to the manpower situation; this gives a positive incentive to the co-ordination of effort on the national level. Where situations exist in which there is both a shortage of skilled workers and, in some regions, a surplus of workers, positive action must be taken, partly through regional policies in which the social aspects are of fundamental importance, and partly through a vocational training policy.

With regard to vocational training, the recent action taken by the Council of the Community of general principles for the implementation of a joint policy constitutes the starting point which will enable the Community to develop joint action in order progressively to achieve its objective—the highest possible level of employment. The raising of the standard of living and the improvement of working conditions do not make sense without this fundamental guarantee of employment, as is so well recognised both in the I.L.O. and in the Community. Similarly, they would have almost no meaning unless they are accompanied by ever-increasing protection of workers against all risks, and not only occupational hazards. That is why particular importance attaches to questions of social security, and consequently the Commission of the Community considers it necessary to pursue programmes of this nature among member States in this field.

The executive bodies of the three European communities therefore organised at the end of last year a European Conference on Social Security, which brought together representatives of employers’ and workers’ organisations, members of the European Parliament and representatives of the governments of the six member States and of international institutions concerned with social affairs. The I.L.O. also gave its valuable co-operation. That Conference provided evidence of the principal trends of opinion among the employers and the working class with regard to social security, and particularly with regard to the extension of social security, its financing and the achievement of greater uniformity in benefits, and enabled the Commission of the Community to evolve an initial action programme.

With regard to the improvement of conditions of work, the policy of the Community is to secure uniformity of systems in this matter, while respecting national peculiarities and the economic situation, though it also provides for specific action towards standardisation in particular fields.

There is another sphere, on which the stress laid by the Director-General in his Report reflects our own concern—namely, a field in which economic and social factors are closely interwoven, where exclusively economic moves would be to the detriment of social requirements but where, conversely, economic needs cannot be ignored, since that would block social progress. I am speaking of wages policy and, more generally, incomes policy, which are the essential adjuncts to economic and monetary policy. It therefore appears increasingly essential that in the European Community the general lines of wages policy should be jointly decided by employers and workers with governments, in order to promote expansion, prevent rises in prices and improve the distribution of the national income.

The Report rightly emphasises the need to examine these problems in the framework of a rapidly changing world, a world changing both from the point of view of technology and production systems and from the point of view...
of political organisation. If therefore we have given close attention to the problems arising from technological progress which, as it happens, merge with those resulting from the growth of the market (quite recently we had a seminar to study consequences of automation in the administrative field), on the other hand the feeling of increasingly close solidarity on the world level has led us to participate actively in all action taken to promote world trade and to intensify in particular our contacts with our associated African and Malagasy States.

The new agreement of association between the Community and these States, which will soon come into force, will enable us to give a new impulse to the economic and social development of those countries, and as in the past the main instrument used will be the European Development Fund. Four major features will mark the new system established by common agreement between the Community and the associated States: an increase in the total amount of assistance; more varied forms of action, which will consist of non-refundable grants, loans, remission of interest and short-term credit; the diversification of fields in which action will be taken, particularly technical assistance; and increased technical cooperation, particularly in the form of sending experts, and providing studentships, training and training seminars. Important advances have already been made in past years as regards technical co-operation, but the new agreement will permit this to be carried out on a more stable basis more in line with our objectives, which include the training of African and Malagasy leaders at all levels.

Those are the subjects of main concern to us within the European Economic Community. The efforts made to ensure and maintain the primacy of social objectives within the European structure enjoy the support represented by the close co-operation that exists between the executive of the Common Market, the national governments and the workers' and employers' organisations. The machinery of our organisation has been found to be sufficiently flexible to ensure the active participation at the various levels of representatives of employers' and workers' organisations in the preparation of programmes and their implementation. Whether it concerns the securing of uniformity, the establishment of working groups to examine particular problems, the setting up of institutional consultative bodies, such as the Committee of the Social Fund, or those of the free movement of workers, or vocational training, or those set up to deal with labour problems in each sector in agriculture, the participation of employers' and workers' organisations in the decisions to be taken is the best guarantee that the requirements of social progress will be respected within the European Economic Community.

The work of the Community cannot of course be on such a universal scale or be as influential as the work of the International Labour Organisation, but we hope that the results which will be achieved by the Community in improving living and working conditions for its peoples will provide a fruitful example for peoples elsewhere. With the assistance of the I.L.O. and its example before us and with the assistance of governments and workers' and employers' organisations, this work will, I can assure you, serve the cause of the fundamental principles which you have always proclaimed to be the foundation of the I.L.O. and which can be summarised as peace, justice and social progress.

(The sitting adjourned at 12.45 p.m.)
The PRESIDENT (Mr. ROBINSON)—We now continue the discussion of the Report of the Director-General.

Interpretation from French: Mr. GRAND-VAL (Minister of Labour, France)—At some time in their existence institutions, like men, are faced with the threat of growing old. However, those who stand behind the institutions know that this threat also carries with it the opportunity for a renaissance. Although it was the threat which induced the Director-General to ask us to reflect together this year on the future of the I.L.O., it is no doubt the opportunity that was in his mind as he wrote the various chapters of the Report. Placing the objectives and methods of the I.L.O. in a new historical context, the Director-General obliges us to ask ourselves a fundamental question: as it now operates, does the I.L.O. pursue fruitfully, and in the interests of all, a task the objective and means of accomplishment of which were defined some 40 years ago? The future effectiveness of the I.L.O. will depend on our reply, and we must therefore prepare it with a full understanding of what is at stake.

One cannot fail to note that the I.L.O. owes its moral influence primarily to the cause which has been and remains its own—systematic, persevering action to improve the living and working conditions of the working class in all countries.

If I regard this reminder as not superfluous today, it is because the structure and methods appropriate for the I.L.O. are dictated by the function which it has to perform. Its tripartite structure meets the requirement that side by side with the Government representatives—the only ones responsible for political commitments—the work of preparing international standards should be shared by qualified representatives of the workers, whom it is sought to protect, and the employers, who should be informed of the sense and nature of the action expected of them.

So much for tripartite consultation. To be effective the protection afforded must be placed in a precise statutory framework defining the rights and obligations of the parties. This is the reasons behind the 120 or so Conventions and Recommendations which the Organisation has adopted since 1919 and which today make up a real international labour code.

A second original feature of the I.L.O. is the supervision procedure to which each State becomes subject as soon as it ratifies a Convention, for it is obliged to report its action to a world organ. In addition to the instrument itself there is thus practical control of its application, without which it might become a dead letter. In my eyes not the least important reason for the success of your work is that those covered by international labour law should have their interests periodically mentioned and defended at the international level.

Together these three elements—triptaite discussion, standard setting and periodical supervision—have given your work its own character. Together they have given your Organisation an unchallenged authority and have contributed to a constant raising of the standard of social development in the member countries.

It would not be the less regrettable, on the pretext of respect for constitutional forms, to neglect the realities of the present-day world. The rapid development characteristic of our age justifies or even requires permanent adjustment of objectives and of means.

The I.L.O. must be able to recognise among the new data those which absolutely must be taken into account and which involve changes in the content and forms of its action, without renouncing any of its fundamental principles.

I can see two main groups of such data, one related to the emergence of new preoccupations at the international level. Among the transformations we must, of course, start by noting the obsolescence of some Conference instruments in relation to their technical or social objectives. Some of the Conventions—Mr. Morse's enumeration is most appropriate—correspond only to forms of protection which are out of date, because production techniques have altered or social legislation has advanced. For instance, the problem of industrial fatigue under automation can no longer be solved with the aid of the older instruments. In the same way 14 years as the minimum age for admission to employment no longer corresponds to the real situation in many western countries.
More important still is the change which has occurred in the manner of posing and solving social problems. It is no exaggeration to say that in many fields, and inevitably, the workers' organisations have passed beyond the stage of claims and demands and have moved on to more constructive attitudes.

Their presence in the bodies where the great social and economic decisions of the moment are examined has involved for them a new and essential part in the future of their countries. I do not mean that the trade unions have abandoned their earlier function of defending the workers' interests. But the very character of the problems facing them, and the prerogatives they now enjoy at the national level, give them good reason to bring the public authorities the assistance which these require.

At the international level the changes are no less extensive. The emergence on the international scene of a large number of young States desirous of rapid social progress but lacking the economic means for obtaining this must inevitably change our general view of social problems. Why be so insistent to reduce disparities within a given country when so much more formidable disparities subsist or are even accentuated between the nations? Why not admit that there would be an element of hypocrisy in suggesting that young States should ratify instruments which will have a meaning for them only when poverty is overcome? This means that the same provisions cannot apply indifferently to all nations, developed or underdeveloped. It means also that the problems of the less favoured countries deserve our particular attention and effort.

From these necessarily brief remarks there seem to me to proceed three guiding principles for our action in the years to come.

The first of these is that the I.L.O. must place the particular social problems of the least developed countries in the forefront of its preoccupations. For one thing, in its traditional standard-setting work the I.L.O. must have regard to the obstacles to progress which are inherent in economic underdevelopment. Each instrument adopted by the Conference should thus provide for the possibility of gradual application as economic development occurs, with due regard to the characteristic conditions of developing countries and territories.

It seems to me no less indispensable to increase the technical assistance given to these countries. By multiplying missions of experts and granting more and more fellowships your Organisation can, as Mr. Morse says, help countries to improve the training of those who will be the strategic vanguard of their growth. There is certainly a great deal to be done, for needs are enormous and resources are small. Too often action of this kind is blocked by a human shortage, for the industrialised countries also feel the shortage of skilled personnel caused by an over-rapid development of structures and techniques. Perhaps, however, they should ask themselves afresh whether the effort they are making in this field is all they can and should produce.

But extension of the scope of technical assistance should not mean that the economic and social stages of development have to be strictly simultaneous. It is no doubt one of the temptations of our time to express social problems in economic terms. Though it is necessary not to neglect the economic factors and aspects of social problems, and to keep the interactions present in one's mind, it is not therefore relevant to subordinate social objectives to economic data. First of all, because we know what conflicts there may be between the immediate aspirations of the workers and the imperatives of middle- or long-term growth; secondly, because human needs seldom lend themselves to precise mathematical evaluation. Furthermore, the objectives of economic assistance and help towards social progress differ. The one points to over-all growth and advance in terms of average, the other will measure growth only to the extent that it reduces inequalities and brings up the standard of the most neglected groups.

I think that when accentuating our technical assistance effort we must better define the scope for that effort, its objectives and its means, and we must also, as Mr. Morse rightly suggests, provide for a double procedure of information and supervision which will enable the Conference to know better each year the result of these operations.

Shall I add that it seems to me just as important that the necessary co-operation with the other United Nations agencies shall not involve for the I.L.O. any subdivision or confusion of methods? Mr. Morse has rightly noted that the organisations of the United Nations family must each concentrate on activities which are their own field. I believe that this shows wisdom and is the condition of collective efficiency.

As a second guiding principle I would like to recall the value and importance of your standard-setting work. There is no doubt some paradox in having an organisation of the I.L.O.'s importance producing instruments of a somewhat bare technicality and a deliberately restricted scope, such as the Conventions. However, these instruments are a token of your influence in the world. It must be admitted, however, as I have said, that time has reduced the value of some of these instruments, and I agree with Mr. Morse when he suggests that there should be reflection on the methods which will make it possible to cut the dead wood out of the International Labour Code and leave space and energy for new branches. To remove out-of-date or inapplicable provisions, to amend some Conventions which go into too much detail, to produce new provisions more consistent with present needs and to improve procedures (I am thinking particularly of a permanent revision committee) are paths which lie open to the Conference.

As for means of supervising the application of the Conventions, here also some adjustment may be necessary. The recommendations are the result of a compromise, as Mr. Morse rightly recalls. Therefore they have some natural flexibility, otherwise their geographical or technical application would be very restricted. This means that their application will allow for practical differences and consequently that a national legislation can only be judged as an entity by reference to its spirit, while the many practical
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details of any regulation are of much less importance. I think it is consistent with your concern to respect national differences if control of the spirit and criticism of the letter are placed at two different levels.

My third suggestion is that this concern for a wider point of view should be expressed also as regards the principal social problems which we have to face. The elements involved in social progress are being constantly renewed. Each particular question tends to be attached more and more to a wider field: vocational training, mismanagement of administration, assistance for the unemployed, are only aspects of a single problem, employment policy, so that to examine one means deciding another.

In its trend and content your work cannot neglect this new formulation, which it seems to me can be inserted without difficulty in your institutional framework. This is equally suited for the joint preparation of social standards and for the organisation of major exchanges on leading problems that evade standardised, uniform solution because they are more directly dependent on an over-all policy. This is particularly the case as regards employment and wage policies and as regards the social aspects of development plans.

In examining these questions your Organisation can gain benefit by its particular structure. The multiplicity of contacts between representatives of the public authorities, labour and management from various countries has an unrivalled information value. One should therefore encourage and develop more systematic contact by means of regional conferences, Industrial Committees or ad hoc meetings such as those recommended by Mr. Morse. It is no doubt desirable that these meetings should be prepared by research and mutual information. However, it should be borne in mind that such research activities of a scientific nature, which are an expensive item for your budget, seem in themselves less suited to the particular spirit of your work, in which it is human contacts which provide the real drive for social progress.

Having made these few suggestions I am well aware of the difficulty of putting them into effect. They presuppose selection and determination of priorities. They imply also an adjustment of structure and methods both at the Conference—of which the perhaps excessive length immobilises most of the Office's energy every year—and as regards the Office itself, which will have to devote most of its means to the new tasks you are to define.

Your decisions will require thorough previous study to reveal all the data of the problem and define possible solutions. Having regard to the complexity of this procedure and the length of the work which it will require, I think it wise to suggest that the Governing Body should be entrusted with it. By its structure, corresponding to your own, by its experience and competence, of which it has given us much proof, the Governing Body seems particularly qualified to lay down the specific details, the stages and the means of such a programme. The Conference itself would then decide on the future of the I.L.O. by adopting such of the conclusions of the study as might appear to you most con-
sistent with the requirements of our time and the interests of your Organisation. This is a long job the success of which requires precise definition of the powers of each organ and systematic co-operation between all.

May I say in closing that France intends to spare no effort, will contribute to the full to the common task and will do all it can to help the vast project Mr. Morse has proposed to a successful conclusion. We shall thus feel that we have helped in the renascence which circumstances demand while remaining faithful to what is and must be the essential ambition of the I.L.O.—the search for greater justice between men and between peoples.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—I now call on Mr. Lubembe, Workers' representative, Kenya.

Mr. WHITELAW (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Labour, United Kingdom)—I want to start by saying how much my Minister regrets that owing to illness he cannot attend this year's Conference. This gives me both the privilege and the responsibility of speaking for my country on my first visit to the I.L.O.

I want to add my greetings to the representatives of the five countries which have joined the I.L.O. since last year's Conference. They include three members of the Commonwealth, Jamaica, Uganda, and Trinidad and Tobago, to whom I extend a specially hearty welcome.

It was an excellent decision of the Director-General to devote his Report to the programme and the structure of the Organisation. My Minister wants me particularly to congratulate him on the Report. It puts before us strikingly the great problems which face the Organisation. The very first paragraph of the Report sets out very well what we have to consider—objectives, priorities, and methods. I wish to stress the vital importance, for the future of the I.L.O., of priorities. The field of possible action before the Organisation is vast and success is going to depend, above all, on getting our priorities right. We must not overload the machine and we must be sure that our working methods are such that the Organisation can carry out the programme we draw up with the same efficiency as it has carried out its other tasks in the past.

The view of my Government is that the top priority for the I.L.O. in the years ahead must be the needs of the developing countries. Some of the major problems which these countries face are in the sphere of labour: problems of employment and unemployment and under-employment; the need to train labour for new jobs as economies develop and diversify; trades union organisation—to name some of the most important. All these questions, so vital to the success of the United Nations Development Decade, cannot be within the sphere of action of the I.L.O. Success in dealing with them is a principal condition of success in the United Nations effort as a whole.
I am, therefore, very glad that the Director-General, in his Report, gives most of his attention in every chapter to the needs of the developing countries. I particularly applaud his concentration, in the chapter on trade unions and labour relations, on the situation in those countries. The help which the I.L.O. can give here could be decisive and I was particularly interested to see what the Minister of Labour and Social Welfare for Malaya said in his speech about the need for strong, free and responsible trade unions in his country.

The idea is not equally true in respect of all matters. In his chapter on incomes, the Director-General urges that the I.L.O. should equip itself to deal with questions of income policy, both in developing countries and also in the industrially advanced parts of the world. But I doubt whether it is practicable to tackle this particular question on so wide a scale, or whether the I.L.O. should give priority to this and so many other matters claiming its attention. The circumstances of member States vary so much that a pronouncement on this question, on a world scale, could not fail to be of the most general character and would be of little practical value. This, surely, is one job which the I.L.O. would be wise to leave—at any rate, for the present—to organisations more limited in range and where progress in examining it and seeking solutions will be easier.

After the complex of labour problems which face the developing countries, I would place next in order of priority for the I.L.O. automation and the consequences of technological progress. Rapid technological progress has conferred many benefits on the economically advanced countries but has also created problems. As the Director-General says, technological change brings losses to some industries, localities and occupations, and can create unemployment. I warmly support the principle that the workers directly affected must not bear the burden of change alone. This is why, in my country, we have given so much attention recently to the provision of suitable training facilities for people who have to change their jobs, improving the mobility of labour and policies for increasing employment opportunities in areas with declining industries. This is one of the reasons, too, why we have introduced new legislation to define workers' rights to a minimum period of notice and to minimum earnings during that period. It is also why we are considering ways of improving financial and other provisions for redundancy. I entirely agree with the Director-General that the accelerated introduction of new technology compels the I.L.O. to undertake a vigorous and practical programme on automation. At the same time the Director-General is, quite properly, realistic about this. He stresses that the I.L.O. should concentrate on those functions which it can perform best and on which it can make a unique contribution. We must in particular beware of overlap with other organisations and concentrate our efforts on labour and social aspects of automation. With this reservation in mind I consider that the programme which he sets out merits careful study by the Conference.

I have singled out these two themes—help to developing countries and the problems which arise from automation—because I feel they need special emphasis. All I will add on the subject of our programme is to repeat once more the need to avoid trying to do too much if we are to achieve effective results.

I must now turn to our methods of working. As I have placed so much emphasis on the needs of the developing countries, you will not be surprised that, when I come to methods of working, I put first and foremost a further development of operational activities. There has of course been tremendous increase in the level of the I.L.O.'s efforts in this respect since 1960 both under its own Regular Programme and for the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund. The mere maintenance of the levels of its operational activities in the coming year will call for continuous effort on the part of the Office and the Members of the Organisation. In this situation if we are to contemplate a further expansion of operational activities we must consider how to reduce other activities. We must look too at the suggestions the Director-General makes for improving the structure and the procedure of the Organisation. Mr. Hare, in his speech to the Conference last year, summed up this two-fold problem when he said that we must ask ourselves whether we were making the best use of our resources, whether we had got the right balance and whether we were certain that our present arrangements might not endanger the full development of the I.L.O.'s work in the field.

Let me then in this context comment on our present activities.

Standard setting, through Conventions and Recommendations, must always remain an important function of the Organisation, but there has now been over 40 years of it and perhaps it is time to stand back and try to see what has been achieved. There are now 118 Conventions and 117 Recommendations on the I.L.O. statute book. There can be few labour matters which are not by this time the subject of at least one instrument. Moreover the instruments which have been adopted are not of equal value or acceptability to member States—as earlier speakers, especially from developing countries, have pointed out. As many as 45 Conventions have fewer than a dozen ratifications each. Looking to the future, some of the items which are to come before the Conference in the next year or two make me wonder if we are not scraping the bottom of the barrel for possible material for new instruments. As regards important subjects, the Director-General himself advises us that there is an urgent need for new instruments on freedom of association, automation or the association of workers in the running of undertakings.

Therefore, so far as standard setting is concerned, I wonder if for the time being we should not concentrate our energies on the revision, consolidation and rationalisation of existing instruments. The Director-General has a great many valuable things to say on this subject. For my part, I would welcome a decision to adopt a self-denying ordinance for a few years in respect of the adoption of Conventions and Recommendations on entirely new subjects. I do not suggest that there need be
any rigidity about this. But I do very seriously put before you that we should make it a rule not to place any new subject on the agenda of the Conference unless we are quite satisfied that it passes the following tests: first, that the subject truly lends itself to the adoption of an international instrument; and secondly, that it really is urgent to do so.

Mr. President, we have a custom in my country that a Member of Parliament who makes a maiden speech should say nothing controversial. Perhaps I have not, in this my maiden speech before the International Labour Conference, strictly adhered to this admirable rule. If I have not, my excuse to you, Sir, is that we must not, at this crucial Conference, content to repeat platitudinous views whose only merit is to offend no one. We must be practical, and we must be critical—but at the same time constructive—if we are to hammer out a new and vital shape for this important Organisation.

The President (Mr. Robinson)—The next speaker is Mr. Ouédraogo, Government delegate, Upper Volta, and I invite him to come to the rostrum.

He does not appear to be in the hall, and that will be recorded.

I therefore call on Mr. Lô, Minister of the Civil Service and Labour, Senegal. Is he in the hall? He does not seem to be present, and that will be noted.

The next speaker on my list is Mr. Jaramillo Arrubla, Government delegate, Colombia. Would he please come to the rostrum?

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. JARAMILLO ARRUBLA (Government delegate, Colombia)—I am happy to congratulate the President in the name of my delegation on his election. We wish him every success in his important task.

The Government of Colombia appreciates the merits of the Director-General's Report. We admire the frankness and determination with which he proposes to adjust the structure and programmes of the I.L.O. to the present state of the world. We also approve his intention to maintain the policy of previous years—namely, to guide the Organisation towards clear and useful targets of an economic as well as a social character so as to help the developing countries in their struggle to eliminate backwardness and poverty. My country admires the effort which is being made by the I.L.O. to strengthen the work which it has been doing for some years with a view to improving not only the position of the individual but also that of the under-developed countries. Colombia will move forward with other member States towards this noble objective, particularly in the light of the guidance given by the Conference, the Governing Body and the Director-General.

My Government agrees with the Report that: "Of even greater importance, perhaps, in its bearing upon world issues is the need to encourage in every practical way effective co-operation between the industrialised nations of East and West in economic and technical aid for the development of the low-income countries." But this aid cannot be limited to technical matters; it is necessary to make it effective and extend it to the economic field so that its repercussions reach the social level. It would be of little use to the low-income countries with agrarian economies to receive only technical co-operation for economic development and assistance with regard to education. My country is looking for more effective co-operation from the industrialised countries to the others—for instance, an improvement in the terms of trade, which have deteriorated greatly in recent years, and the fixing of prices of basic export products at reasonable levels, since in the case of Latin America these provide 70 per cent. of our income. My Government is aware that man must be the central preoccupation of a progressive economic and social policy, and it has practised such a policy. It is sufficient to note the effort it has been making for some years to train Colombian workers, with the valuable aid of the I.L.O. It has acted first of all through the National Institute of Training, established when I was Minister of Labour for the first time. This was subsequently transformed into the National Apprenticeship Service. Through these institutions the Government has been striving to establish a vocational training system which will prepare national manpower for improved productivity and a higher standard of living. In the same connection the Report proposes sensible solutions on the human level, such as better utilisation of manpower, vocational training and education, and the participation of wide sectors of the population in national development activities.

But this is not enough. If we are concerned with the worker's earnings so that he may enjoy a higher standard of living, I think we must adopt the same attitude towards the countries where increases are low and economic development is retarded. The Director-General's concern to assist those countries must, in my opinion, have its logical consequence in the activity of the Organisation—such as an attempt to improve the prices of export products. These prices are for our countries what wages are for a worker; they are our international remuneration, the payment abroad for the work of our people. Justice in this respect would contribute to raising our standard of life and bringing us the economic and social progress to which we aspire. The Director-General's Report proposes an appropriate policy of assistance to the underdeveloped countries, but it would have been desirable that he should speak clearly of the objective of securing better prices for export products. It may be said that the I.L.O. has no competence with regard to making proposals of this kind. I would answer that it has felt free to pose the problem and must therefore be free to propose solutions.

My country believes that the I.L.O., in cooperation with the United Nations, the Organisation of American States and other international bodies, should face this vital matter of improving the prices of products exported by the low-income countries as a really direct, just and rapid means of raising their standard of living and achieving the economic and social development they desire. It would be the best
means of promoting the economies of the underdeveloped countries and these are new emerging. As I said only a month ago when I closed the First Conference of the American Ministers of Labour at Bogotá, of which I was President, our evils flow to a very large extent from that source. Quite rightly, the President of Colombia, Dr. Guillermo León Valencia, repeated a short time ago at the same conference that we are not so much underdeveloped as underpaid countries. If we had reasonable prices we would not see our foreign exchange diminish every year by thousands of millions of dollars. With more dollars, pounds, francs, marks or crowns for our coffee, tin, sugar, cotton, copper, wool, meat, bananas and zinc, we low-income countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia could build the schools and train the teachers we require; we could replace the slums, of which we are ashamed, by decent dwellings; we could improve the nutrition of our people and supply them with drinking water; we could, finally, provide all the modern forms of social security for the whole population, and particularly for the rural population; we could provide our towns with hospitals, clinics, nurses, doctors and administrators, and build up a good programme of social assistance. In fact, in the Americas, Africa and Asia we could provide men with a much more tolerable way of life.

If, as the Director-General says in the Report, the world is now beginning, on United Nations initiative, a Development Decade during which it is to make a concentrated effort to increase the resources spent on economic development and ensure better utilisation of its resources, with a view to attaining concrete practical objectives in its struggle against world poverty by the accelerated progress of economic development, one must recognise that we cannot progress along this path unless there is a change in the price policy which I have mentioned. With such an improvement in the terms of trade, the plan would not be one of ten years but of considerably less — and, on the contrary, if there is no such fair and equitable revision of prices, the plan might last a great deal longer.

That poverty means, if poverty in the world has to be faced with decisiveness and energy in action. The facts must be faced, not in the form of plans which look very fine and which, I am sure, are a great deal of fun for specialists to work out, but realistically. The reality is that the hungry peoples of our countries cannot wait. You cannot wait when a man is sick from chronic poverty. You should not need a long-term plan when, in the solution to which the big countries and the international agencies are working, there is the danger of a great deal of unemployment and of persisting frustration in the less developed countries.

My country asks that an opportune solution be adopted. If it is not adopted in good time the great nations should not subsequently complain when the catastrophe and all its consequences follow. As the Director-General states frankly in his Report, page 30 of the English text, "Prosperity in the industrialised countries could not long be sustained if prevailing frustration in the less developed countries were to endanger the peace of the world."

Fortunately, in America a policy has been initiated which raises hopes regarding a change of attitude to these matters, namely the Alliance for Progress of President Kennedy, which would be very greatly reinforced by the adoption of a frank policy to increase the prices of export products until they reach a stable and appropriate level.

All these proposals can be understood here and now if we study what the Director-General says about the future of the Organisation. He says: "The I.L.O. should, I suggest, during the coming years, be prepared to give a greater share of attention to these various problems affecting incomes in developing countries. What form should our activities take in this matter?" In the opinion of my country, the reply lies not only in the solutions proposed in the Report, but in the policy which I have respectfully but firmly just suggested to you. If this were so, the I.L.O. would really take on the role which it should have in the present-day world, and would have adjusted to a large extent its structure and programmes to the changing world of today such as the Director-General suggests, as the Director-General says, a potent instrument for action on world social problems and... a potent bulwark for world peace.

Another aspect of the Director-General's Report is that which relates to freedom of association. He says, "It is not difficult to understand the practical meaning of freedom of association for workers within a society where working conditions are determined largely by collective bargaining. But it has now become important to consider how this principle can be given real specific content in a society where basic decisions affecting employment, income and living and working conditions are taken through a central plan; or in an economically underdeveloped society in which the trade unions are weak and such industry as exists is mainly owned and operated by the State." Further on, the Director-General states that "trade unions and their economic bargaining position are generally weak because of a variety of factors." Then he expresses his thought more clearly by asking the delegates to the International Labour Conference to consider carefully whether the I.L.O. should not have the opportunity of giving more direct assistance to trade unions, in particular in those cases in which they meet with great difficulty in setting up sound organisations. He concludes by saying, "The I.L.O. should devise a strategy of action for the promotion of sound trade union development.

Colombia fully shares this doctrine because it considers that through a free and democratic trade union movement the workers can better ensure their own progress. We also think that the I.L.O. and its States Members should stimulate, encourage and strengthen the association of the workers by all appropriate means.

In this connection, my country is about to adopt a statutory scheme giving effect to these and other important objectives. The Senate has already passed a Bill submitted in July 1962 under which the system of collective bargaining for the determination of wages and conditions of work is to be generalised. Under this Bill every employer with more than five persons permanently in his service must determine the remuneration and conditions of employment of
his employees by means of collective bargaining with them.

Although our legislation recognises, and has done for many years, trade unionism, freedom of association, and regulation by the labour code of all matters connected with collective agreements, this system only effectively applies to a few workers, because not all of them belong to trade unions, so that owing to this weakness of trade unionism in our country there is no generalisation of the system of collective bargaining, as would have been desirable. This makes it necessary to pass legislation such as that described, making collective bargaining for the determination of wages and conditions of employment compulsory. If Congress agrees, not only will we have stimulated that achievement of modern labour law—the collective agreement, which balances the economic weakness of the worker by the force of numbers—but it will stimulate trade unionism, because in an undertaking where there is no union one will be established in order to enable a collective agreement to be concluded. We think this is one of the best ways of strengthening the trade unions and therefore we would suggest the adoption at a coming session of the Conference of a Convention which would make collective bargaining compulsory and generalise the system for the determination of wages and conditions of work.

I would have liked to have made some more remarks, but time is too short. I shall end by calling for more direct contacts between the I.L.O. and ministries of labour so that the peoples can enjoy social justice as a basis for universal lasting peace.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—Mr. Fennema, Employers' delegate, Netherlands, has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. FENNEMA (Employers' delegate, Netherlands)—We accepted an amendment to the Standing Orders last year that for visiting ministers the time limit should also be 15 minutes. I do hope that visiting ministers not only will comply with this rule but will follow the indications of the President of this Conference when they are warned that the time limit is passed.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—Your remarks are noted, Mr. Fennema, and we hope that the delegates will conform to the Standing Orders as you have indicated.

I now call on Mr. Jarison, Government delegate, Malagasy Republic.

I see he is not in the hall.

I call on Mr. Fall, Workers' delegate, Mauritania.

He does not appear to be in the hall.

I call on Mr. Cuffe, Employers' delegate, Ireland.

Mr. CUFFE (Employers' delegate, Ireland)—The International Labour Organisation, through the medium of the very able and most comprehensive Secretary-General which it has submitted to the plenary session of the Conference this year, is engaged in a process of what I would call "spring cleaning" which, having regard to the rapidly changing world conditions in which it has to operate, is particularly opportune at this present juncture. Recognition of the necessity for taking stock and, if need be, for self-criticism, is a most healthy sign in any international organisation, and particularly one of this nature, as there is always a danger of complacency as a body such as this grows and expands at the rate which the I.L.O. has been and is doing.

In the necessarily short time at my disposal it would not be practicable to attempt to deal with the Report of the Director-General in all its varied aspects or in any great detail, but I will therefore, if I may, limit my remarks to such points which, to my mind, seem to be of major or paramount importance.

The I.L.O., as I understand it, is not and certainly was never intended to be a political organisation, but one dealing with purely technical problems of a world-wide pattern concerning labour conditions and standards of life arising from the relationships of management and labour. World politics or the clash of ideological concepts should never be allowed to intrude, in so far as is humanly possible, into the discussions or deliberations of either the plenary Conference or the work of the various committees of the Organisation. To allow this to happen is the surest way to disaster. It has to be recognised, unfortunately, that tensions and disagreements of a political nature exist in the world today, as they did in the past, but surely there are other arenas and other more appropriate organisations for dealing with such controversial and contentious questions. As I have said previously, their introduction into the work of the I.L.O. can only gravely impair the social and technical work which is clearly its primary mission. This being so, and there can surely be little difference of opinion on such a vital matter, there is a pressing need, particularly having regard to the additional misunderstandings which can arise owing to the existence of language barriers, for a clear-cut and agreed definition of what constitutes the meaning of the word "political" in this particular context. If it were possible to get unanimous agreement that politics be excluded from the speeches of delegates and a uniform standard adopted for the guidance of chairmen on speakers as to what does and what does not constitute political intervention in debate, this would constitute a most valuable step forward in expediting the work of the whole Organisation. The task of the chairmen, of officials and of participants would also be immeasurably facilitated and the possibilities of friction thus considerably lessened.

Now to turn to the technical aspects of the matter. In the matter of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations a clear need exists, to my mind, for great expediency in bringing the reports of this Committee before the plenary session of the Conference at a much earlier stage than is the case at present. It has been the custom for these reports to come before the plenary at a very late stage in the Conference for consideration, which is anything but helpful.

Once again, whilst the difficulty of suggesting a suitable alternative method is only too evident, it would seem that the present system...
of conducting the proceedings of the plenary session almost simultaneously with the discussions in the various committees of the Conference calls for reconsideration because, whilst this method of procedure may be feasible for countries with large delegations, it causes very considerable problems indeed for the smaller countries, which do not have sufficient representatives to be present simultaneously both at the plenary session and in the different committees and to enable them to be present and participate in the work of both the plenary session and committees to the extent which they desire. The present situation produces a result which, so far as the plenary session anyway is concerned, can be tedious and in danger of becoming somewhat perfunctory. This impression is heightened by the constant comings and goings of the delegates and advisers to attend the different committee meetings; the plenary proceedings accordingly tend to become ragged and at times, indeed, in danger of suffering from a lack of that degree of dignity and decorum which the supreme forum of the International Labour Organisation should surely possess if it is to be accorded the measure of respect which it must enjoy and which is certainly its due. As we all know, there are times during the day when the speakers at the plenary session are often addressing rows of vacant seats.

To any objective observer it would also seem that some urgent thought would have to be given to the number of speakers whom it is physically possible to cater for in the plenary settings. Perhaps it would be possible for the different groups of the Conference to agree on the limitation of the number of speakers whom they would bring forward. It is very natural, and very understandable, that as the Organisation grows and the number of member States increases, the number of those wishing to address the Conference will increase in proportion, but if the I.L.O. is not to develop into a mere word factory some very serious thinking will surely have to be devoted to this particular problem. To my mind it is quite impossible for the delegates to digest the torrent of words and documentation, which is tending to increase and to multiply to quite an alarming extent each year.

Again, some more definite instructions for speakers should surely be drawn up by the Governing Body, or whatever the appropriate authority may be. At present speakers tend to deviate from the technical aspects of the subject under discussion and either, as I have said, to delve into contentious political issues or to spend a considerable time in describing conditions in their own countries, which, while extremely interesting, are very often scarcely relevant. It would seem that the seriousness of the situation has already been recognised, as is evidenced by the existence of a special committee of the Governing Body which was set up to consider the working methods of the Conference but which, apparently, so far has not produced any very concrete results.

It must surely be recognised that the primary functions of the I.L.O. are of a practical—and I stress practical—and technical nature. There is a very real danger that a trend might develop whereby the Organisation would concentrate too much on what I might describe as the academic side of affairs rather than on the practical and technical, which is surely its real métier. Technical assistance and co-operation with governments and employers' and workers' organisations and the supervision, particularly the supervision of the administration, of such technical assistance, coupled with co-operation with the newly emerging countries, without the attachment of any political strings—surely these are the aims and objectives which the I.L.O. should strive to achieve, rather than barren and sterile wranglings on political matters which do not belong to and certainly cannot be settled in this particular forum.

The I.L.O. should also give careful consideration to the criticism which has been levelled in some quarters that it is tending to take the easy way out—that of satisfying governments at the expense of employers and workers. There is in this respect, I submit, a need for closer cooperation between the I.L.O. and the employers' and workers' organisations. I think that is a very important aspect of the present situation.

Whilst other speakers have referred to the question at some length, no consideration of this year's Report of the Director-General can fail to have special regard to the matter of the periodicity of the annual Conference. With over 1,000 delegates and advisers from over 100 countries, the bringing together of this mammoth assembly at such short intervals could in time defeat its purpose. Is the position not coming about that it would be better if, instead of taking place annually, this Conference were held every second year, in order to allow the technical work of the Organisation—which, as I have stressed before, I consider to be paramount—to proceed with less hindrance? Would it not be possible, for example, to have a Conference for free discussion, a free exchange of views, without necessarily proceeding to a legal instrument from time to time? The I.L.O. has a splendid chance to do extremely useful work, never more so than in the new world of today with its very rapidly changing conditions, but I submit that it must have a care that it adheres to its primary function and does not, as I fear there is a chance it may do, lose its way. Organisations of this nature are particularly prone to this danger.

To the newly emergent countries in particular the I.L.O. must surely hold out a special hand of welcome, because it is in those countries that the specialist services and technical aid which the I.L.O. is so qualified to supply can be of particular and special benefit. In assisting these—as indeed all—countries to raise their standards of life and prosperity the I.L.O. will surely be fulfilling its real purpose. The I.L.O. has a job, a world job, to do in the field of labour relations, which is essentially the field of human relations.

In his Report the Director-General has very rightly stressed the major fundamental principles for which the I.L.O. stands, namely freedom of labour, freedom of association and freedom of speech and the achievement of social objectives. These are all very fine in their way as abstract ideas and general aims,
but surely it is on the ability or otherwise to achieve the practical attainment of these aims, putting them into actual practice, that the future of our Organisation will stand or fall.

One further fundamental question which arises from the Report of the Director-General is that of the tripartite structure of the I.L.O., that it includes governments, employers and workers. This is an essential feature of the Organisation and of its structure, however it may be criticised. Whatever the defects in this set-up, and I am fully aware that there are many contentious and controversial facets at the moment in its make-up, it must surely be maintained and strengthened. The interests of workers and employers are certainly not irreconcilable—I repeat, not irreconcilable. Tripartism stresses and underscores that essential fact.

In this period during which the process of political, social and economic revolution is taking place at an unprecedented pace throughout our world the I.L.O. can play a very valuable part in assisting towards maturity of thought on social problems and objectives in reconciling the approach of those countries which are already developed to a considerable degree in contradistinction to those countries which are in process of development. Patience and tolerance will be needed during this transition period, but speaking as I am—and I, particularly, feel this personally—as a delegate from one of the smaller nations which has passed through just such a period, I can say that, given these two essentials, there is every reason to hope that the I.L.O. can play its part in bridging the gulf between conflicting ideologies and attaining the goal of universal social justice.

In conclusion, I congratulate the Director-General on the comprehensive nature of his Report, particularly in the hope that it will provide a welcome opportunity for introducing a new breath, a wind of change, for that reshaping and refashioning of the I.L.O. which is clearly overdue and for the introduction of a new practical—and above all practical—approach to the labour problems of the world.

Mr. McPHERSON (Workers' delegate, Jamaica)—This 47th Session of the International Labour Conference sees my country, Jamaica, for the first time as a full-fledged Member of the Organisation. This new status was derived from Jamaica's emergence last August to independence nationhood.

My country participates in this great world body as a country in which free democratic institutions are firmly established, the most important of which is our Parliament conducted under a two-party system and patterned on a constitution that enshrines the rule of law and the rights and freedom of the individual, consonant with the United Nations Charter.

The growth and increasing influence of the I.L.O. and the indelible mark for good that it has made in the world are due to the concept with which it was created and established. All can see that this concept is being followed with equal as well as with alert eyes and practical actions.

This is how the I.L.O. has come not only to concern itself with the protection of the workers as human beings and the improvement of actual conditions of work, but also to pursue as its function technical economic, social and political questions affecting communities and nations. These approaches have had the effect of bringing about the maximum benefit to raise the standard of living and providing social security for the workers and their families.

I represent the trade union movement of Jamaica and as part of the delegation of that country, let me say this: our Government continues as a Member of the I.L.O. not just for the vanity of graduating from observer status to full status but because the trade union movement is satisfied that the Organisation is important to the industrial harmony and social and economic development and progress of nations. I think it will interest you to know that Jamaica has actually ratified and legislated on more I.L.O. Conventions than the minimum required of a member Government of the Organisation.

In all matters affecting the working people of Jamaica there is the closest co-operation between government and the trade union movement. Nevertheless, the movement is not giving up its militancy or losing its identity. This might be an example to the trade unions in some countries which permit themselves to be politically dominated and stifled in return for legislative co-operation.

At the national level the trade unions, while normally operating as separate units, participate jointly in collective bargaining, and industry-wide negotiations are conducted on that basis, presenting a united front on the workers' behalf.

There is another matter which is of obvious vital importance to the life of my people at home. It is the question of employment.

The Director-General in his Report deals with this subject in relation to economic development. He says, among other things, that by far the largest part of the population of underdeveloped countries lives in rural areas and is dependent on agriculture; therefore, the I.L.O. is engaged in a programme to promote the expansion of rural employment. He says that it seems likely that the main avenues towards fuller employment in underdeveloped countries are to be found in the rural sector.

These references all apply to Jamaica. But the I.L.O. in its usual logical approach could consider an important factor which has caused the economic stifling of Jamaica and other underdeveloped countries. It is the question of prices in marketing primary products which are the main source of revenue and employment in these territories.

The trend today is that the prices of manufactured goods of the developed countries are rising faster than the prices of primary goods and this puts the underdeveloped countries, which produce primary goods, at a severe and increasing disadvantage. This unbalanced situation is inimical to the economic development of the underdeveloped countries and could retard the work of the I.L.O. in this field.

I propose that serious and proper steps be taken by the I.L.O. to ensure the trading among these two groups of countries. Over the past years the I.L.O. has served the purpose in the true concept in which it was
created, and has grown in usefulness because it has never permitted itself to operate in too restrictive a field.

I call on the I.L.O. now to pursue the course of challenging all obstacles that confront it in making for a better way of life for workers and their families throughout the world. If this policy is maintained surely it will take prompt, ample and effective action in dealing with the relations, both social and economic, between developed and underdeveloped countries.

Mr. Acting President, will you please convey to Mr. Johnson that Jamaica joins with the rest of this Conference in congratulating him on his high appointment to preside over this 47th Session. We are aware of his outstanding ability, his strength of character, his tolerance and other remarkable qualities which have made him the man for the Chair.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BALILI (Government delegate, Albania)—On behalf of the Albanian delegation I would like to pay tribute to the President, whom we have unanimously elected, as a representative of awakening Africa. Africa, whose sons are united in their bold struggle for freedom, has the sympathy and support of all the workers of my country and the whole world. At the same time I should like to extend a warm welcome to the delegations which are taking part in the proceedings of this Conference for the first time: to the delegation of the heroic Algerian people who, after seven years of bitter struggle, have attained independence; and to the delegations of Rwanda, Jamaica, Burundi, Uganda, and Trinidad and Tobago. While hoping that the peoples will be successful in their subsequent efforts to consolidate their national independence and social progress, our thoughts, sympathy and support go out to all nations fighting for their freedom and we express our conviction that they will soon be represented among us.

In this connection the delegation of the People's Republic of Albania would like once more to draw the attention of the Conference to the fact that a country of over 650 million inhabitants, a free and sovereign State which by its example has become a very important factor in defence of peace and social progress in Asia and throughout the world, the People's Republic of China, is deprived of its legitimate right to be represented at this Conference. Despite the pressure and intrigues of the United States of America and its followers against the People's Republic of China our delegation is perfectly convinced that the characters sent here by Chiang Kai-shek's traitorous clique who occupy China's place in international organisations will be driven out, and that the genuine representatives of the People's Republic of China will come and take their place here.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. ROBINSON)—May I remind the speaker that political subjects are forbidden in this discussion.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BALILI—The question of discrimination within the Organisation against the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the German Democratic Republic may be approached along the same lines. The Government of the People's Republic of Albania welcomed the position taken at the 46th Session of the Conference according to which the Director-General's Report to this session should be devoted to questions such as the programme and structure of the I.L.O. and their adjustment to the new conditions which have been created in the world. As emphasised in the Report, new political, economic and social factors have become operative in the social field.

The Albanian delegation considers that, after noting those changes in his Report, the Director-General should, in a spirit of impartiality, propose measures to allow full utilisation of all the Organisation's resources for the implementation of a programme which would be in the interest of the thousands of workers who, by their work, increase the wealth of the world, and not of the capitalists and the policies they represent.

In this Report, however, all these questions are, unfortunately, not viewed in this light. For example, from the very beginning of the Report, in the part referring to the question of peace, we noted with surprise the opinion that the threat to peace lies in the so-called "frustration of the desire for rapid development in the low-income countries". This claim can only be deemed grossly offensive to countries in the course of development. It is a calumny which is designed to conceal the true threats to peace.

These dangers have nothing to do with the legitimate efforts of the peoples of countries in course of development. They are due to the aggressive activities of the imperialist and colonial powers which want to re-establish and assert their domination over other countries. In their attempts to slow up the inevitable historical progress of society, the reactionary forces use every means and every method. The headlong armaments race, the encirclement of socialist countries by military bases, the equipment of the army of the Federal Republic of Germany with nuclear weapons, the attack against Cuba and South Viet-Nam, the intervention in Laos, the co-ordination of their plans to put the lid on the liberation struggle of the peoples who are still under colonial domination, bear eloquent witness to all this.

It is clear that, as long as the reactionary circles continue in this way, it will not be possible to establish either durable peace or international co-operation.

The defence of peace calls for a concentration of the attention and activities of the nations in order to compel the imperialists to abandon their aggression.

On the question of international co-operation, the Director-General expresses the view that the I.L.O. should investigate every possibility of promoting better international co-operation.

In our opinion, international efforts to help settle the labour problems cannot be successful unless the organisation possesses political and social realism and ceases discriminating against the socialist countries and the international workers' organisations.
In the Report which is submitted to us there is no reference to this essential prerequisite for the necessary international co-operation.

The question we are considering at this session is of such importance that the decisions that will be taken will condition the effectiveness of the Organisation's work in the years to come.

In his Report the Director-General analyses labour relations on the international plane and gives the reasons which, according to him, account for all those economic and social problems with which the Organisation is concerned.

In this connection, I should like to express my opinion with regard to my country's position in respect of economic development, freedom to work and freedom of association. In fact, in what country have such important questions been better and more fairly dealt with than in the socialist countries? I should like to make a brief but emphatic reference to a few results achieved in this direction in Albania.

By 1962, that is 18 years after the people came to power, a modern industry had been established and its production had increased 28.5 times.

Agriculture, which used to be in a very backward state, has caught up once and for all. Thanks to the use of fertilisers and the opening up of new land, the area of land under seed has increased by 85 per cent. Agricultural mechanisation is very extensive. Total agricultural production has increased 2.2 times.

The achievements in the fields of education and culture are equally great. The number of pupils has increased 6.4 times. In the State University and in other institutes of higher education which were first set up after the liberation, 11,700 students are pursuing their studies. A large proportion of them, when they leave their employment, do so on full pay and have certain other facilities.

In the field of public health the number of physicians has increased sixfold; there are 24 times as many nurses as there used to be; the number of hospital beds is now 12 times as high as it used to be. The population has freedom to receive medical care, the cost being met by the social insurance scheme first set up under the régime of popular democracy.

These achievements, which cover the main fields of economic and social life, are the fruit of a new order, of the socialist order set up in Albania with the object of raising the material and cultural standards of society as a whole.

Time does not allow me to enumerate here all the rights guaranteed by labour legislation to the toiling masses of my country in the field of freedom to work and freedom of association, but I feel I should emphasise what is vital for the workers, that is the fact that in Albania the workers no longer live under the anguish and uncertainty resulting from depressions and unemployment, as happens in the capitalist countries. Whatever can be the point of the so-called right to work and freedom of association when the workers of the capitalist countries, defending their rights by going on strike, are mown down by bullets? Is it not true that, in the interval between the last two sessions of our Conference, the workers of several capitalist countries have paid in blood for taking part in strikes and demonstrations to secure so-called freedom of association?

What is the point of freedom to work and freedom of association when, in certain capitalist countries, there is racial discrimination, a striking example being the State of Alabama in the United States of America?

At the previous session of our Conference, certain delegates, wishing to strengthen the I.L.O. and to create necessary conditions to ensure that international questions with which the I.L.O. is supposed to deal would be discussed by all members of the Organisation, made a few proposals for the extension of the scope of the Conference in order to ensure that certain procedural rights of the Governing Body and the Director-General would be transmitted to the Conference itself.

In his closing speech at the previous session, the Director-General had also stated that he would put forward measures for the democratization of the I.L.O., but there is, unfortunately, no proposal of this kind. On the contrary, there are certain proposals in it which could well be described as anti-democratic.

We have to express our profound regret that the Director-General of the I.L.O. should have taken the premature step which this year for the first time has deprived the Conference of the possibility of considering resolutions relating to the various matters affecting the workers of all countries, and that he should have done this without any preliminary consultation of all the member States, in spite of the issue of a very useful Report. I shall therefore try to make a brief but emphatic reference to a few results achieved in this direction in Albania.

In his closing speech at the previous session, the Director-General had also stated that he would put forward measures for the democratization of the I.L.O., but there is, unfortunately, no proposal of this kind. On the contrary, there are certain proposals in it which could well be described as anti-democratic.

The Albanian delegation, on the basis of experience accumulated to date, considers that these proposals, far from improving, would only hamper the work of the I.L.O.

These are the views of the Albanian delegation on certain fundamental questions to be considered at this session of the Conference. We hope that the Conference will examine these questions in a spirit of impartiality, as the interests of the I.L.O. require and as is required by the new needs of our time.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. GALDOS GARCIA (Employers' delegate, Spain)—In the short time at my disposal I cannot speak as fully as I would wish of all the many important questions raised by the Director-General in his very useful Report. I shall therefore try
to describe, if only very briefly, our views on some of the problems which we consider to be of particular interest. With the Director-General that it is indispensable and urgent to bring up to date the structure and activities of the I.L.O. if we really wish the work begun so many years ago and so beneficial to mankind to be continued without interruption. We listened with keen interest to the Director-General's speech on 26 June 1962 when he replied to the discussion of his Report to the 46th Session of the Conference. Since that time we have shared the concern which he so wisely and honestly describes in the present Report.

There are many problems facing the world. One of the most important is that which relates to the relations, in the widest sense, between employers and workers. These relations are sometimes guided and sometimes more or less directed by the public authorities. The differing views and the differing structures of the member countries, in form or substance, oblige us to contemplate the influence of governments in the matters which concern us. In some cases considerable confusion has been produced and it is therefore more than difficult, indeed, even impossible, to distinguish between the parties concerned and their interests.

There is no doubt that, whatever the political forms existing in a country, differences of opinion and conflicts with the workers are inevitable, and so it remains necessary for each opinion to be freely expressed. Therefore our tripartite system must be maintained and we must ensure that there is sincerity and independence in putting forward and upholding the viewpoint of each group. However, this vigilance must be objective and unprejudiced; we must admit that we can make mistakes; but we must not prevent anyone from expressing his views, with due respect for others and for the high social purpose which brings us together, and with a readiness to listen and to learn from others.

We must therefore eliminate every intent not in accordance with the essential objectives of this institution, and must abstain from abusing this rostrum for equivocal purposes. Nor should our time be taken up and our Conference used for the discussion of matters which may be interesting but which should be handled by other and more appropriate organisations, of which there is no lack.

Tripartism should rest on two foundations, unity and universality. This is a difficult task, and despite the difficulty, it is only through its oneness and its tripartite structure succeeded in observing the strictest independence.

We should all therefore regard ourselves as pupils at a single school; we should seek to avoid desertions and should not provoke them. When anyone disagrees we should like to believe that it can help us to face the uncertainties of the future, having itself through its ownness and its tripartite structure succeeded in observing the strictest independence.

This is the time at which we most need the presence of countries in this already venerable I.L.O., its advice and, if possible, its successful endeavours at reconciliation; for it can help us to face the uncertainties of the future, having itself through its ownness and its tripartite structure succeeded in observing the strictest independence.

We should all therefore regard ourselves as pupils at a single school; we should seek to avoid desertions and should not provoke them. When anyone disagrees we should like to believe that it can help us to face the uncertainties of the future, having itself through its ownness and its tripartite structure succeeded in observing the strictest independence.

It follows from the above principles that we should adopt the non-political approach advocated in the Report of the Director-General, whose opinion has the authority of one who has long contemplated events from an exceptionally advantageous standpoint.

I could have devoted part of my short speech to particular matters, but have not done so in order not to act in a manner which I myself would criticise. I have merely expressed an
opinion which may not be of value, because it is mine, but I think it merits indulgence because it is the product of a good intention, that of serving the objectives of the I.L.O., which requires help from all sides in its coming process of adjustment.

Let us be sincere, seeking to agree rather than to disagree.

In concluding I should not fail to mention a few important problems for employers such as myself, namely automation and the social function of the I.L.O.—problems with which the Office is dealing with zeal and success.

Interpretation from French: Mr. DUMITRESCO (Government delegate, Romania)—There can be no doubt that the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference is of particular importance. The discussion of major issues—such as the contribution the I.L.O. can make to the maintenance of peace, general and complete disarmament, the liquidation of the vestiges and consequences of colonialism, and the need for certain structural changes—can only be the beginning of the adjustment of the I.L.O. to the realities of our time.

I remain convinced that this initial success will be followed by many others, so that our Organisation may become a truly effective agency of international co-operation. As far as we are concerned, we have the most sincere desire to do all we can to ensure the attainment of this noble goal.

Similarly, I should like to emphasise straight away how right the Director-General has been, in his Report, to deal with certain major problems of existing international life, taking account of the framework in which the I.L.O. operates.

This effort, which we appreciate, is all the more deserving of our praise because it leads to the logical conclusion, dictated by the facts themselves, that it is necessary to adapt the structure and programme of the I.L.O. to the profound political, economic and social changes that have occurred in the world in the years that have elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration of Philadelphia.

As far as my delegation is concerned—and this applies also to delegations from many other countries who have expressed the same view at previous sessions—the conclusion of the Report is a matter for great joy. We are also very happy that the Director-General emphasises in his Report the obligations—unfortunately long forgotten—of the I.L.O. as a member of the United Nations family to contribute by every means to the maintenance and strengthening of peace.

It is certainly not easy to provide straightforward solutions for all the existing shortcomings in the structure and work of the I.L.O. The essential thing is to discover—in the complex, radical changes that have occurred in the world over the last few years—the guiding spirit and the direction which should be followed by the I.L.O. This calls for lucid analysis of the facts, for the absence of all prejudice and outside influences which are remote from the goals of the Organisation.

I should now like to say a few critical words with regard to the Report. As the representative of a socialist country which is fighting for peace and peaceful coexistence, for co-operation among all States based on equality and mutual respect and strict independence and national sovereignty, I cannot refrain from disagreeing to some extent with the opinion expressed in the Report with regard to the most important problem of our time, namely peace, the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and general and complete disarmament. The role of our Organisation in this connection, according to the Report of the Director-General, is to provide an open forum for dialogue among differing world political... and economic forces.

Unfortunately, the stocks of nuclear weapons are continuing to grow. The Western powers have, up till now, prevented any agreement in this respect. The I.L.O., as an agency of the United Nations, cannot remain a mere spectator of this process. It must act in order to secure general and complete disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons, which is the key to a radical improvement in the international situation.

We have read with much interest the last speech made by Mr. Kennedy. Of course it is very important, but we should look at the facts.

Side by side with a few interesting arguments the Report also contains opinions which we do not share, exaggerated concern in certain respects and solutions which do not correspond to the importance and urgency of the problems to be solved. Even more astonishing is the failure to appreciate and adopt certain proposals which have been made from this rostrum not for the first time.

It seems to us that the work of the Organisation over the last few years has revealed tendencies towards association with the European Economic Community, the Council of Europe and other institutions which are not of a worldwide character and whose presence in the I.L.O. is contrary to the interests of an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Organisation.

Our delegation cannot agree with the passages in the Report which give an ideal view of the establishment of supranational organisations such as the European Coal and Steel Community or the European Economic Community. Experience proves that such bodies involve the violation of national sovereignty and the independence of States, unequal relations and subordination of one nation to another, the domination of underdeveloped countries and the submission of the weak to the strong.

The Report contains certain unfortunate generalisations. They cannot mislead anyone, since they are disproved by the facts. For example, there are general references to the difficulties of all industrialised countries, without distinguishing among them. Now, we know very well that at the moment there are different social systems in the world. Even our own Organisation has both capitalist and socialist countries among its Members. When we look at the facts, therefore, one must take into account the social and economic system of the particular country. I shall not try to refute the allegations of the Director-General with regard to isolated depressed areas, the unequal development of certain areas in the
most advanced countries, unemployment and the lack of opportunity for workers to find employment in various industrialised countries. However, these statements require some qualification: all these evils, and many others besides, are peculiar to the capitalist countries. This state of affairs is impossible under socialism. I should like to show, for example, that in the People's Republic of Rumania over the last 15 years an industry has been built up which is now the main sector of the economy and produces eight times more than it did in 1948. The engineering industry and the metal trades, which were almost non-existent in the past, now account for over a quarter of the total industrial production.

The policy of industrialising our country has always been designed to improve the geographical distribution of production, thus ensuring the economic progress of all backward areas, districts and towns. At the same time considerable attention has been devoted to raising the standard of living of the people. For example, in the years that have elapsed since nationalisation the national income has increased 4.7 times.

I should now like to make a few comments with regard to universality and the democratisation of our Organisation. There can be no doubt that the admission of new States to our Organisation is not only an act of justice but also an important step forward towards universality. Unfortunately, there is still a considerable amount to be done to ensure complete respect for the principle of universality. To perform its tasks the I.L.O. will have to admit to its proceedings all countries which are at present excluded, as well as the most representative trade union organisation, the World Federation of Trade Unions, whose wealth of experience could be put at the disposal of Members of our Organisation.

The democratisation of the I.L.O. and of its component bodies is still the main problem to be settled, particularly in view of the unfavourable consequences of the present situation on the programme and policy of our Organisation. If we want the I.L.O. to be able to deal with the problems of our times this problem will have to be considered by the Director-General and by member States with all the boldness and lucidity which has been shown by the United Nations and the other specialised agencies. It seems, unfortunately, that this is very unlikely to occur as things stand. The structure of the I.L.O. reflects a membership which corresponds to that of the pre-war period. Most of the Members, especially the new States which have recently become Members of our Organisation, are rightly claiming their perfectly natural right, which would justify their feeling that they really belong to the family of the Organisation. The Rumanian delegation supports this legitimate claim. It considers that to correct this disproportion some Members of the Organisation should show political understanding by giving up posts and rights to which they are not entitled. This is partially true: In view of the composition of the bodies as the Governing Body with regard to the Workers' and Employers' groups. It is also true for Industrial Committees and other bodies, including the staff of the Inter-

national Labour Office. Better application of the principle of regional representation is necessary in consultation with elections to the Governing Body. The need to represent all trends in the trade union movement and employers from the state sector which is growing steadily throughout the world, and the elimination of discrimination, which has been made into a principle in the I.L.O., should now also become reality.

The Report refers to the tripartite system as being a fundamental principle which gives originality and strength to this Organisation. We feel that this special feature should be a sort of seismograph that would draw the attention of the Organisation to all the new problems and economic and social changes which call for urgent action. Unfortunately, in practice, this principle continues to be invoked by the so-called free Employers' and the Workers' from Western European and North American countries in order to promote the policy of cold war and prevent the full participation of Employers' and Workers' representatives from socialist countries in the work of our Organisation.

There must be an end to this. So far as we are concerned we cannot regard it as proper that sovereign States which comply with all their obligations, including their financial obligations, under the Constitution, should see their representatives deprived of their rights under the Constitution.

The composition of Industrial Committees reflects the same anomalous situation. In six Committees—the Building, Civil Engineering and Public Works Committee, the Iron and Steel Committee, the Coal Mines Committee, the Chemical Industries Committee, the Metal Trades Committee, and the Textiles Committee—African States are represented by only one country. In the Petroleum Committee the Arab States are hardly represented at all, and a country such as Rumania, the second in Europe in terms of oil production, has not been included for reasons which have nothing in common with the I.L.O.'s Constitution, whilst seven other European countries have been included although their production of oil is very slight or they are countries that are of very slight importance in this connection.

If the essential aim of our discussion is to be achieved, and the foundations laid for positive subsequent action, the bodies appointed by the Conference must also try to make practical proposals to review or clarify the provisions concerning the role of the Conference as the supreme organ of this Organisation. The powers of the Governing Body should be restricted, the principle of fair geographical representation in I.L.O. organs observed, and procedural provisions introduced to ensure the proper working of these various bodies.

I should like to associate myself with those who have expressed the hope that this session will be able to put forward proposals for dealing with the problems under discussion.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—The next name we have on our list is that of Mr. Achour, Employers' delegate, Tunisia.
We note that he is not here.
I should like to invite Mr. Aguilar Ladrón de Guevara, Workers' delegate, Peru, to participate in the debate on the Director-General's Report.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. AGUILAR LADRÓN de GUEVARA (Workers' delegate, Peru)—In the name of the Peruvian Workers' Confederation I am glad to greet the President of the Conference and to congratulate him on his election to that high post. The workers of my country are always sensitive to demonstrations of solidarity and are therefore happy to greet the various new delegations from the African countries. I particularly greet the Workers' delegates, who come to this Conference to add their efforts to improve the conditions of life and work of the workers of the world. I should like also to greet all the delegations represented at the Conference.

In the name of the Peruvian Workers' Confederation I am glad to greet the Director-General on his extensive Report. I am in agreement with his views on the part which can be played by trade unionism in the political and social fields as a contribution to world peace. The Director-General mentions the need for freedom in our Organisation so that we can express our points of view on major labour problems, particularly in developing countries like my own. At the international level the Director-General faces the urgent need to bring closer together the countries of East and West, so that they may co-operate both technically and economically, for their better assistance to the most needy countries and so that we may have real peace to enable assistance to be as effective as possible.

The Peruvian Workers' Confederation considers that the workers must take an active and permanent part in the General and Regional Conferences, in the technical and Industrial Committees and in all other I.L.O. bodies, regional or world-wide, so that the workers may themselves have a direct responsibility and make their modest contribution to the results we seek. The workers of Peru—in the interests both of their own and of other countries—would like the I.L.O. to ensure ratification of the Conventions and to ensure also that Conventions, once ratified, are incorporated in national legislation so that the workers may receive their benefits.

The fight against poverty undertaken by the workers' organisations is not only directed towards improving standards of life and providing remunerative jobs; it is also aimed at training the worker technically and as a trade unionist so that the factors which prevent his normal development may be counteracted. Among these factors I should mention the unsatisfactory distribution of incomes in rural areas. We wish agrarian reform to be used as a means by which the rural worker may have more economic and social independence.

As regards the recommendations of the recent conference in Bogotá, I would mention the Institute of Labour Administration; we are seeking to train employees in labour services so that they may be more effective in trade union education of the workers and so that there may be more efficiency in trade union circles. We wish the workers to take a greater part in international meetings so that they may have more experience of what is required in order that their contribution may be as great as possible.

At the Conference of Ministers of Labour held in Colombia, principles were adopted which are in accordance with those suggested by the Director-General of the I.L.O. with regard to the protection of the worker, namely principles regarding the establishment of a minimum wage, the extension of social security schemes and the periodical readjustment of pension rates. The problems of employment resulting from automation and the failure to incorporate in the economic and social life of the country the indigenous and agricultural workers call for intensive international cooperation, owing to their extent.

The Peruvian workers expressed their criticism of the Bill for the reform of the Penal Code, which reduced trade union rights already acquired and destroyed the right already secured by the workers and their leaders. This Bill would have imposed drastic penalties, including prison and the suspension of trade union leaders on the pretext of guaranteeing freedom of employment, and thus provided the opportunity for strike-breakers to betray our trade union movement. Luckily we managed to alert the working class and we held up the implementation of this Bill.

The Peruvian Workers' Confederation requests the I.L.O. to provide the necessary technical assistance to reform the workers' pensions and social security scheme in order to raise the level of pensions and ensure that all workers benefit from social security. The assistance provided should include an international effort of comparative study of labour and trade union institutions in order to facilitate the generalisation of the experience and measures which have been found advantageous and useful for economic and social progress in various countries.

The Peruvian Workers' Confederation, which is affiliated to the Inter-American Regional Organisation of Workers of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and to the I.C.F.T.U., expresses through me its thanks for the work done by those federations in the trade union field, particularly in the promotion of workers' education. In this connection I should like to refer to the importance for the workers of having an adequate education. In modern society the worker is called upon to play a role of primary importance, and that role he cannot play unless he has the necessary education. Therefore we in Peru are carrying out an intensive workers' education campaign, and we intend to go on with it as far as we can. We would like the I.L.O., with its great experience, to devote the greatest attention to this basic form of activity.

In conclusion may I ask all of you to make a joint effort to secure world peace and to guarantee employment and fair remuneration to all workers. I am sure that I shall go back to my country convinced that the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference has been successful. I hope it will achieve concrete results for a better world in justice with bread and liberty for all.
RATIFICATION OF CONVENTIONS
BY COLOMBIA
AND THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

The PRESIDENT (Mr. ROBINSON)—I have the pleasure to announce to you that the Director-General of the International Labour Office registered on 7 June 1963 ratification by Colombia of the following Conventions: Holidays with Pay Convention, 1936; Protection of Wages Convention, 1949; Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951; Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957.

The Director-General also registered on 10 June 1963 ratification by the Central African Republic of the Final Articles Revision Convention, 1961.

(The Conference adjourned at 5.30 p.m.)
CONGRATULATIONS TO THE SOVIET COSMONAUTS

Interpretation from Russian : The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—Before we resume our agenda for today, permit me to make a short announcement.

I am sure the Conference will support me when I say that I would like to congratulate Valentina Tereshkova and Valerii Bykovsky on their phenomenal achievement in space; they have made a triumphant break-through. The Seagull and the Hawk have flown off together. This achievement has closely followed that of the American achievement, that of Major Cooper. Who knows, perhaps, but that at this very moment the Seagull and the Hawk are flying over Geneva or Lausanne, although, according to calculations, they will be over Geneva at about 9 p.m. No doubt the time will soon come when the I.L.O. will deal with such questions as conditions of work for cosmonauts and spacemen. However, if we are to judge by the songs that they are singing, the spaceman and the spacewoman are in excellent spirits. At any rate, their joint flight shows that the I.L.O. principle of equality of the sexes is being upheld. The right to work, irrespective of sex, is being fully upheld by the Soviet Union, as are the other principles of this Organisation. I would like to wish these courageous Soviet cosmonauts a successful flight and a happy landing. Let us hope that more seagulls and hawks will fly off together in peaceful skies in the future.


Interpretation from Russian : The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—We take up the study of our agenda for today. First, however, Mr. Johnson, Government delegate, Nigeria, has asked for the floor. Is it on a point of order, Sir?

The Honourable J. M. JOHNSON (Government delegate, Nigeria)—I beg leave to make a very important statement affecting the future of our beloved Organisation.

It is now common knowledge that I have resigned the presidency of this Conference in protest against the manner in which a delegate of the Republic of South Africa was forced on this Conference, in spite of the clear feelings of delegates on the matter. I had no other choice in view of the principles involved, and I wish to make it abundantly clear that I did not subscribe to the declaration which was made by Mr. Faupl of the United States delegation that I authorised him to report to the Conference that any delegate of the South African Government had the right to address this Conference. I did not see, let alone approve, the text of the statement before it was made on the floor of this house.

This is a serious moment in the life of this Organisation. This is a moment which challenges the conscience of people who value democracy, fundamental human rights and human dignity, and all the delegates from Africa share this view with me because of the vital principles involved that call for no compromise.

There are two issues in this matter. In Nigeria we believe in human dignity and social justice. As a Member of this Organisation we subscribe to the Declaration of Philadelphia which article 1 of our Constitution sets out to promote. We believe that a violation of this Declaration is a breach of the Constitution.

It was on this ground that my delegation submitted a resolution to this Conference in 1961 condemning the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa and calling upon it to withdraw from this Organisation. The resolution was approved by the Conference. The resolution of 1961 states in part that apartheid is against the clear principles embodied in the Constitution of the I.L.O. This being so, we hold, as the Conference did in 1961, that the South African Government has violated the Constitution. It would be inconceivable to hold otherwise in view of the continued trampling and brutal disregard of these noble principles by the Government of South Africa.

My delegation finds it impossible to sit in the Conference with the delegates of a government which does not believe that all human beings, irrespective of race, creed or sex, have the right to lead their lives in conditions of freedom and dignity.

This matter is also a moral issue. We are in a society which holds certain principles dear to its existence. A Member violates these prin-
ciples. For this reason we called a meeting, heard him and found him guilty. As honourable men we advised him to withdraw from our society. It is only a person who has lost all sense of honour that would remain in a society which condemned him and advised him to withdraw. A situation of this character happened in the British Commonwealth, and the South African Government did not persist in retaining its membership. It she did, that great society of free States would not have taken things the way we have been asked to take them here.

In my presidential address at the opening of this Conference I gave the story of the feather. We have together taken a decision that the South African Government is unfit to be a Member of our Organisation. Do not let us blow off the feather of responsibility in carrying out this decision. We have a duty to the world to promote and establish human dignity and social justice. It is a duty as necessary and honourable as the fight the human race undertook not long ago to rid the world of fascism. There is another fascist régime in South Africa; millions of Africans have been denied the most elementary rights and freedoms. They are oppressed, they are daily beaten up, imprisoned and tortured. They are gradually being exterminated by the most brutal methods. Are we going to wait here until they are totally eliminated from the face of the earth? These are things that make freedom-loving people all over the world fight and die in the great struggle against fascism. Do we have to fold our hands and feel unconcerned because these things are happening outside Europe and America? But our resolutions and good wishes for a future that is not discernible for the suffering workers of South Africa are not enough. Hypocritical judgment of violence will not solve the trouble either. This is a serious matter.

My delegation regards this South African issue as a challenge to the conscience of the South African Government in this Conference.

The African delegations have given serious consideration to the situation that has arisen and I am directed by them to make the following declaration:

"The African delegations representing the Governments, the Employers and the Workers participating in the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference, meeting in Geneva on 14, 15 and 16 June 1963,

Recalling the provisions of resolution 176 (1) of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 7 November 1962,

Recalling further article 6 of the United Nations Charter providing that: 'A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council',

Considering that the I.L.O. has committed itself to pursuing co-operation with the United Nations and wishes to ensure the universal and effective respect of human rights and of fundamental freedoms on the basis of dignity and value of the human being,

Considering that it has been proved definitely that these elementary principles are being violated daily in the Republic of South Africa to the detriment of the indigenous population by arbitrary arrest, detention and exile, and also by the violation of other fundamental freedoms proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

"Considering the decisions taken unanimously by all the African Heads of State at the Addis Ababa Conference against apartheid, who have proclaimed that they will use every means possible in order to help the African peoples still under foreign rule to regain their independence,

"Considering the resolution adopted at the 45th Session of the I.L.O. Conference in 1961 requesting the withdrawal of the Republic of South Africa from the I.L.O. because of its apartheid policy,

"Considering that, informed of these measures by the Governing Body of the I.L.O., the authorities of the Republic of South Africa have purely and simply rejected the power of these resolutions,

"Considering the passive and inadmissible attitude adopted by the executive authorities of the I.L.O. and in view of the personal and unconstitutional action of Mr. Faupl, Vice-President of the Conference, and the manner in which South Africa was imposed on the Members of the Conference in violation of the 1961 resolution,

"Decide as a sign of protest to abstain from participating further in the deliberations of the 47th Session of the I.L.O. and to address an urgent appeal to all delegates of countries pledged to freedom, justice and peace to show their active support."

This is the end of my group's declaration. In order to avoid any misunderstanding of our position in relation to the Conference, I have been asked to state that the step which we are now taking does not mean withdrawal from or leaving the Conference. In fact we shall continue to enjoy the rights conferred on us as delegates of the Conference until we finally decide a further step in the light of developments. Thank you.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—On my list of speakers I next have the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Morse.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE—I have, during 15 years, come to this rostrum to defend many interests in the interest of maintaining the universality and the strength of our Organisation. Today I come again in what is perhaps my most difficult intervention, but one which must be made, since ours is a responsible Organisation dedicated to the struggle for peace, dedicated to improving the welfare of all men. I owe it to the member States to set the record straight and to give you the objective facts in the situation, because we are now part of the historical process, and it is important, in the writing of history, that the truth be stated so that those who follow us can benefit from our own experiences.

I rise to speak because I was told yesterday by a committee officially designated to repre-
sent the African group that they had not yet prepared an agreed declaration and that before they made a declaration they would inform the Secretary-General—the Director-General of the I.L.O.—who, after all, is the trustee of the Organisation's Constitution and its welfare. I have not yet been so informed, and I am surprised that my first notice is your statement this morning, Mr. Johnson, from this rostrum.

Secondly, I must put the record straight. Mr. Johnson has resigned as President of the Conference, and, of course, it will be necessary to elect a new President. In his resignation Mr. Johnson sent me the following note:

"Director-General, I.L.O.

I regret initiating a move that may bring strain and add to the already heavy work of the Congress. Please accept my resignation as President of the 47th Session of the I.L.O. It is inevitable that I should take this step, and I wish the Congress every luck.

(Signed) J. M. JOHNSON."

This was delivered to me during the latter part of the morning of Saturday. It has been officially acted upon by the Officers of the Conference. The Selection Committee was notified yesterday. Mr. Johnson is, of course, as he himself indicated, no longer President of the Conference.

Now I want you to be good enough, all of you, to sit back and hear me out. This is not easy, but I have got to do it, and I beg of you your courtesy and your patience, because I speak to you from the very best of motives and from the bottom of my heart.

This Conference and this Organisation have been living through very difficult days. The situation has developed since last Wednesday, when a protest was made by the African delegates concerning the right of the Employers' delegate from the Republic of South Africa to speak in the discussion on the Director-General's Report. It continued last Friday when, as you know, on the ruling of the Chair, the Employers' delegate from South Africa made his statement and a number of delegates thereupon left the hall and, as you know, there was a considerable and noisy demonstration.

Since then plenary sittings of the Conference have been suspended. There have been a series of discussions and negotiations outside this hall in an attempt to find a way out of the impasse in which the Conference found itself. These were initiated by me, because of my responsibility as Secretary-General of the Conference and on the specific authority given to me by the Selection Committee of the Conference last Wednesday evening to carry out consultations with a view to a resolution of the difficulty. These consultations have, in an atmosphere of tension, been accompanied by various rumours. There have also been certain statements to the press, and, as I said earlier, I must set the record straight so that all delegates may have a correct understanding of what has transpired and so that the work of this Conference may continue.

First let me say that fundamental issues touching the very structure of the Organisation and human dignity are involved in this situation. There is the issue of discrimination, of a racial policy which has been condemned by a resolu-
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messages offering to speak with this meeting, but I was informed each time that it was not necessary. Finally, at my request to be heard I was informed that a delegation of 12, composed from the three groups, had been appointed to meet with me yesterday at 9 a.m. This delegation's spokesman made it clear that it was not empowered to discuss with me, but only to hear what I had to say and report back to the full meeting of African delegates.

Thus I explained to this delegation four points—I want to tell you about these four points—outlining a composite of measures that were open to the African delegations, and these were as follows.

First, the African delegations might have come to this session of the Conference with a challenge to the credentials of the South African Government delegation and, in view especially of the 1961 resolution, this could have been a basis for excluding the delegation from participating at this session. The African delegations could, however, take action to challenge these credentials at the next session if they so desired.

Second, a resolution could be submitted to this session of the Conference under the existing urgency procedure which would put this Conference clearly on record against the policy of apartheid. In addition, this resolution could ask the United Nations to become seized of this problem and to determine a policy to be adopted by the entire United Nations family on the issue of apartheid. This resolution could also request the Security Council of the United Nations to deal with the issue of apartheid on an urgent basis at its next session, which will be next month, July 1963.

Third, I stated that I would be prepared personally, in my capacity as Secretary-General of the Conference and Director-General of the I.L.O., to meet with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in July, upon the close of this session, in order to clarify and put personally to the Secretary-General, U Thant, such views as this Conference might decide to embody in a resolution at this session. This would ensure that resolutions passed by the I.L.O. and by the United Nations are fully coordinated and that the Secretary-General is in possession of all the elements for his presentation to the Security Council when it meets in July.

Fourth, the African group could decide to undertake concerted action in the Governing Body of the I.L.O. and in the governing bodies of all other international organisations, and in the United Nations itself, to obtain the specific amendment of the Constitution of the I.L.O.; the Constitutions of all other international organisations, and the Constitution of the United Nations itself, which would state specifically that the policy of apartheid was fundamentally contrary to the Conventions of all these bodies and that any nation practising this policy cannot be a Member of the United Nations or any of the organisations comprising the United Nations family.

Thus I explained to this delegation which met with me I reiterated my willingness and my desire to meet with the whole assembly of African delegations, to explain the position to them as I saw it and to discuss any question with them. The delegation's spokesman indicated, however, that they would report to the whole meeting and would inform me in due course of its wishes.

That was yesterday morning. Early in the afternoon I heard unofficial reports that the meeting of African delegates had concluded. The press, however, had word that a declaration had been adopted and that it was to be read to the plenary sitting. There was even a text of such a declaration in the hands of some journalists.

Some of the members of the delegation from the African meeting came back to see me yesterday afternoon. Their spokesman then informed me that the meeting had decided that the African delegations would cease participating in the work of the session. At the same time, it was made clear that this decision was subject to change in the light of developments that might take place—presumably any further negotiations that might lead to a different situation.

I turned to these gentlemen and I asked these spokesmen for the African delegates whether they could clarify the reports I had received concerning a declaration to be made on their behalf. In reply I was informed that the information I had received, and that I had heard, was completely inaccurate. No declaration had been approved by the delegations. Furthermore, I was assured that, as Secretary-General of the Conference, I would be informed of any such declaration before it was made to the Conference. I told the Selection Committee last evening, for the record, on my word as Secretary-General of this Conference, that I was informed that there was no declaration, that no declaration had been agreed and that I was not seized of one; because I believed.

Meanwhile, as I mentioned, a statement was circulated to the press purporting to be a declaration of the African delegations to the Conference. Many of you will have read the substance of this so-called declaration in today's newspapers. I have. I refer to this now as a matter of privilege because this text contains certain allegations concerning which the facts must be made clear also. It concerns the person who presided over the sitting of the Conference last Friday, Mr. Faupl, the Workers' Vice-President of the Conference. Let me read the text which was given to the press:

"Considering the personal and anti-constitutional action of the Vice-President, Mr. Faupl, President of the 11th Meeting, and the deplorable manner with which the representative of the Republic of South Africa was imposed on the members of the Conference in violation of the 1961 resolution...decides as a protest to abstain from participating in the meeting..."

What I am going to tell you now I also told the spokesman representing the African delegations and, subsequently, the Selection Committee. It is this: that Mr. Faupl, when he presided at the sitting of the Conference where this problem came up, was presiding after a meeting of all the Officers of the Conference at which it had been agreed by all the Officers of the Conference that he should take the Chair so that the business of the Conference could proceed. The situation was that the Govern-
ment Vice-President had already had the Chair, and he agreed that he should not take the Chair on this occasion. It was his own view that, as he had had it, it was the next person's turn. The next person was the Employers' Vice-President. The Employers' Vice-President felt that, in view of the fact that he would be Vice-President, that his ruling might even be impugned. So, in the circumstances, it was suggested that the next person in turn take the Chair; and that happened to be Mr. Faupl.

Now, Mr. Faupl stated that he did not want to take the Chair; he stated that he had voted in favour of the resolution on South Africa; he stated that from the bottom of his toes he was against the whole policy of apartheid; he stated that his whole career in his country had been spent in fighting racialism and he did not want to have to be placed in the position of ruling in a case which ran against his own conscience when it came to the elements of this issue. This was the discussion which took place among the Officers of this Conference. But he was prevailed upon by his colleagues, by all the Officers of this Conference, to do his duty, and he said: "I will accept that; after all, it is true, I have been elected; this is an honour, being Vice-President, which has been conferred upon the Workers. But I accept only in all these circumstances, in the interests of the Organisation and in the interests of complying with the constitutional requirements of the job at this session, and only on this condition, that all the Officers of the Conference agree that I shall rule in this matter that the South African delegate has the right to speak." That was his position.

The Government Vice-President then indicated that he would like to suggest an amendment to what Mr. Faupl had proposed, his amendment being that when Mr. Faupl ruled it should be very clear that he was ruling that all delegates had the right to speak, not just the delegate of South Africa, so that it was clear that we were talking about a principle which really was basic to the whole issue of freedom of speech. That was his position. It was accepted unanimously by the Officers, including Mr. Johnson, and it was on that basis and on behalf of all the Officers that Mr. Faupl came to this rostrum and agreed to preside.

We then went back to the Selection Committee, all the Officers of the Conference went to the Selection Committee, including Mr. Johnson, and I reported to the Committee that the acting President would proceed in the Conference on this agreed basis.

Now, there are many other aspects of this problem that I could go into, but I thought I ought to make it clear that any public insinuation of this character in this matter concerning Mr. Rudi Faupl and concerning the manner in which he presided must be publicly, irrevocably and clearly denied. There must not be any misunderstanding about the manner in which any Officer of this Conference has discharged his responsibilities. I do not want to go further into this case, but I think it important that this particular point be made. Now let me revert to the story of the negotiations and add that on several occasions during the last few days I have been in contact with the Government delegation of the Republic of South Africa in order to ascertain, in line with the resolution of 1961, whether that delegation would be prepared to withdraw from the Conference. I was given to understand that the Government of South Africa had decided, as a matter of policy, not to leave.

So much, then, for the record of the discussions. Where does this leave us? Let me recapitulate the position as I saw it and let me tell you what I think should be the course of action for our Conference.

This Conference at its 1961 Session adopted a resolution condemning the racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and advising the Republic of South Africa to withdraw from membership of the I.L.O.

The Government of South Africa has not complied with this advice, nor has its delegation consented to withdraw from this session of the Conference, and there is no provision in the I.L.O. Constitution for the expulsion of a member State.

In the face of this situation, Mr. Johnson of Nigeria, who was the mover of the 1961 resolution, as he stated this morning, resigned as President of the session, and the African delegations, as I was told yesterday, have decided to participate no further in its work.

So far, the situation would seem to be entirely negative. However, there are, in addition, more recent factors which put the situation in a different light.

The first of these is the continuing determination of the majority of delegates that the constructive work of the I.L.O. in fulfilment of its basic objectives should not be allowed to be paralysed. Accordingly, a new President of the Conference will be elected, and under his guidance the basic work, our search for peace based upon social justice, can continue its way to fruition.

And, in addition, a resolution has been submitted to me under the urgency provision of the Standing Orders, and the Officers of the Conference are now seized of it. This draft resolution would reflect the condemnation of apartheid of the 1961 resolution and refer the situation created by South Africa's non-compliance with that resolution as a matter of urgency to the United Nations. It would request the United Nations to consider the situation in relation to South Africa's continued participation as a Member of the United Nations and to report action taken to the I.L.O. This draft resolution, which has been presented by the Government delegate of Panama, thus takes up one of the suggestions I made to the African delegations. Other points could be taken up in the Governing Body.

Let me say, in concluding this assessment of the situation, that the I.L.O. has had to face very grave crises in its recent history. I have been through them all, and I believe myself that from each test we have emerged strengthened, and I believe that we will do so again. There are two reasons for this: as an Organisation, we have never wavered, we never will waver, in our basic moral purposes; and we have never adopted, and we shall never adopt, arbitrary methods.
In 1954, when issues of a different character, but equally as grave as those which confront us today, were raised, issues concerning the right of the Soviet Union to participate fully in the work of the I.L.O., I recalled to the Conference that the rule of law, due process of law tempered by reason and equity, was the essence of our tradition and civilisation.

Let me quote what I said then. “Yet we can never afford to take a tradition like ours for granted. The rule of law can be destroyed by any acquiescence in a violation of law. A habit of utilizing force can be undermined by emotional intransigence. Whatever future course this Organisation may take, any abandonment of our tradition, any resort to unconstitutional means to overcome a problem in defiance of due process of law, can only be to our loss. It would drain away our constitutional strength.”

And this is an issue, let me emphasize, which does not affect us, the I.L.O., alone. With great care we have all helped to build a framework for international co-operation through the United Nations family organizations. Any move to break away from this acquired habit by resorting to the use of power alone, no matter what the seeming advantages, no matter what the provocation, would not only threaten the I.L.O., it would be a setback for the United Nations. Each of us here must continue the work of our predecessors, to nurture prudently the growth of a civilized community of nations.”

That is what I said in 1954, and which I feel bound to recall in the light of our present very different circumstances, because the principle I tried to express, the feeble manner in which I tried to put my views across on this particular concept, is I believe of lasting and real validity. These are words, but there is truth in them, and I believe that if we adhere to the law it will reinforce the moral purpose of the I.L.O. in its struggle against racial discrimination and for universal recognition of human dignity. Without law there can be no respect for dignity, no civilized recognition of equal rights and equal opportunities. The infraction of law only creates the basis for discrimination. So we must fight discrimination, but we must fight it with dignity and with the dignity that comes from truth.

My friends, you do not have to tell me about racial discrimination; I need no lessons on racial discrimination. Racial discrimination is the enemy of the civilized world community. It is a challenge to the existence of a world community, and so it is a challenge to world peace, it is a challenge to world order. We must fight this discrimination, we must fight this enemy, but we must fight it with methods which strengthen the foundations of world order. We must—I urge upon you, I pray you—engage this enemy effectively. This cannot be done by quitting the Conference, by sitting in the halls.

That is why I regret the decision of which I was informed yesterday that the African delegations were planning to take no further part in this session of the Conference. I think this is an unfortunate decision, I think it is a very unwise one. I would prefer to see Africans stay and fight on this issue, fight under the rules of law which are open to them, and show the world how men can meet a challenge and master it, and master it with the power of truth and dignity. I know from my own struggle with fascism through five years of war that you cannot engage the enemy when you retreat from the field of battle.

This issue of apartheid is one by which the United Nations and the other specialized agencies, as well as the I.L.O., are now challenged. I believe that this Conference should take a decisive step in responding to the challenge, in doing so in a way whereby the United Nations and the I.L.O., with the other organizations, work out together a common policy, a common action, combining their force and their effectiveness. Whether this is done depends upon the delegates present here—depends in large measure upon the African delegates.

It has been said, and it has been mentioned in the press, that some people would be ready to destroy the I.L.O. as a protest against South Africa. Let me say this. They will not. They cannot destroy the I.L.O.; they do not have it in their power to destroy the I.L.O. The I.L.O. is too firmly rooted in the movements of workers everywhere in the world towards fuller freedom and a social order which is more just and equitable, and in the struggle of the peoples of emerging nations for a better way of life. Those who talk this way cannot destroy the I.L.O., but they can limit the effectiveness with which the I.L.O. works to achieve what they themselves want. They can, if the passion of the moment so dictates, reject the weapon which the I.L.O. can be in the struggle against discrimination.

And this is the question with which this Conference is now squarely faced. Do we lay down our weapons? Do we abandon the field of battle? Do we sabotage the foundations of a civilized world community in our haste to leave? Or do we, on the contrary, go forward together to engage in the struggle and to triumph over injustice and oppression, to triumph over poverty and discrimination? That is the decision before this Conference.

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—Mr. Johnson has asked for the floor to reply, and since Mr. Morse’s remarks concerned him I think it is only right that he be granted this opportunity. I therefore invite Mr. Johnson to come to the rostrum.

Mr. Johnson (Government delegate, Nigeria)—It is far from being my intention to engage in a wordy battle with the Director-General of this great Organisation, but I would like to call attention to a few remarks that concerned me in his impassioned plea for the continued participation of African States in the great work of the I.L.O. As you all know, it is part and parcel of our lives as politicians, as workers, as employers, to believe in the binding rule of collective bargaining.

When I had the honour of being President of the I.L.O. Conference a few days ago this question of the continued participation of South Africa arose. I was invited by telephone
to come over to a meeting of the Officers and the Selection Committee. I thought I should not shirk my responsibilities, and I accepted this call. I met the Officers and the Legal Adviser to the I.L.O., and I was informed that it was the advice of the Legal Adviser that nothing could stop South Africa from speaking because South Africa was legally entitled to a hearing. This opinion was shared not only by all the Officers but by all members of the Selection Committee. Before that, I knew what was going on at the meetings of my colleagues and countrymen from Africa. I thought it my duty to respect the I.L.O., to do my best to serve by doing otherwise. The Legal Adviser had already given his advice, the Officers felt he was right, and all the other members took a similar position. Would I be helping the work of the Officers of the Conference if I started to argue or to debate a matter when I knew I would only come off worst in the encounter?

I do agree that the decision was unanimous—unanimous in the sense that I kept quiet because I thought no useful purpose would be served by doing otherwise. The Legal Adviser had already given his advice, the Officers felt he was right, and all the other members took a similar position. Would I be helping the work of the Officers of the Conference if I started to argue or to debate a matter when I knew I would only come off worst in the encounter?

I expressed my desire, and I received the co-operation of the Officers and members, and in order to prove to you that I was not shirking my responsibility I opened the meeting and I made a statement that I could not continue, at least for the time being, as President of this august assembly.

That is what happened, but are you not surprised, then, when the Director-General mentioned here that this was accepted by all of us, that he did not say that I gave definite instructions to Mr. Faupl to come here and quote me as saying that South Africa was entitled to a hearing? I should have thought the elementary rules of debate and decency would prevail when putting forward to a general assembly the views of the executive. Put yourself in my place and imagine how I felt when I sat and listened to Mr. Faupl saying "I have been authorised by President Johnson..." and so forth. If we all took a unanimous decision—never mind whether I was in the minority—was it necessary to single me out and mention me? The post of the President never dies. If a President is not sitting, his Vice-President carries on and takes absolute responsibility for whatever he does. He does not have to come here and say "I am acting on the instruction of the holder of the post", does he? But that is by the way. I have given my experience to a man of great ability and honesty. Similarly, I have great respect for my friend the Director-General.

I appreciate how we have come to this impasse. Maybe love for the Organisation supersedes love of fairness to one's colleagues. We could all agree for this great Organisation, but let me state here that it is not the intention of the African people to wreck this Organisation. We are all aware of the fact that South Africa is not wanted here. Do not let us be carried away by well-planned and effective speech-making. If ten gentlemen form a club and make the provision that nobody will be dismissed, if subsequently one is found not to be true to type, he would be asked to resign. Does it follow, when such a decision was taken, the member should cease to participate in the affairs of his club? Why was this provision made in our laws if it meant nothing? The provision was made because we are all honourable ladies and gentlemen here. We thought that any nation with self-respect, when asked by all the other Members of the Organisation to resign, would not dare to wreck this Organisation. We are all aware of the fact that South Africa is not wanted here.

South Africa has been condemned by the Director-General even, but apart from asking it to resign has anything been done, and reported back to this assembly, to show that this matter has been followed up? We have been talking about credentials. We challenged the credentials of South Africa last year. Did we succeed? We failed. If we had challenged the credentials of South Africa this year those forces which are interested in the continued participation of South Africa would still have defeated us. Therefore, we thought the only way open for us was to come here and—to borrow the Director-General's language—to do a bit of filibustering. That was denied us. The President could have continued to recognise speaker after speaker on points of order, and perhaps this would have meant the adjournment of the meeting so that a solution could be found afterwards. However, we were overruled, contrary to the rules of this Organisation, and we had to walk out. It is a pity.

We are told that today it is happening to South Africa and tomorrow it may happen to another nation. I would not like this to be interpreted as a fear that Africans may try to oust Europeans one of these days.

I hope that was not in the mind of the last speaker, but I assure you we are prepared to fight apartheid, to fight racial discrimination, not only in Africa but in Asia, in Europe and all the other parts of the world.

Africans today are very, very grateful to the President of the United States of America for the steps he has been taking to make it impossible for Negroes in America to continue to live in shame. I hope those who left the United States before this change of heart on the part of the President would please write back home and get new instructions.

Law is one thing. If you believe in the rule of law as it is delivered, law has it that we have asked this country to leave our fold, but they continue to hobnob with us, and you say they are entitled to all the courtesies and privileges that you would give to a gentleman. Is that fair? Is that moral?

Well, I will leave at this stage because I would not like to prejudice the chances of
speakers who come after me. But this is a clarion call to you. It is for you to back us now or to think of other considerations, economic or otherwise, and back the forces of evil. God forbid that this Organisation should go on the rocks. We will do everything in our power to sustain it and make it a very effective weapon, which it has always been, for the promotion of peace. But we expect sympathy and understanding from our brothers and sisters in this hall.

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—I think we shall follow the following procedure. Those who wish to speak on a point of order are entitled to do so. I think in such conditions one principle must guide us—to give the floor in so far as these requests come up.

First on my list of speakers on a point of order is Mr. Kamel, Government delegate, United Arab Republic, and I would call him up to the rostrum.

Mr. Kamel (Government delegate, United Arab Republic)—I am greatly honoured to have the opportunity to deliver to you the following statement on behalf of the Arab delegations to this session of the International Labour Conference.

"The delegations of the Arab States to the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference,

"Fully convinced that the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of the Republic of South Africa constitutes a violent crime against humanity and human rights,

"Protesting against the insistence of the Republic of South Africa to pursue this policy in challenge of the resolution adopted by the International Labour Conference in June 1961,

"Acting in solidarity with the decision taken by the African States in protest against the permission given to the delegate of the Republic of South Africa to address this Conference,

"In conformity with what the delegations of the Arab States unanimously decided and with the declarations made by their delegates at the meetings of the African group;

"Decide to abstain from further participation in the deliberations of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference, in solidarity with the African decision in this connection."

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. Borisov (Government delegate, U.S.S.R.)—In connection with this extremely important statement by Mr. Johnson, I consider it my duty, on behalf of the group of socialist countries at the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference, to declare that we have the greatest sympathy for the statement by the delegates of the African countries. We understand and share their sentiments of indignation and the fury of the African peoples against this policy of racial discrimination, apartheid. Such a policy is a shame in the twentieth century, yet it still exists and it has even been made a general policy of the Government in the Republic of South Africa.

We well understand the indignation of the African countries, particularly because when the U.S.S.R. came into being we declared full equality among peoples, and we declared it a heinous crime to indulge in any form of racial oppression or discrimination.

In the international arena, in all international organisations, the representatives of the Soviet Union have decisively and consistently called for the immediate and universal liquidation of colonialism, the most extreme form of oppression of one nation by another, and for the immediate and total eradication of all forms of racial discrimination.

The Soviet delegation and the delegations of the other socialist countries have on many occasions called on all progressive forces in the International Labour Organisation to join forces in combating colonialism and its consequences and to fight against racial discrimination.

We continue to feel that the International Labour Organisation has been shirking its responsibilities in this respect and we are convinced that a great deal must be done to improve the programme and structure of our Organisation in order to see to it that the way be made clear for an effective and thorough campaign for social and economic progress and the implementation of fundamental human rights. We have stated on many occasions in the past and we reiterate now that the International Labour Organisation cannot consider that it has been pursuing its objectives as it should until we have completely done away with colonialism and its monstrous consequences, that is, discrimination against people because of the colour of their skin.

Delegates of African countries! We are convinced that the peoples of Africa, with the support of all progressive humanity, will prevail in their justified struggle against apartheid and against any other form of racial discrimination, irrespective of any obstacles that might be put in the way of this noble endeavour. In this struggle the African peoples can always count on the decisive and firm support of the socialist countries.

I have been asked to state that the delegates of the socialist countries declare their complete solidarity with the justified and proper stand taken by the delegations of the African countries at this Conference in their fight against this hateful policy of apartheid in South Africa.

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—Ladies and gentlemen, delegates, in view of the importance of this issue I will need your advice. The time for our morning session is elapsing but I still have some speakers on my list. I think we will be acting correctly, in view of the fact that there has not been a plenary for some time—and I think this will be democratic—if we enable these speakers who are on the list for the morning session to take the floor, and with your permission I propose to do so.

A point of order has been made. I can give Mr. Mørø every assurance he is on my list of speakers. He is in fact fourth, and it is with pleasure that I shall give him the floor.
Maybe I have not quite explained my point clearly, but I stated a few minutes ago that all Negro delegates on my list, including Mr. Moré, wished to speak on a point of order. Accordingly I have to abide by one principle, that is to give the floor in order of priority to those speakers.

Interpretation from French: Mr. POPOVIĆ (Government delegate, Yugoslavia)—In the course of our proceedings we have inevitably come up against a problem which has arisen from a situation which must be measured realistically in all its seriousness.

A considerable number of African States Members of the I.L.O., with the support of many other countries in all parts of the world, have raised an issue connected with one of the essential principles of our Organisation: Is it possible to tolerate in the proceedings of the Organisation the presence of the delegation of a country whose Government pursues a policy which is contrary to the fundamental rights of man? The action taken to prevent the participation in the proceedings of the Conference by the representatives of the Republic of South Africa is of exceptional importance. The fact that a stand has been taken against the policy of racial discrimination practised by the Republic of South Africa in respect of the great majority of their citizens merely because their skins are not white is at the same time a defence of our Organisation and a reminder of the fundamental principles of its Constitution.

The issue at stake is personal freedom, which we are discussing now and to which the Director-General referred in his Report as a fundamental principle, which it would be the duty of the Organisation to uphold in future. Our Organisation has already taken a stand on this issue by the adoption in 1961 of the resolution expressing the opinion that the continued presence of the Republic of South Africa in the Organisation is not compatible with the goals and objectives of the Organisation and that it should withdraw as long as the Government of that country had not abandoned its policy of apartheid.

However, as you know, this resolution has so far been ignored by that country. On the contrary, as may be seen from the records of the tenth plenary sitting at this session, the reply given by that country, whose Government has made apartheid an obscene social philosophy fundamental to its government policy, is itself a moral and political condemnation of our Organisation and our Conference. With the same cynicism with which it has, for 20 years, ignored the recommendations of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Government of South Africa refuses to pay any attention to the resolution adopted by the Conference of our Organisation. At the same time it persists in implementing the policy of apartheid, which, logically and in the light of historic experience, can only lead to a worsening of relations between racial groups in that country, and represents a serious threat to political stability in other parts of the world, and a danger to peace in general.

The Government of the Republic of South Africa—which representative has, allegedly in defiance of freedom of speech, been allowed to speak here—has included the protest of many delegates to this Conference—recently passed a new Act, the General Law Amendment Act, one provision of which is that a politician exiled abroad who tries to draw the attention of the United Nations to the affairs of the Republic of South Africa shall be liable to the death penalty. This statement is taken from a report issued by the International Commission of Jurists in Oranavia. The measure taken by the Government of South Africa clearly proves that the policy of segregation and racial discrimination against the majority of the population continues to be practised even more extensively and in an even more inhuman manner, at a time when the extraordinary political development and emancipation of the African peoples has created a great impression throughout the world.

Racial discrimination and inequality of rights, together with the degradation of human dignity on the grounds of the colour of persons' skin, is an affront to modern civilisation. While I do not wish to repeat and elaborate on the well-known attitude of the Yugoslav Government regarding the policy of apartheid, my Government wishes to stress once more the seriousness of the situation and the consequences which might result. In the declaration accepted at the Belgrade Conference in 1961 the Chiefs of State of the uncommitted countries condemned the policy of apartheid practised by the Union of South Africa, and urged it to abandon that policy immediately—I stress the word "immediately".

The declaration also stated that the policy of racial discrimination, in whatever part of the world it might be applied, was a serious violation of the United Nations Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Our Organisation, which includes in its programme the struggle against discrimination and which, by agreement with the United Nations, has taken over the task of ensuring respect for human rights and the human person and for the fundamental freedoms of all men without distinction of race, sex, language or creed, must take a firm stand on the issue unanimously raised by all the African States. There can be no doubt that the reaction of the Republic of South Africa to the resolution adopted in 1961 shows once more that it has no desire to respect the principles and objectives of our Organisation and that it has thereby excluded itself from our Organisation. By applying this policy the Republic of South Africa has really itself infringed the principle of universality of our Organisation—a principle which is not a purely organisational one but which also presupposes the abolition of all forms of discrimination.

For that reason we cannot agree with the attempts that have been made to avoid, on procedural grounds and through formal and purely legalistic interpretations of the Constitution of our organisation the substance of the issue which is now a world political problem, otherwise we would inevitably be in a position in which we would have tacitly accepted the status quo in these countries with regard to apartheid.
It is therefore clear that this is not a matter of political routine or a purely legal matter, but that the essential issue is the fundamental rights of man. You must therefore understand the justified protest of African countries against racial discrimination—which has long ceased to be an issue affecting African countries alone. We must now appeal on behalf of the conscience of mankind.

The question also arises whether the Conference can ensure respect for its decisions and their effective implementation. If we recognise that the Conference of member States is the supreme organ of this Organisation—which a number of delegates are in the habit of stressing—then the reply to that question is clear and unequivocal. The Conference has not only the right but also the duty of ensuring that its resolutions will be implemented, because they have been adopted with a view to implementation.

We express the hope that this Conference will give constructive and realistic consideration to the question raised by the African countries and will grant this issue priority, and arrive at a just solution. What is at stake is the conscience of the I.L.O.

The Yugoslav delegation wants to state once again that the attitude of the African countries is entirely justified and that is why it gives them its full support.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—I must repeat that the speakers coming up here are all speaking on a point of order, so I am in conscience bound to give the floor to those who have asked for it, in the order of their requests. I would urge you to follow this normal procedure, because these people have put in their requests to speak through the secretariat, the proper channel.

Now as I have a large number of speakers who wish to speak on this important point of order—I repeat, point of order—I would like to ask delegates to show understanding on this matter and to try to be as brief as possible in the statements made from this rostrum.

Interpretation from French: Mr. LÔ (Minister of the Civil Service and Labour, Senegal)—I will not be too long. I do not speak in the name of Senegal to support anybody, for I am a signatory to the resolution read to you and come from one of the States represented at Addis Ababa which took up the attitude of which you are aware. I merely wish to state my view of the explanations given by the Director-General.

The discussion was on the basic question, and particularly on the moral aspects, of the presence of South Africa in the Organisation. I shall not speak on that: the Director-General is in agreement with us upon that.

I confess that I might have been shaken by the argument in his speech to the effect that if we gave the floor to South Africa it was out of respect for freedom of speech. However, I would put the question why, having regard to those same principles, four African ministers have been refused permission to speak, although they put points of order and we have been told that points of order come before any other kinds of speech. I think it is a good thing to make that clear, because here we have the impression that the same principle is not applied to everyone.

I would add that no doubt there have been contacts with a view to solving this crisis, for the African delegations have always been in favour of negotiation as a means of overcoming it. We saw only once a representative of the Director-General, his Deputy, who came to tell us that the Director-General desired to meet us. We accepted that, and we immediately made up the delegation to go and interview the Director-General. At the end of that meeting the proposals which the Director-General has told us of were made to us, namely that we could come back to the Conference and challenge the credentials of the South African delegation. That would not be the first time that we have had to contest the credentials of the South African delegation, but no result has ever been reached by that procedure.

We were also told that we could submit an urgent resolution for adoption at this session with a view to enabling the executive of the Organisation to initiate action in the United Nations, but it is perhaps overlooked that the executive of the I.L.O. has a resolution voted in 1961 against the apartheid policy of South Africa. It is a resolution enabling the I.L.O. to take action, and no action has been taken. There has been delay to see what attitudes were going to be adopted. Why ? To make us come back to the hall where we have already refused to sit with those who are "in the dock".

In my country we respect democracy and freedom (and I can say that in Senegal we do respect individual freedom and democracy) but we also have dignity and we refuse—like all the other African peoples—to allow ourselves to be made fun of. We are sensitive to this appeal made to us by Mr. Morse not to destroy the Organisation—we are conscious of that. But when he asks us not to quit the battlefield, I must answer that we are not accustomed to know how to fight—against fascism, for instance. However, when you ask us not to quit the field, we must also be allowed to choose our own weapons.

We consider therefore that the African position is perfectly proper from these various points of view, legally and morally, and having regard to the spirit in which the Conference was desired to meet us. We accepted that, and we immediately made up the delegation to go and interview the Director-General. At the end of that meeting the proposals which the Director-General has told us of were made to us, namely that we could come back to the Conference and challenge the credentials of the South African delegation. That would not be the first time that we have had to contest the credentials of the South African delegation, but no result has ever been reached by that procedure.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BALILI (Government delegate, Albania)—On behalf of the People's Republic of Albania, including the Government representatives, Employers' representatives and Workers' representatives, I should like to express from this rostrum our fraternal, warm and total support for the delegations of the African countries in their just demands that the Conference should not be injured by the participation of the delegation.
of South Africa, whose Government pursues the criminal policy of racial discrimination by oppressing and killing simple indigenous workers—an inhuman act incompatible with the most elementary principles of human rights. We fully support them in their struggle and their demands for the liquidation of all forms of colonial oppression or racial discrimination, whether in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique or any other country in the world.

We add our voice to the protests made by our African brothers against the completely arbitrary and undemocratic attitude of the United States delegate, Mr. Faupl, who, as Vice-President of the Standing Orders and contrary to the wishes of the majority of the Conference, had the effrontery to give the floor to the South African delegate, thus provoking the deepest indignation of all Africans, and of the majority of delegates here, as well as of all honest and progressive people all over the world; this created a serious and intolerable situation in this Conference. This, of course, is quite understandable since what is happening today in South Africa is the same as what is happening in Alabama in the United States and elsewhere in countries which are still under the colonial yoke.

For these reasons and in agreement with my country's just policy my delegation expresses its entire solidarity with the attitude taken by the delegations of the African countries, and states that it too will adopt this attitude.

Interpretation from French: Mr. MÖRI (Workers' delegate, Switzerland)—Mr. President, I would like first of all to beg your pardon. I did not understand that these were all requests to speak on motions as to procedure; and indeed in listening to them I realised that they were not really anything but a cloak. I have a real motion as to procedure to raise, but, following the examples I have been given, I shall leave it to the end of my speech.

I should like first of all to state here, in the name of the Workers' group unanimously, that we continue to condemn resolutely all racial discrimination, a practice which brings shame upon a civilised State.

The Workers' group would like also to protest against the fact that a delegate from South Africa should have imposed his right to speak on the Conference, thus taking the risk of imperilling not only the Conference, but also the whole Organisation. That delegate certainly forgot that in some circumstances silence is golden. If he forgot that rule, he might at least have remembered that the most elementary modesty requires one to be silent in some circumstances.

Last Friday you will have noticed that the Workers' group unanimously left the room when the Employers' delegate from South Africa spoke, and in the name of the unanimous Workers' group I have the honour to tell you that if such an incident occurs again—that is to say, if the floor is again given to any South African delegate—the whole of the Workers' group will leave the hall during the speech. That is the constitutional means of protesting against speeches which seem quite out of place.

Having said this, I think that it is not necessary to stress that all the Workers are against the policy of discrimination, against the policy of racial segregation. The best proof has already been given to our African friends on more than one occasion. We hope that it will be repeated.

However, that is not the point at the moment. I very much regret that the statement made by Mr. Johnson just now in the name of the African delegations from all three groups should have quite unfairly attacked the person who was in the Chair last Friday, namely our friend Rudi Faupl, Workers' delegate of the United States to the Conference, Vice-President of the Conference nominated by the Workers, and an eminent Workers' member of the Governing Body. I should like to thank the Director-General for having the courage to clear the matter up in public.

Mr. Faupl, as you have heard, did not act as was alleged; this clarification has not been challenged. The long replies given to the Director-General's statement make it clear that Mr. Faupl did no more than respect a decision unanimously taken by the Officers of the Conference. It was the Officers of the Conference who decided on the procedure to be followed, and the Selection Committee, a much larger body, also decided to apply that procedure, so that Mr. Faupl, in the circumstances, is as innocent as a new-born child.

I hope I have shown now that Mr. Faupl continues to deserve the confidence and consideration of all delegates to the Conference, whether Workers', Employers' or Government representatives. Mr. Faupl and all the Workers' group continue to deserve the confidence and consideration of the whole of the African delegations, Government, Employers' or Workers'.

And now I am going to speak personally and not in the name of my group. I should like to ask you to accept a procedural motion to defer this discussion, which will lead to nothing and which leads the Conference only into a blind alley, and now to proceed to elect the President of the Conference; that is the question on the agenda.

That is the motion which I now make, Mr. President, with all due respect: namely, to close this discussion and to proceed to the election of the President of the Conference.

It is not to avoid discussion that I propose this. We are disposed to discuss, but a large number of speakers have put in their names for the discussion of the Director-General's Report and on that occasion they will be able to express their views. I am persuaded that a large number of my Worker colleagues will take that opportunity. If it were possible to study a procedure enabling the work to be conducted so that each person can express his opinions I should be delighted. My motion is to postpone, close the discussion and to proceed to the election of the new President of the Conference.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—A formal proposal has been submitted. If I understand it correctly, it is to adjourn the discussion of this matter, or to defer further study of this matter, and proceed to the election of the President of
the Conference. In accordance with the Standing Orders, therefore, it is my duty to inform the Conference of the speakers that are on my list: Mr. Calamari, Government delegate, Panama; Mr. Messor, Government delegate, Israel; Mr. David, Workers' delegate, Malaysia; Mr. Collison, Workers' delegate, United Kingdom; Mr. Robinson, Employers' delegate, Canada; Mr. Camara, Government delegate, Guinea; Mr. Ortega Suárez, Government delegate, Cuba; Mr. Weaver, Government delegate, United States; Mr. Ziartides, Workers' delegate, Cyprus; and Mr. Pongratz, Workers' delegate, Congo (Brazzaville). Those are the people on my list at present.

I should be very grateful to the Conference if we could proceed as democratically as possible and, in so far as possible, give everybody the possibility to speak very briefly—I repeat, very briefly—at this rostrum. Then we could declare the list closed, since there have been no other requests from the floor, and immediately thereafter to these speeches we can proceed to elect our President.

So, unless there are any objections, we shall proceed accordingly and again I do urge you to speak as briefly as you possibly can.

First, Mr. Weaver has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United States)—Mr. President, if I understand the parliamentary procedure correctly, a motion for closure was just made by the previous speaker which requires to be acted on. If I understand the rules correctly, the Chair has fulfilled one of the requirements under a motion of closure by advising the Conference of the number of speakers; I think the next step, sir, is that the Chair has to ascertain if there are 30 delegates who support it, and then the motion would be put.

Am I correct, sir, in my parliamentary inquiry?

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—If I understood the Workers' delegate from Switzerland correctly he did not suggest that we should interrupt the discussion but that we should defer study of this matter. When I made my statement I looked over to Mr. Möri, and I think we understood each other because when I repeated what he had said he nodded in agreement. As regards the proposal of the Government delegate of the United States on the closure of this debate, this does not come under article 15 of the Standing Orders, but under article 16, which lays down a special procedure for closure of the debate.

I therefore have before me Mr. Möri's proposal to defer study of this matter, and I think I have acted quite constitutionally. In this context I read out the list of speakers and called on the delegates concerned to speak as briefly as possible. We are thus proceeding in accordance with article 15 of the Standing Orders, that being the article which comes into play following Mr. Möri's request for deferment.

There having been a request to defer study of this matter, we have taken the right decision and a democratic decision, and I would ask speakers once again to be as brief and concise as possible.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. CALAMARI (Government delegate, Panama)—I have asked for the floor as Chairman of the group of Latin American Government delegates in order to give effect to the express instructions of that group.

The Government delegations of Latin America in the face of the crisis which has arisen at this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference, have approved the following statement:

"We wholeheartedly condemn the apartheid policy followed by the Government of the Republic of South Africa and consider that this policy is contrary to the aims and purposes of the International Labour Organisation.

"We are prepared to consider any measure designed to put an end to the present crisis, within the framework of the Constitution of the I.L.O. and the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference.

"We consider that abstention from participation in the work of the Conference is an inappropriate measure for the achievement of the objectives which are sought. Nothing positive would be gained by paralysing or hampering the work of this 47th Session. On the contrary, failure to adopt the budget and international instruments before the session would prejudice the interests of the workers of the world and particularly of the workers of the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The failure of this session would very much weaken the Organisation without solving in any way the problem which has given rise to the crisis.

"For all these reasons we are persuaded that the struggle against the racist policy of the South African Government should be carried on with all legal means within the Organisation and not outside it."

In the name of the Latin American group of Government delegates I therefore have the honour to communicate to the Conference the fact that the group has submitted under article 17, paragraph 2, of the Standing Orders of the Conference a resolution inspired by the considerations I have just put forward in the name of my group, which would be a first step towards a frank, sincere and cordial contribution, with full consciousness of the threat to the peace of the world which the policy of segregation of the Republic of South Africa creates, to the solution of the grave problem now before us.

Permit me to repeat that I am only the spokesman of the group of Latin American Government delegates and that the resolution which we have put forward is the work of the group and not of any particular delegation. I ask the Chair's permission to explain to the Conference the terms of the resolution to which I have referred. The text of the resolution sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela is as follows:
"The International Labour Conference,

"Recalling that on 29 June 1961 it adopted a resolution advising the Republic of South Africa to withdraw from membership of the International Labour Organisation until such time as the Government of the said Republic abandoned apartheid, which is against the declared principles embodied in the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation,

"Considering that the Government of the Republic of South Africa has not complied with this resolution and that as a result a situation has been created which may impede the normal progress of the work of the Conference,

"Reiterating its condemnation of the apartheid policy of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, and reiterating its declaration that the continued membership of the Republic of South Africa in the International Labour Organisation is not consistent with the principles and purposes of the Organisation,

"Noting that the United Nations Charter contains provision for the expulsion of member States, whereas the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation makes no such provision,

"Considering that the apartheid policy of the Government of the Republic of South Africa is an affront to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as to the principles and purposes of the International Labour Organisation, and

"Considering further that this policy may constitute a threat to international peace and security;

"Resolves to request the General Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations forthwith—

(a) at their next sessions to give urgent consideration to an examination of the situation that has been created by the Government of the Republic of South Africa by its failure to abandon its apartheid policy and comply with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations and by the International Labour Conference;

(b) to examine this situation in relation to the status of the Republic of South Africa as a State Member of the United Nations; and

(c) to inform the International Labour Organisation of the action that the United Nations decides to take in this matter."

We trust that it will be possible for delegates to have copies of this resolution we are submitting to you within a very short time.

**Interpretation from Russian**:

"The PRESIDENT (Mr. Sliptchenko)—I would like to refer you to article 15, paragraph 4 (1), of the Standing Orders: "No resolution relating to an item on the agenda shall, unless it be a motion as to procedure, be moved at any sitting of the Conference unless a copy has been handed in to the Secretariat of the Conference at least two days previously." Consequently, I feel that this resolution is part and parcel of the speech made by the delegate of Panama. We have heard that this resolution will be submitted, and it will be two days before we can recognise it as a resolution which is before the Conference."

**Interpretation from French**:

"Mr. MESSER (Government delegate, Israel)—The Government and people of Israel cannot remain indifferent to any issue of racial discrimination. Our people have suffered more than any other people from such discrimination, accompanied often by the indifference of peoples, governments and international organisations.

"Since this is a question of human rights and of the equality of human beings, we feel that means must be found to ensure absolute priority for this principle, irrespective of the words and phrases of constitutions and standing orders. We think it is quite right that this Organisation should head the struggle for human equality. Unfortunately, we have not yet found a practical means of carrying on the struggle at our conferences. We are sure that constitutional means can and must be found, as a matter of urgency, to deal with the position now facing us. This position raises passionate feelings among a large number of, if not all, Members of this Organisation.

"In asking the whole Conference to take immediate action, and without going at this stage into the legal and formal aspects of the matter, the Israeli delegation expresses its most complete solidarity with the States of Africa whose statement we have just heard. We fully identify ourselves with their statement.

Mr. DAVID (Workers' delegate, Malaya)—The workers of Malaya believe in the unity and solidarity of the Afro-Asian workers, and we are perturbed at the unpleasant situation which has arisen in the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. In this hour of grave crisis the Malayan workers are with the African workers in their struggle against racial discrimination and colonial exploitation.

"The Malayan workers deplore and condemn the South African Government for its continuous defiance of the fundamental principles of the I.L.O. Constitution. We also wish to state at this juncture that their presence in this Conference would destroy the very purpose for which we are gathered here. It is only right and just that they be expelled from the Conference. In the eyes of the world the South African Government is a criminal, and we are convinced a criminal cannot contribute to peace and social justice.

"Further, the United Nations should be urged to expel the South African Government from membership. This is the beginning in the I.L.O. Let this flame spread to the United Nations so that they will expel the South African Government.

"The Malayan workers reaffirm their belief in human dignity and mutual respect for each other regardless of race, colour, creed or religion.

"I have been asked by the Singapore delegation, who are observers at this Conference, to convey the fact that they are fully behind the African workers.\"
Mr. COLLISON (Workers' delegate, United Kingdom)—I am a little surprised that so few references have been made to the magnificent speech made by the Director-General. I think that full account should be taken of what he has said, because he alone has clarified the problem which lies before this Conference and before the I.L.O. He has distinguished between the problem of apartheid on the one hand, and the problem of maintaining the rule of law and the right of the individual on the other. Both these principles are important. There is not a Workers' delegate in this room who will say that the principle of apartheid should not be opposed—and opposed with all the strength that we have as organised workpeople. As I said in the Workers' group, there is no doubt of our solidarity on that point. We all hate apartheid, we all condemn it, and we will work to get rid of it. The question is, how should you do it? What, in fact, is the best way to do it?

I entirely agree with the Director-General and with those who say it would be wrong—and I use the word "wrong" deliberately—to jeopardise this other great principle in attacking apartheid. It would be wrong to jeopardise the principle of the rule of law and the principle of the individual to express themselves, whether we agree with them or not.

I do hope that this problem can be looked at without emotion; certainly let us look at it with great sincerity but let us look at it objectively and try to determine our position upon what we then find. Is it not better to use the democratic machinery at our disposal to oppose this thing and to destroy it? I think it is. I think that if you do the other thing, then you destroy the I.L.O. We must have a Constitution. Those who have said the Conference must decide these issues, believe me, are terribly wrong, because if one adopted that principle then one could stop anyone from coming to the rostrum when they did not wish to speak. It could apply to me; it could apply to you; it could apply to the Africans.

I really want you to understand that I have the greatest sympathy and understanding of what they are trying to do and I do agree with them, but I do not want them to go about this in the wrong way. We would be destroying the whole position of the I.L.O.; and worse than that, we would be destroying and attacking the whole basis of democracy in which we all believe. Therefore, I would hope even at this late stage that some change of view can take place.

Having said all that, I can only declare my own personal position. I too will never agree to the principle of democracy being attacked without my defending them and I will not agree to them being destroyed. Neither will I agree to the prospect of the destruction of this great Organisation, which does so much for peoples all over the world, and not only for developing countries but developed countries too. We in my country and in the United States and the other great industrial nations still depend so largely upon the I.L.O. that we could not dream of seeing it disappear or of seeing it destroyed. We dare not contemplate any move which will kill this great body and I am sure you are all with me in that. So I would say to you please consider this again.

I cannot leave this rostrum without making reference to the position of Mr. Rudi Faupl. I listened to Mr. Johnson with great sympathy and, I assure him, with great understanding, but you know Mr. Johnson himself cleared Rudi of any charge that could be made against him. Mr. Johnson said that if silence indicates agreement, well then that Committee was agreed. I was a member of that Committee, as the Workers' Vice-President of the Selection Committee, and I confirm what Mr. Johnson has said. So far as we all knew or thought or believed quite honestly and sincerely, there was complete unanimity in that Committee as to what should be said and done by Mr. Rudi Faupl when he sat in that Chair. He carried out explicitly the understanding and the agreement reached by the Officers of the Conference. And again I am defending something more precious than an individual. I happen to like Rudi Faupl. I have known the man for years; I have worked with him and know that on a personal basis this is a man of complete and utter courage and integrity. But I am not defending Rudi Faupl; I am again defending the truth and the principle involved. There was agreement and Rudi carried it out and therefore I must say, together with other people, including the Director-General, that the allegation made against his integrity must be repudiated in this room and must be repudiated through the press and through the public, because it is just not true.

Now finally, I hope I have not been emotional; this is not a time for emotion. But again, I appeal to you all to give the greatest possible thought to this magnificent, wonderful great speech of the Director-General who said something quite fundamental in terms of extreme clarity and of extreme force. Think about what he said and, if you will, change your minds about this—those who are saying we are not going to participate in the work of this session. It is a mistake. The I.L.O. has got to go on doing its work for you, for my people, for us all. We could not and we ought not to handicap or hinder that work in any way.

Mr. ROBINSON (Employers' delegate, Canada)—I am speaking as an Employer and as one who was present at many of the meetings which have preceded today's session. First of all, as an Employer, I would like to say that I abhor apartheid. I think I speak with the great majority of Employers in this gathering. Secondly, as an Employer, I set great store by freedom of speech and by the orderly process of law in the determination of policy and action.

These are the points which the Director-General has made and which many other speakers have made. These are the fundamental issues which are before us. It would be an anti-climax for me to recapitulate what the Director-General has said in his remarks...
earlier today. I think Mr. Collison was correct and his remarks were very appropriate in calling attention to the magnificent statement which the Director-General has made, which is of the type we have come to expect him to make. I want to say that I agree completely with his outline of the facts. They are as I understand them and as I participated in them.

What concerns me mostly, and my associates in the Employers’ group, however, is the utterly unwarranted criticism of Mr. Faupl. I think the facts with respect to Mr. Faupl’s assumption of the presidency of this Conference last Friday morning are well known and I do not want to repeat, but I do want to say, on behalf of the Employers of this Conference, that Mr. Faupl not only has our confidence but he has our admiration for the exceptionally fine and competent manner in which he handled the meeting on Friday morning. I think Mr. Faupl would also be the first to say that his personal position in this situation is much less important than where we go from here. This, after all, is the question that confronts us.

In connection with that, I would like to raise a couple of questions. What does the African delegation expect to get from failure to participate, what constructive consequences can follow from that action? I have yet to hear anything along that line. On the other hand I think that if those delegations were to stay to participate in the work in which they and we think of as being a common objective it will be accomplished that much earlier.

After all, I think that this Conference and this Organisation is as much in need of men of good will and good faith as it is of Conventions and Recommendations and resolutions, and it is only through the co-operative and combined authorised actions of men of good will and good faith that this Organisation can accomplish what it has been established to do.

I would therefore appeal to such men to view this situation calmly and objectively, without passion, and thus make the decision which they think is in their own interests and in the interests of this Organisation.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—Before giving the floor to the next speaker I should like to inform the Conference that after I called the Workers’ delegate of Congo (Brazzaville) another three requests came in to me. I think we can arrange these things as follows: We shall consider that these three requests can be met and thereupon the list will be declared closed. I would like to beg the Conference to go along with me in this decision. Mr. ben Seddik was the first, the Workers’ delegation, like all of us here, were dealing with a particular issue, as we all have here; that they had met and had taken steps, or at any rate had been for some days discussing the steps they could take, and that they had gradually come to discuss precise problems, adopt resolutions, redraft them, and draft and redraft texts. In the course of yesterday’s sitting, however, we had already discussed this matter at length on Saturday, and we discussed it on 13 June after the sitting of which you are present, having heard the discussion that the news had leaked out. It is possible that the decisions which we might be taking but

be no objection to Mr. Hauck’s request to be put on the list, and let us hope this really will be the last speaker. I think the most democratic procedure is to ask Mr. Hauck’s request to be put on the list.

Interpretation from French: MR. CAMARA (Government delegate, Guinea)—I am speaking this morning from this rostrum for a particular purpose, because I belong to the group of African delegations and was a member of the delegation which met the Director-General. It is my duty, on behalf of that delegation and of the African group, to set certain facts straight, because the position strikes me as being a morally difficult one. The Director-General has referred to a moral contract which he alleges was made between him and the delegation, and referred to a breach of that contract; it is therefore my duty to recall what were the terms of that contract in order that you may all be informed.

Then there is the question of the Vice-President of the African group. It is my duty to recall what was the attitude which is fully understandable.

The first question concerns the discussions which took place with regard to this unwritten contract. The Director-General told us yesterday afternoon, when we met him for the second time, at his request, that he had been informed by the press of a final declaration voted on and adopted by the assembled delegations of Government, Employers’ and Workers’ members of the African group. He said the press had asked him whether he had any comment to make on that declaration. He said his reply had been that he had no comment to make, since he had not received the declaration, but that in any case the Africans are courteous, and if they had a public stand to take up he would have been the first, as Director-General and the Secretary-General of the Conference, to have been informed of its content and substance. He questioned me on the matter. I replied, on behalf of the delegation, that, as he knew, as all delegates here know, as the international press has said, the African delegations, like all of us here, were dealing with a particular issue, as we all have here; that they had met and had taken steps, or at any rate had been for some days discussing the steps they could take, and that they had gradually come to discuss precise problems, adopt resolutions, redraft them, and draft and redraft texts. In the course of yesterday’s sitting, however, we had press and radio representatives, recording equipment and shorthand writers, and we asked very courteously that everybody should be sent out, because we had not yet taken a final decision. You need only ask to find out that this is true.

We had already discussed this matter at length on Saturday, and we discussed it on 13 June after the sitting of which you are aware. Therefore decisions had not been taken at all. It is possible the press, which was present, heard the discussion that the news had leaked out. It is possible that the decisions which we might be taking but
which had not yet been taken had been brought
to the knowledge both of the press and of the
authorities of the I.L.O. I told him, however, and
I think it is right to state that here—the
Director-General will be my witness—I said
that we had not yet taken a final decision, that
we had not yet drawn up a final declaration.
However, I also said, on behalf of the delega-
tion, that the African delegations had decided
to abstain from participating in the debates of
this Conference as long as the situation existing
over the past few days remained unchanged.

Therefore the Director-General was informed
of this state of affairs. I also said that if there
were any further developments he would be the
first to be informed. But I am correct in
saying that the Director-General was informed
of the stand already taken by the African
degations, in order to get the facts straight.

Therefore, if there was any sort of unwritten
contract, the Africans did not break it, since
the news that could be issued at that time had
already been heard by the spokespersons for
the African delegations. But there was no
subsequent change. Therefore we had no other
information to give the Director-General.

We also discussed the question of the Vice-
President, Mr. Faupl, and the Director-General
(who is a man of honour, I must say) with
regard to the question of the discussions held by
Officers of the Conference—or at least by the
authorities of the International Labour Office—
said this: "I am morally concerned. I have
heard it said that in your declaration, or in the
decision you took, you made a personal and
direct attack on Mr. Faupl, and I must tell you
that the Officers of the Conference took the
following decisions . . . ." I shall not recall
those decisions, because we heard what they
were this morning. "Therefore, Mr. Faupl, the
Vice-President, was merely implementing
the decisions of the Officers of the Conference."

However, this was not a new development,
since we knew that. On 13 June Mr. Faupl
himself said that he was merely implementing
the decisions taken by the Officers of the
Conference.

I replied, on behalf of the African delegations,
that that was not the issue. At no stage did the
African delegations discuss or challenge the
decisions of the Officers of the Conference.
The African delegations, like all other delega-
tions here, are not empowered to discuss the
decisions taken by the Officers of the Confer-
ence in appointing a President for a parti-
cular sitting. We respected our Vice-President,
Mr. Faupl, as President. We sat here while he
was in the Chair, since we listened to him and
were guided by him, for reasons which I
mentioned a moment ago. Therefore, there
again, we agreed.

The African delegations did not criticise the
way or the circumstances in which Mr. Faupl
came to the Chair at that sitting. It is right to
stress that we did not discuss these circum-
stances. That is an internal matter for the
Officers of the Conference, and for them alone.

I should like it to be placed on record that
this was the statement made by the repre-
sentatives of the African delegations to the
Director-General.

However, another question arises, still with
regard to Mr. Faupl. He stated that what he
did had been decided by the Officers of the
Conference, and I now ask this august assem-
by, are the Officers of the Conference entitled,
as Officers of the Conference, to decide on
unconstitutional action? That is the issue,
because once again we challenge the way in
which the sitting of 13 June was carried on.

Points of order were raised on a particular
issue both by our delegation and by other
degations with reference to articles 13 and 14
of the Standing Orders. We received no reply
either of a formal or of any other nature. It was
simply decided to adjourn the sitting. This
morning we were officially informed by the
Director-General that this was a decision
of the Officers of the Conference. And that
is where the issue of competence arises: are
the Officers entitled, contrary to the
supreme decision taken by this Conference, to
decide to violate the Constitution? Are we
the supreme organ, or are the Officers the
supreme organ, in the course of a sitting?

If we hear it said that the Officers decided
that Mr. Faupl should violate the Constitution,
we say that the reproaches made to Mr. Faupl
are in fact directed to all the Officers of the
Conference; and I think that in fact and in
law we would be right, as a Conference, in
saying so. There is a Constitution which binds
us all, it is true. It also binds the Officers of
the Conference—and it binds the Conference
to some extent as long as the issue at stake
does not exceed the bounds of morality and of
the policy we follow in order to ensure respect
of freedom and universality.

The infringements committed during the
sitting of 13 June were committed in circum-
stances which we condemn, but we want to
know once again whether this was a decision
of the Officers of the Conference. If it was,
then it will be for the Conference to take a
decision. That is a further point.

Finally, I should like to say this: we do not
criticise anyone here, except on the issue of
racial discrimination. We are sure that, apart
from certain delegations, all the delegations
which have expressed their views here are in
favour of action against racial discrimination.
We want to believe—we know—that the
Director-General is not in favour of racial
discrimination. But that is not the issue. The
problem is whether, on the moral plane, on the
political plane or the legal plane, we have any
lessons to be taught with regard to the issue
of South Africa. We refuse, because our
concern in this is more direct and affects
friendly delegations who are willing to under-
stand our worries, people concerned with
humanitarian issues.

Reference has been made to democracy, to
the passion of the African delegations, to the
restrictive sense in which we understand de-
mocracy. We have even been accused of
misunderstanding. I let those who make these
allegations stand up for them, but I say that
they really have not understood the issue at all.
We are not propaganda-makers; we are
directly concerned in this issue. It is our duty
and our right to make the demonstrations we
are making. Because the basic problem is a
political one, a human one, a problem which
affects our hearts, our souls, our reason and
our feelings.
If the structure is not what it should be, if the Constitution is not what it should be after the decisions taken by the Conference three years ago, allow us to exert the necessary pressure to bring about radical and rapid changes.

Reference has been made to procedure, too. We could not challenge the credentials, because the resolution adopted three years ago was clear in its terms. It imposed a duty on the authorities of the I.L.O. It is up to them to perform their duty. If the authorities of South Africa used to implement the resolution it was up to the I.L.O. authorities to find a solution before the next session, before the present incidents occurred. Nothing was done, and I let this Conference make its own judgment on this.

Reference has been made to resolutions, but you know what can be done with resolutions, however urgent. When a quorum of Members is required, it amounts to asking us to come back in six months, a year, two years, three years, to do the same thing. We are not under age. It has been said that we are irresponsible. Some people may think so, but here we feel that we are individually and collectively responsible. Our States have reached their political and moral majority, and the problems being discussed relate both to constitutional and to other procedures, with which we are as familiar as anyone else.

The problem is, therefore, not to know what should be done. We have read the Constitution and the Standing Orders. We know what can be done in the way of amending the Constitution. We have assumed our responsibilities to the full. We have the approval of our governments.

We are told that this is not a wise or generous course of action; that it will break up the I.L.O. No. We are aware of the fact that the I.L.O. is a valuable institution, and we give it our full support. This is so true that this year we could have provoked these incidents even before the voting for the Governing Body. We could have provoked this incident with the help of our friends, but we thought that we should first put in order one of the I.L.O.'s organs, the most important for the future of the Organisation. We thought, and that is contained in the text, that we should not simply leave the Conference. We also thought of article 20 of the Standing Orders and the interpretations which could be put upon that.

That is why we are concerned with the future of the I.L.O. We too are in favour of safeguarding the future of the I.L.O. But that is not the issue—the issue goes beyond that legal consideration. You must be aware of the seriousness of the problem. You can do what you like with the Constitution, but we will not allow ourselves to be bound by law, which is only a means. The law does not create mankind; we create the law.

I ask you therefore to consider that the African delegations are aware of their responsibilities at this very serious moment. We ask you to show understanding and not to say, like certain journalists who are short of news, that we are irresponsible, that we know nothing about democracy, that we are out of our element here and are beating our tom-toms at the back of the hall. We, like yourselves, have a deep consciousness of our responsibilities, and all we ask is that you join with us in finding a means of arriving at a solution, of revising the Constitution which no longer corresponds to the situation. We are concerned with the problems of all mankind, since no one here this morning has said that he is in favour of racial discrimination. I want to ask you once more, not only to co-operate with us, but to understand us.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. ORTEGA SUÁREZ (Government delegate, Cuba)—Cuba could not fail to express solidarity with the African peoples in their struggle against apartheid in South Africa. One of the motives for the Cuban revolution was the racial discrimination which existed in our country. A large part of our population is of African origin. They were slaves in past centuries and, during the first half of the present century, they were deprived of many of the rights which the rest of the population enjoyed. The great monopolies refused to give the African peoples technicians’, office and management posts—Negroes. The best schools were closed to Negroes; beaches and other places of recreation were denied to them. Our revolution abolished all this. When we nationalised the undertakings we gave Negroes rights, and they now form part of the management of all Cuban undertakings. When we nationalised schools, not one or two but all Negroes had the right to enter and to belong to the schools as teachers and as students. Today in all recreation centres, in all beaches everywhere, there is equal access for white and black persons in Cuba. We have entirely liquidated forever racial discrimination.

It is logical that a revolution which did this should support the African peoples in their struggle against apartheid in South Africa. It supports them because what is going on is not merely discrimination but brutal crime. Cuba expresses its solidarity with the African peoples in this struggle against South African apartheid.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United States)—I recognise the fact that this has been a long and at times impassioned debate, one that I believe quite often has strayed from the central question and the central points at issue. I remarked that at the outset each speaker during this long debate has seen fit (and I think properly so) to state his position on one of the central issues, and I think the context of this debate clearly illuminates that there are two basic issues involved. There have been divergencies, as could normally be expected in an issue which has within itself the possibilities for so much passion. We have listened to observations that are familiar to this rostrum, to this house, and to the delegates who are regular attendants at the Conference—issues that really have no place in a debate as serious as this, and one that runs to the heart of one of the basic reasons for the I.L.O.’s existence.

I will join those speakers who at the outset indicated their position on the question of
apartheid, and I will do it not only personally (I do not think I need any personal attestation as to where I would stand on this question) but I will also do it for my Government. My Government's repugnance to the policy of apartheid has been set forth in several appropriate forums. We emphatically maintained this position when the central core of the matter was debated in this forum in 1961, as well as in the United Nations and other international agencies; and the reason is quite clear. We are unalterably and irrevocably opposed to apartheid in all aspects because we think it contains not only the seeds of destruction for South Africa, but it also contains a potential seed of destruction for the rest of the world, given the kind of world we live in. I think all delegates here, with very few exceptions, feel just the same about this issue as any of the speakers, including Mr. Johnson who opened this debate, and any of the speakers who have spoken before him.

I think that the central issue was well put by the Director-General and I can think of no one's eloquence or reasoning which could match the logic as well as the passion of his statement—a passion born out of experience and travail that democratic procedures and processes in the I.L.O. had to undergo in order that the Organisation might become the kind of instrument that it is for the attainment of the ideals that we all subscribe to.

I think it well to draw the attention of the delegates, particularly those who are not members of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, to the report of the Committee of Experts which is presented and being considered by that Committee this year, because one of the central findings was very interesting and it is well for every country, particularly every country whose representative takes this rostrum, to realise it; one of the positive conclusions that was drawn from that study of these experts is that discrimination in one form or another is to be found in every country, and, before any of us come up here in self-righteousness, let us realise this basic fact. And this is one of the purposes for this Organisation. And how do we get on, and how do we go about it?

I would submit, based upon very practical personal experience as well as the experience that this Organisation has undergone, that we all know that, when freedom of speech is threatened in any forum, the usefulness of that forum is ended. And this is the basic issue which is posed before us this morning: not whether we condemn apartheid—because I do not think any speaker, if he believed in it, would have the nerve, in 1963, to take any forum and seek to defend racial discrimination and particularly a system as bestial as apartheid is, so this is not the central issue—but the issue is how do we go about removing this scourge from international life? How do we best go about it?

I would suggest and submit to the delegates that the best course of action that has been suggested here is that which was outlined by the Director-General and an attempt to implement which was sought by the distinguished Ambassador from Panama, speaking for the Latin American group. We accomplish no positive purpose, we take no steps forward, by refusing to participate or by tearing up the business of this Organisation, an Organisation to which we all subscribe, an Organisation which we all believe has the capacity to take a step forward in attaining this objective in which we all believe. We cannot do that by withdrawing. We can only do it by, collectively, continually seeking new instruments and new weapons with which to do it, and I submit that we cannot do it by threatening another basic right.

The most effective instrument that we have discovered to define our position and take a proper course is that of freedom of speech.

I have a dual obligation to protest, deeply, almost bitterly, against one section of the declaration that has been referred to. I feel almost equally strongly on the previous one, because I think any implication that the executive authorities of the I.L.O. are deliberately passive and have an inadmissible attitude on a question as important as this, a question that runs through the heart of an Organisation like the I.L.O., is unwarranted. Anyone who knows the authorities of this Organisation, anyone who has had any experience in working with them, anyone who has looked at the record, cannot in good conscience and logic make this kind of statement.

This is an Organisation which many of us are proud of. This is a house which has produced many social advances. It has led the family of the United Nations in these very issues, the very issue that is under debate and under consideration here. And this work has been implemented not by us delegates who come here once a year, or by the members of the Governing Body who come three times a year; it has been implemented by the executive officers and the devoted staff that make up the I.L.O. We do not serve our purpose by tearing down a structure.

And I have a double responsibility to take issue with the next statement, the one which refers to the personal and unconstitutional action of the Vice-President, Mr. Rudi Faupl. There is little that I can add to what has been stated by the Director-General and all the other Officers who have taken this rostrum, because I participated in these discussions as a fellow Officer, and I say that Mr. Faupl would not have been carrying out his functions, he would not have been carrying out his duties as an Officer, if he had not protected the right that we all agreed on, that every delegate has a right to be heard whether we agree with him or not. He was not only carrying out his agreement as an Officer but, more important, he was carrying out a much higher principle, the principle of defending and promoting the right of freedom of speech.

I would like to close by referring to a couple of, I think, basic fundamental statements that were made by previous speakers, one of which causes a good deal of concern and trepidation.

If I remember correctly, one of the speakers, in discussing this false dichotomy that I think has been set up between morality and law—because no law lasts which is not fixed on a moral basis—one of the speakers made a statement that we are not bound by the law;
and I hope that I heard it incorrectly. The implications are that we are the law, and there have been decisions based on theory than on any other I know. We must establish, if we hope for continuity of the work in which we are engaged, a society of laws, not of men—and I speak as one who was part of a group that has deliberately used the law as an instrument and has developed it into an instrument of social precision in terms of rectifying age-old injustices and terms of providing equality of opportunity. The American Negro has gone to the Supreme Court in the United States 38 times and has been victorious 32 times and each one of those victories established another stone in the foundation of the climax that you read about and we are experiencing in the United States every day. I repeat, they have developed that law is an instrument of social precision. This has been the great protection. This has provided the means and the instrument for orderly evolution, or orderly revolution, whichever way you want to describe it.

I repeat that the central issue we have to decide here today—and if we do not decide it today we shall have to decide it tomorrow, because we shall meet it again—is how we can devise the means and the technique of advancing this cause of eliminating from the family of nations, from amongst decent people, the bestial system of apartheid; what tools, what techniques, can we devise collectively in order to achieve this goal dispassionately and without rancour towards one another. That is the challenge which is before us, a challenge with which this house is not unfamiliar, a challenge that must be met by democratic procedures. In my first year in the I.L.O., at my first Conference, this house was racked by an issue as deeply passionate, as deeply emotional, as this one. It was the first year that the Hungarian credentials were challenged. That issue was resolved; it was resolved on democratic principles by staying within the confines of our Constitution and by respecting that Constitution, and in this way it became not only a stronger but a more living document. That is the challenge before us here today and we can only meet that challenge through a scrupulous regard for democratic principles, not by walking away from the struggle.

Mr. ZIARIDES (Workers' delegate, Cyprus) —Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on this very important question which has thrown this Organisation into its most serious crisis since its establishment. I speak here not only on behalf of those Cypriot workers whom I represent but also on behalf of the trade union organisations affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions—an organization which, as you very well know, are not adequately represented in this Conference or in other bodies of the I.L.O. On behalf of these organisations I should like to make the following statement.

The African delegations at this Conference have protested against the participation of the South African delegation. I want to state that the Africans are not trying to destroy the I.L.O. That is completely false. We want the I.L.O. to continue along its road in an effective manner, not like a man who is disabled. We believe in the ideals of the I.L.O., because we are workers of poorly endowed countries. We want the I.L.O. to carry out good work for the African workers. That is why we are unanimous in condemning the attitude of South Africa. We want South Africa to leave our Organisation in order that the International Labour Organisation may function.

We have been told that, from a legal point of view, we cannot exclude South Africa because the Constitution does not provide for fundamental human rights, should not be allowed to come and sit in this Conference. The organisations affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions and the South African Congress of Trade Unions itself fully support this position of the African and Arab delegations. We believe that as long as the South African Government does not abandon its apartheid policy there should be no place for it in this Organisation.

The Director-General of the I.L.O. has received a memorandum submitted to him in May this year. They were not South African Congress of Trade Unions. Most of the delegations attending this Conference have received a copy of that memorandum. The leaders of the South African Congress of Trade Unions should be here attending this Conference. They are the real representatives of the South African workers. Instead, they are in prison. That is why the World Federation of Trade Unions, at the request of the South African Congress of Trade Unions, has officially challenged the credentials of the Workers' delegation from South Africa. Those who have read the memorandum of the South African Congress of Trade Unions will agree with me that the South African Government has not only ignored our 1961 resolution but has further intensified its racist policy and its acts of persecution against the people of South Africa.

The workers and the people of South Africa require the moral and material support of all of us; they require the solidarity of all the democratic forces of the world. The trade union organisations which belong to the World Federation of Trade Unions extend their solidarity to all the oppressed people of South Africa. They have already established, together with some African organisations, an international committee on solidarity with the workers and the people of South Africa. In this Conference and outside the I.L.O. we shall do everything possible to support their just cause, and we consider that the I.L.O. as a body should do the same. This crisis through which the I.L.O. is going indicates that this Organisation should adjust to the present-day world.
expulsion. But they have forgotten to tell us that the Constitution does not prevent us from expelling South Africans. There is no specific provision preventing us from doing so. When the law is silent, what does one do? One refers to custom, and in the legal field custom with regard to association is that, when a member acts to the detriment of the honour of the association the other members can exclude that member. I believe that is the precedent of French jurisprudence in this matter. Therefore, I think we can exclude South Africa.

We have also been told that we did not challenge the credentials of the South African delegation. Let us be serious. The resolution which was adopted in 1961 constitutes a permanent challenge. I do not believe that the Africans can go back now. We are unanimous behind Mr. Johnson. We are defending our decision and the stand we have taken together. We cannot allow the Constitution to be valid in the case of South Africa, and not valid in the case of Africans. The spirit of the Constitution was violated when the South African delegate was allowed to speak in accordance with the Constitution and the Standing Orders. We think that our honour has been attacked, and we maintain our position.

Some people have tried to treat us Africans like little children and to deal with us as a firm hand, as one would in the case of little children. But we are not little children, and we know what we are doing. As the delegate of Guinea said, a certain section of the press which was short of news—and, I might add, short of arguments—claims that we are savages and barbarians because we protested. But allow us to say that we know the history even of highly industrialised countries in Europe. We have heard of meetings in which there have been riots, where some people have sung and others have shouted. We have known of such meetings. Why were these people not described as barbarians? Why are we called barbarians? Because we held a demonstration. I think that those who put forward these arguments are behind the times and the Africans will not forgive them. We know that ours is a just cause and we do not need the support of any particular section of the press.

We want this matter to be settled finally and absolutely. It will be impossible to divide us by accusing individual Africans. We are unanimous. We have some experience of the colonialists' method of using some one for a time and then getting rid of him—but we will accept this method no longer. We are unanimous behind Mr. Johnson. We support him in the declaration he has made, because it is the only African declaration capable of asserting our views.

I shall be very brief. The Moroccan Workers' delegation has not spoken very much this year because we have not been alone in suffering the constraint which we have undergone for many years. Only and yet we cannot have expressed with such conviction the feelings we share. I should like to speak now to make two small observations. My first observation relates to Mr. Möri. Like many of my friends, I listened to his speech with great attention, and I was astonished to hear him speak, although rather vaguely, as if he was speaking in the name of the Workers' group. I do not know if he was speaking in the name of the Workers' group of the Conference or the Workers' group of the Governing Body but, in any case, I should like to make one correction. If he was speaking for the Conference group, it would be a good thing for the Conference to know that many Workers' delegates do not agree with him. If he was speaking in the name of the Workers' group of the Governing Body, it would be useful to make a correction there also. It would be better to say that he spoke for the I.C.F.T.U. group, because the Governing Body Workers' group is monopolised by the I.C.F.T.U. and no other workers' movement is represented there.

My second observation is in reply to the United States Government speaker. He expressed complete agreement with us, but asked us to see means of solving this difficult problem. I will tell him that there is a really simple means of doing so. It does not require much effort for this problem of racial discrimination to be solved once and for all. The solution does not consist of calming one's conscience by making a high-minded speech while remaining enclosed within a wall of legalities. The solution would be solidly to support the African representatives, who express the universal feeling, by saying to the South Africans, "You have placed yourselves outside the law; leave our assembly." That would not destroy the I.L.O. at all; on the contrary, that would be the most effective means of saving the Organisation and enabling it to perform its task fully.

In this connection, I would like to say to Mr. Morse, whose speech I listened to with great attention, that a few years ago on this platform he told us, quite rightly, that of all the specialised agencies the I.L.O. was in an exceptional position. It was not like the others he said, and he was right. The I.L.O. is not an agency like the other United Nations agencies, which are obliged to have regard to rigid legal procedures because they are composed of Government representatives who are all bound by diplomatic or other considerations. The I.L.O. is an organisation made up not only of Government representatives but also of Employers' and, above all, Workers' representatives. Therefore, Mr. Morse, you were right to say a few years ago that it is the only international agency where the feelings and hopes of the working class are really freely and clearly expressed. The voice of the people cannot be expressed by juridical and procedural considerations. It is expressed by ourselves, and so we are justified in exerting pressure on those who make the law to make good laws and abolish bad laws.

You told us, Mr. Director-General, you told the African representatives who went to see you that you had recommended a certain number of measures which could be taken and I agree they are good measures, but they are too late. Why were they not taken a few years ago? I have given answers to that, and I would reply that that is not true. We know that no urgent resolution can get through the Standing Orders Committee, for
it is made up of immovable people who have made it a wall through which nothing can pass except what they wish to go through. However, I do not think the situation is irremediable. In fact, I think that the African position and the proposals of the Director-General are complementary and may both contribute to the solution of this difficult problem. I think that the African initiative will constitute a means of exerting considerable pressure on the United Nations and on the Security Council, which is made up of governments only, whereas we can express the opinion of the working masses of all the peoples. Through our stand we shall support action in the United Nations.

I would therefore tell the United States delegates and all other delegates that the best way of saving the I.L.O., the best way if you are really sincere and want to liquidate apartheid, is to stand firm with us and exert the strongest possible pressure on the United Nations.

Interpretation from Russian: The President (Mr. Slipchenko)—Mr. Möri, Workers’ delegate, Switzerland, has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from French: Mr. Möri (Workers’ delegate, Switzerland)—Thank you for allowing me to speak and availing myself of a point of order to give Mr. ben Seddig the satisfaction he expected. I see that he was applauded by a large part of the hall when he asserted that I was not speaking on behalf of the Workers’ group. I shall therefore draw a distinction between the three parts of the short statement I made a while ago.

The first part was in accordance with specific instructions given me by the Workers’ group as a whole and I defy any Workers’ member to come here, that is any member who attended the meeting of the group—at which Mr. ben Seddig was unfortunately not present—and say anything to the contrary. I am referring to the protest against apartheid. The Workers’ group was unanimous in instructing me to recall that we had always been against apartheid and that we would continue to fight against it.

The second part of my statement, under instructions from the group, was to call on the Employers’ representative of South Africa to give up his right to speak and availing myself of a point of order to give Mr. ben Seddig the satisfaction he expected. I see that he was applauded by a large part of the hall when he asserted that I was not speaking on behalf of the Workers’ group. I shall therefore draw a distinction between the three parts of the short statement I made a while ago.

The first part was in accordance with specific instructions given me by the Workers’ group as a whole and I defy any Workers’ member to come here, that is any member who attended the meeting of the group—at which Mr. ben Seddig was unfortunately not present—and say anything to the contrary. I am referring to the protest against apartheid. The Workers’ group was unanimous in instructing me to recall that we had always been against apartheid and that we would continue to fight against it.

The second part of my statement, under instructions from the group, was to call on the Employers’ representative of South Africa to give up his right to speak and availing myself of a point of order to give Mr. ben Seddig the satisfaction he expected. I see that he was applauded by a large part of the hall when he asserted that I was not speaking on behalf of the Workers’ group. I shall therefore draw a distinction between the three parts of the short statement I made a while ago.

The first part was in accordance with specific instructions given me by the Workers’ group as a whole and I defy any Workers’ member to come here, that is any member who attended the meeting of the group—at which Mr. ben Seddig was unfortunately not present—and say anything to the contrary. I am referring to the protest against apartheid. The Workers’ group was unanimous in instructing me to recall that we had always been against apartheid and that we would continue to fight against it.

The second part of my statement, under instructions from the group, was to call on the Employers’ representative of South Africa to give up his right to speak and availing myself of a point of order to give Mr. ben Seddig the satisfaction he expected. I see that he was applauded by a large part of the hall when he asserted that I was not speaking on behalf of the Workers’ group. I shall therefore draw a distinction between the three parts of the short statement I made a while ago.

The first part was in accordance with specific instructions given me by the Workers’ group as a whole and I defy any Workers’ member to come here, that is any member who attended the meeting of the group—at which Mr. ben Seddig was unfortunately not present—and say anything to the contrary. I am referring to the protest against apartheid. The Workers’ group was unanimous in instructing me to recall that we had always been against apartheid and that we would continue to fight against it.

The second part of my statement, under instructions from the group, was to call on the Employers’ representative of South Africa to give up his right to speak and availing myself of a point of order to give Mr. ben Seddig the satisfaction he expected. I see that he was applauded by a large part of the hall when he asserted that I was not speaking on behalf of the Workers’ group. I shall therefore draw a distinction between the three parts of the short statement I made a while ago.

The first part was in accordance with specific instructions given me by the Workers’ group as a whole and I defy any Workers’ member to come here, that is any member who attended the meeting of the group—at which Mr. ben Seddig was unfortunately not present—and say anything to the contrary. I am referring to the protest against apartheid. The Workers’ group was unanimous in instructing me to recall that we had always been against apartheid and that we would continue to fight against it.
South Africa has no place here, where civilised men have come together. They came together and declared that one was an undesirable member of society because it did not respect the laws of society. South Africa simply replies: "What you say is not constitutional." Does this so-called Government of this so-called Republic of South Africa itself respect the principles of human rights, the principle of the United Nations Charter? By no means. The law as it serves your own interests but it is not good when it condemns you. That is their real attitude.

It should be clear that there is now no further need of proof that the so-called Republic of South Africa has no place in this Organisation.

Friends have tried to bring it to reason and to draw its attention to the dangers which the Organisation might run as a result, and its reply was one of contempt, as the Director-General told us. He spoke to them, and their only reply was that they could not leave. They have contempt for our Director-General and contempt for our Organisation, and you ask us in relation to these people to apply a Constitution which they themselves are continually violating. That is the issue.

The procedural question is no longer topical. For the Conference it is no longer a constitutional matter or a legal matter. It is no longer a matter of granting the floor to a particular delegate. This question was raised on Wednesday before my delegation asked for an adjournment. The problem now facing the Conference is whether or not our Organisation, the International Labour Organisation, the senior international organisation, whether or not this Organisation is going to accept that the principles on which its whole existence has been based for nearly 45 years be wilfully trampled underfoot, and whether the Conference is going to accept this passively.

It has been suggested we should concern ourselves solely with legislation and laws. There has not been a single speaker today who approved of the attitude of the Republic of South Africa, yet one could ask, thinking back over the years, whether certain delegations which to clear their consciences really supported the resolution of 1961. We doubt this, and with good reason. I do not want to give any names, but we all know who voted for what, and that is why we shall no longer be satisfied with words, with purely formal declarations.

We must take a decision once and for all. For the Conference it is no longer a constitutional matter or a legal matter. For the Conference it is no longer a matter of granting the floor to a particular delegate. This question was raised on Wednesday before my delegation asked for an adjournment. The problem now facing the Conference is whether or not our Organisation, the International Labour Organisation, the senior international organisation, whether or not this Organisation will remain true to the fundamental principles on which its whole existence has been based for nearly 45 years.

In South Africa men are reduced to the level of beasts of burden, that there is no such thing as human dignity in South Africa, and that we here must defend human beings. Such is the purpose of our Organisation, and we shall achieve nothing as long as we ourselves have not decided to remain true to the fundamental principles to which we lent our support, namely the defence of human dignity and freedom.

I would like to add that the African States, for their part, whatever the attitude which the International Labour Organisation may subsequently adopt, will not compromise. They have made their choice, and in years to come when the records of history tell of the decision taken by the African countries to withdraw from the 47th Session of our Conference in defence of human liberty and dignity, I am sure that history will be on our side; we think the International Labour Organisation cannot be false to its own principles, the principles by which it stood throughout the war and other troubled times; by remaining true to them the International Labour Organisation became a bastion of human dignity and freedom. The International Labour Organisation is a democratic international organisation if ever there was one, and it was able to defend all the fundamental principles of human rights. Today, after the statements which have been made, after all the information we have received, I am sure that the International Labour Organisation will remain faithful to itself. We do not want to cast the first stone, but we say that a heavy burden of responsibility rests with those who do not allow South Africa to be dropped, as it should be.

South Africa deserves no mercy. If things were done normally the representatives of South Africa would be in prison. The South African Government has no place here, it should be locked up in a fortress. These are not civilised people, and we should not even speak with them. I feel shame in mounting this rostrum, deified as it has been by a so-called republican from South Africa.

This is an insult to the whole world. It is an insult to civilisation—in short, it is an insult to mankind, the godlike being for whom we are working, to allow these people who do not deserve the name of human beings to sit among us any longer. South Africa has made its choice. We are resolved, in accordance with a decision taken by our Heads of State at Addis Ababa, to pursue the noble fight against South Africa, the only fight that deserves to be fought—the fight for human liberty and
human dignity, Africa is resolutely marching into this battle. Those delegates who wish to preserve the I.L.O.'s reputation as a democratic organisation faithful to its fundamental principles would do well to weigh their responsibilities, not alone for today but for the future. History will judge. Today you will have to choose between having in the I.L.O. either South Africa or the African States whose aim is to uphold their dignity and the universal principles of human rights.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SLIPCHENKO)—The last speaker is Mr. Hauck, Government delegate, France, and before he comes to the rostrum I must say, with regret, that there were other speakers who wanted to speak after the closure of the debate and I am very sorry that I am unable to give them the floor.

Interpretation from French: Mr. HAUCK (Government delegate, France)—Perhaps after so many words and attitudes, in such a serious situation as this in which we are placed, it is too late to speak. However, I would not wish this discussion to close without its having been possible for a representative of the French Government to turn to our African friends and address a few words to them.

This Conference, since the outset, has been a hymn to Africa. The first day you elected as your President a representative of Africa. You chose an African Minister of Labour, Mr. Camile Gris of Ivory Coast, as Chairman of the Government group. You chose chairmen, vice-chairmen and reporters from among the African delegations. When the Governing Body elections took place we were present at a triumph of Africa. And we were glad. We were sincerely glad, in a friendly spirit—although we may have thought it rather unjust to eliminate every European candidate. However, we were glad of Africa’s victory. The Conference’s feelings of friendship were expressed generously to the African delegations, and today’s discussion, if it has been useful at all, has been useful by showing the unanimity of the Conference in its horror of the apartheid policy, the unanimity of the Conference in sharing the concern and indignation, which are so legitimate, of those from the African countries. The apartheid policy has been condemned once more in the present Conference, as it was two years ago, and not a single delegate has here defended a policy which we are unanimous in condemning.

Having noted these comforting facts, what is the position now? We have had in the last few days a series of misunderstandings—misunderstandings which have been very much cleared up today by the excellent, courageous speech of Mr. Morse, who spoke with an emotion and a sense of responsibility which no one in this Conference, I am sure, can fail to feel. He showed that good faith which had been suspected could no longer be suspected, and I am sure we all refuse to suspect in any way the good faith of the reactions, sometimes vigorous, which our African friends have shown. He showed the way where, after the explanations that have been given, the good faith of Mr. Faupl, who carried out the difficult task entrusted to him with a sense of duty to which we must pay a tribute.

That is the past. Do those misunderstandings of the days that are past weigh heavily against what brings us together? What brings us together, I repeat, is our common feeling towards the policy of apartheid. I think I need not tell the Conference and our African friends that if there is a country which condemns apartheid it is France—which is not only the France of 1789, the France of the Rights of Man, but also the France of 1963, the France of a decolonisation policy which she is proud.

The Director-General reminded us that he had made a certain number of proposals to the African delegations, proposals or suggestions which went a good way towards condemning apartheid. After all, what would be the use of condemning apartheid in the I.L.O., which deals essentially with technical labour problems, if it were not condemned at the same time by the organisation which is responsible at the international level for the great political decisions? I mean the United Nations.

The Director-General proposed to the African delegations procedures by which it would be possible to seize the United Nations—and not only the Secretary-General but also the Security Council and the General Assembly—of the whole problem of apartheid.

Do you not think that if the International Labour Conference started such a procedure with a view to achieving the elimination of apartheid by universal condemnation through the United Nations, the gesture we would make would have considerable effect and would not be merely a matter of words but a precise and heavy blow struck against those who do not understand yet that in 1963 one must respect equality between men and races?

The Director-General made these proposals to you. I would like you to reflect upon them and I would like to ask you not to drop the weapons which you have in your hands today. One of the best weapons is the International Labour Organisation, which enables you—Africans and all underdeveloped peoples—to seek and find assistance and help in organising vocational training, in improving labour-management relations and applying social security systems with a view to enabling social progress to go forward throughout the world.

Perhaps the international agencies, including the I.L.O., are slow. Perhaps we seem to you to be too cumbrous; but their constitutions and their rules, as has been recalled several times from this rostrum this morning, are safeguards for everybody and may tomorrow be safeguards for yourselves, if a certain conjuncture occurred which made a given country the accused.

Mr. Camara in his interesting and vigorous speech just now rightly said that it is man who makes the law. Yes, but if the law created by man is not respected by man then it is useless. It is because we have created the law that we want it to be respected. However, it is always open to us to make new laws and rules to meet new circumstances. Therefore, I think that although one must fight for justice and equity one cannot fight with contempt for the elementary rules which enable our Organisation to live and its Members to live together.
During this session we still have a real job of work to do. We must conclude the consideration of the technical items on our agenda, we have to adopt new international instruments, we have to vote the budget of the I.L.O. without which from 1 January 1964 the Organisation will cease to operate. Reflect on that. It is not only a question of paralysis, it is a question of life or death. Do you think that the best thing to do is to leave the Conference? Do you not rather think that after today’s discussion, which has proved the unanimity of the Conference on the point which is nearest to your minds and hearts—the question on which, I repeat, we are in full agreement with you—we should make an effort to try again once more to come together and dissipate any misunderstandings which may still persist?

Mr. Camara said earlier today "Collaborate with us". If he was appealing to us I reply, in the name of France (and I am sure that many delegates here present will make the same reply in the name of their country)—"We are ready to co-operate with you".

We shall soon be adjourning this sitting—and with rather empty stomachs, which perhaps will incline us better to reflection than do overfull stomachs. We shall have leisure for a little reflection and we shall reflect on what has been said this morning and this afternoon. Could we not have some consultation—perhaps the Africans together, the Latin Americans together? I would like here to thank the Latin American group particularly for the proposal it has made, namely an urgent resolution condemning apartheid. Such a resolution could be adopted very rapidly, with the agreement of the Officers of the Conference, and that would enable us once more to express our unanimity regarding apartheid.

Reflect on all this when we adjourn this afternoon; reflect on the situation as it now stands. I ask our African friends particularly to reflect on this matter, this new situation and stay with us to continue to fight the good fight for social justice, equality of peoples and equality of races.

ELECTION OF A NEW PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SPILCHENKO)—At the beginning of today’s sitting you heard the statement by the Secretary-General of the Conference. It was a statement concerning the resignation of the President of the Conference, Mr. Johnson. Now we have to elect a new President. On this point I give the floor to Mr. Weaver, Government delegate, United States.

Mr. WEaver (Government delegate, United States)—I am authorised on behalf of the Officers of the Conference (who include the Officers of the Selection Committee and the Officers of the Governing Body) to say that their unanimous recommendation to the Conference is the selection of a man to preside over our deliberations in the remaining period of the Conference, one whose record and reputation in the I.L.O. is well known, a man who has graced the rostrum of the Conference as well as that of the Governing Body with great dignity, devotion and efficiency. The Officers asked me to recommend for selection as President for the rest of the session, in the unusual circumstances in which we find ourselves, Mr. Dreyer, Government delegate from Denmark, who has served this Organisation long and faithfully and with great devotion and efficiency; and I so do.

Interpretation from Russian: The PRESIDENT (Mr. SPILCHENKO)—Does anybody second the nomination of Mr. Dreyer as President of our Conference? It is seconded.

Then I declare Mr. Dreyer, Government delegate of Denmark, to have been elected President of the Conference and invite him to come to the rostrum.

(Mr. Dreyer, Government delegate, Denmark, is elected President of the Conference and takes the Chair.)

The PRESIDENT—Fellow delegates, my first words shall be an expression of thanks to the Officers of the Conference, the Officers of the Governing Body and the Officers of the Selection Committee for having nominated me as President for the rest of this 47th Session, and I add to that thanks the delegates who have elected me President of this Conference. I will do my very best not only to be an impartial President but also an effective one, as this will be necessary if the Conference is to be able to finish its work within the time limit fixed, 27 June.

As all the delegates will know, we have in front of us very comprehensive work to be done and, as already pointed out, we have very little time in which to do it. Hence, this is not the time for me to make a long speech and I will abstain from making any presidential address in the common sense of that term. I hope that we shall be able now to embark upon our ordinary work, and I will only add that the President cannot alone secure the successful work of the rest of this Conference; he will need the help of all the delegates and advisers. I venture to hope that all of you will be prepared to give me this help. Thank you so much.

POINT OF ORDER: REQUEST FOR PRIOR DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTIONS MOVED UNDER THE URGENCY PROCEDURE

The PRESIDENT—Mr. Bouladoux, Workers’ delegate, France, has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BOULAUX (Workers’ delegate, France)—I am not sure that what I have to say is really a point of order, but I wanted to ask that, before any other decision is taken, this Conference should deal with the resolution submitted a moment ago, and I wanted to say that, as far as I am concerned, although I am not quite sure of the procedure, I, too, have a resolution which I would like to submit under article 17, that is under the urgency procedure, which could be appended to the other resolution which has also been submitted. I was therefore going to ask that this matter of the resolutions should be discussed first.

The PRESIDENT—The resolution just submitted will be transmitted to the Officers.

(The Conference adjourned at 4 p.m.)
FOURTEENTH SITTING

Wednesday, 19 June 1963, 10 a.m.

President : Mr. Dreyer

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

The PRESIDENT—We shall now proceed with the discussion of the Director-General's Report.

Mr. ABID ALI (Workers' delegate, India)—I am glad to join the speakers who have preceded me in congratulating the Director-General for the most appropriate approach and analysis of the I.L.O.'s present structure and the role of the Organisation in the future. However, though the analysis is correct, the remedies suggested may not fulfil the need of changing times. My silence on certain of the good points made in the Report should not be misunderstood. In a brief space of 15 minutes one cannot cover all aspects of this weighty Report.

In the chapter "Approach to an I.L.O. Programme", the Director-General has given priority to five topics for action. Irrespective of the responsibilities of the United Nations and the other specialised agencies for the maintenance of peace, the I.L.O. is undoubtedly committed to peace by upholding the basic human rights in the labour and social fields. In my opinion the I.L.O. cannot barter away these basic human rights for any diplomatic consideration or consideration of so-called universality. We would not like to sacrifice the genuine universality of its principles in order to maintain a superficiality of universality.

Regarding freedom of association, it must be understood that every member State of the I.L.O. is bound by the fact of its membership to freedom of association, and any violation in this regard should not be tolerated. Effective procedures will have to be evolved for redressing the grievances of the workers concerned, if necessary even by taking the bold step of amending the Constitution so that such member States as do not honour these basic principles of freedom of association are compelled to do so. Unless they conform to these standards they have no right to remain within the I.L.O. family.

Regarding human resources and economic development, the I.L.O. has not yet expanded its activities adequately towards the major utilisation of human resources through rural development programmes. The amount of money spent in this direction is too meagre, though there has been a substantial increase in recent years. But compared with the magnitude of the problem even the increased amount is negligible.

Here I would like to sound a note of warning. In their zeal to develop fast the developing countries should not suppress freedom of association and impose forced labour.

The recognition of human rights is as important as the satisfaction of social needs. Industrial development should increase opportunities for free development of individual personality and not curb them. The evolution towards well-being and towards basic freedom should go hand in hand. And the I.L.O. is the only organisation that can help the establishment of a setting which simultaneously allows the growth of individual expression and the development of free association, the expression of individual right and the right of collective protest.

The Director-General has recommended that at an early stage of the Conference consideration be given to incomes policy in relation to economic development with a view to reaching agreement on general principles. This is a very complicated subject and there are conflicting opinions even among economists on the principles of wage fixing and social security systems. The rapid growth of highly automatic machines on the one hand and the old orthodox methods of production on the other create very difficult and complicated problems as regards income and its distribution. Clear guidance will have to be evolved for national and international action in this regard.

One of the most controversial subjects in the Director-General's Report is that of trade unions and labour relations. The I.L.O. is neither an intergovernmental nor a bipartite organisation. Its scope is therefore limited by its very structure. Being a tripartite organisation, the I.L.O. cannot and should not do anything which would result in or amount to interference with the freedom of trade unions. No free trade union organisation would tolerate interference with its internal structure or working. Unions must be free to act in their own way even if sometimes they may commit mistakes. We do not think it is the role of the I.L.O. to assist in establishing sound trade union organisation or to provide specific trade union leadership training. The I.L.O.'s assistance in the development of free trade unions
should therefore be of a very limited character, such as dissemination of information, technical co-operation when wanted, and the supply of literature in various local languages which can be easily understood by the workers concerned. This "plus" trade union education and research work would be of considerable assistance.

The Report itself stresses that the I.L.O. cannot undertake activities in any country without the concurrence of the government concerned, and that the tripartite supervision of all I.L.O. activities is a guarantee of "impartiality and discretion in these matters". It is regretted that the fundamental basis of a free trade union movement — namely, that the trade union movement in a modern industrial age is absolutely essential for the development of the self-respect and prestige of the working class— is not properly appreciated. If any attempt is made to channel these efforts of the working class into other directions there are bound to be strong reactions. The I.L.O. would be doing a disservice to the free trade union movement by trying to rush the help of the various trade unions without their voluntary invitation and genuine co-operation. If such a step is attempted the I.L.O. will lose its impartial character.

While acting as an information centre the I.L.O. should make a very careful selection of subjects for its educational activities — such as social legislation, wage structure, and so on. Care should be taken that it does not make inroads into the freedom or rights of the workers' organisations. Similarly, it would not be proper for it to confuse workers' education with trade union training. This trade union training must remain the primary responsibility of the trade unions themselves. The I.L.O.'s contribution in this respect could be to provide literature and lectures dealing with the structure and functions of the I.L.O., international labour standards and the application of international labour Conventions and Recommendations.

The expert missions can give assistance only in the development of labour legislation or social security systems, labour services or administration, and so on, and not in the methods and procedures for countering tendencies towards a multiplicity of weak and rival trade unions. Although the Director-General has laid stress on the implementation of the old standards, we feel that the old functions of the I.L.O., mainly those of standard-setting, cannot be ignored altogether while taking care of the need for new standards.

Coming now to the question of the role of the Organisation and the procedure of the International Labour Conference, the Director-General has made certain suggestions, some of which have neither basis nor justification. Taking particularly the item regarding credentials procedure, no data have been supplied in support of the reasons which have led the Director-General to make such a suggestion, which cuts at the very root of any democratic organisation. We should refuse to abdicate our responsibility to decide on credentials. The Director-General is not right when he says that the credentials procedure is not governed by the provisions of the I.L.O. statute book of Conventions and Recommendations. In fairness to the Workers' representatives who have served on this Committee, I may add that a few years back the Workers agreed to delegate the powers of the Conference in respect of membership of the Conference committees to a judicial tribunal. The working of that tribunal has made us realise that the Employers were right in protesting against this procedure. We feel it is high time this procedure was reversed. The principle of universality cannot be taken to ridiculous extremes.

We do not agree with the view expressed by the Director-General that there is no inherent virtue in Conventions as compared with Recommendations. I hope the Director-General has not fallen into the trap of some of the Governments and Employers who want to convert the I.L.O. into seminars and a body of experts.

The suggestion for periodical revision of existing instruments on the basis of widely agreed general policy and for the removal from the I.L.O. statute book of Conventions which are outdated or have been supplanted by others should get support from all delegates.

However, we strongly oppose any attempt to replace the present Industrial Committees and their tripartite structure by expert missions. We do not want to convert this tripartite Organisation into an organisation of experts. The parties should be free to have the assistance of their own experts when needed. If the experts' advice is ignored by the parties it amounts to a waste of time and labour, and it is not infrequently that such advice is ignored.

Although I do not agree with certain of the remedies suggested in the Report, this should not be construed as meaning that the analysis of the present structure and methods of the I.L.O. made by the Director-General is wrong. The Report deserves the earnest consideration of all of us.

In conclusion, I do not think all the 108 countries and their delegates have had sufficient time to study the Report fully. It might therefore be a hasty step to try to come to any conclusion on the present report, therefore, I urge upon my fellow delegates and the Director-General that these discussions should be

[Note: The text continues, discussing the correctness of the credentials procedure and the implications of the Director-General's suggestions.]
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carried forward to next year. This will give
the various world organisations, member States
and employers' and workers' organisations a
full opportunity to study the Report in the
light of the discussions held this year, and the
supplementary report which the Director-
General might like to circulate. We have
already got a double-discussion procedure for
all important matters, and I think this subject
is certainly no less important than the subjects
already covered by the instruments of double-
discussion procedure. This affects the very
root and fundamentals of the I.L.O., and
requires more detailed and serious considera-
tion so that concrete, constructive and sub-
stantial results may be achieved for the good
of those whom we want to serve.

SIXTH AND SEVENTH REPORTS
OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE: SUBMISSION
AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We will now take the
sixth and seventh reports of the Selection
Committee.

I would ask the Chairman of the Selection
Committee, Mr. Weaver, to be so kind as to
come to the rostrum and submit the two
reports.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United
States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—
The sixth report of the Selection Committee
has already been circulated. It relates to one
matter only, that is a certain number of changes
in the composition of committees of the Con-
ference, and I would ask the Conference to
adopt this report.

The seventh report of the Selection Com-
mittee has also been circulated. This report is
also concerned only with changes in the compo-
sition of committees of the Conference, and
I would also ask the Conference to adopt this
report.

The PRESIDENT—Are there any comments
on the sixth report of the Selection Committee?
If not, I will take it that the sixth report of the
Selection Committee is adopted by the Con-
ference.

(The sixth report is adopted.)

The PRESIDENT—Are there any com-
ments on the seventh report of the Selection
Committee? If not, I will take it that the Con-
ference adopts the seventh report.

(The seventh report is adopted.)

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL: DISCUSSION (cont.)

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue
with the discussion of the Director-General's
Report.

Mr. BEKTI (Employers' delegate, Indonesia)—Allow me, to begin with, to state briefly that

we all now know the whole story of apartheid,
which started with the adoption of a resolution
by the Conference in 1961. We have further
witnessed all the deplorable events of last
week, which culminated yesterday in long
debates and concluded, by necessity, with the
election of a new President, which took place
while a great number of delegates were absent.

I regret very much that, regarding this issue,
much has been said with excitement and
passion. On the other hand, I think we must be
thankful for it, since we now know exactly
where we stand. We have heard the presenta-
tion of different views, which is invaluable
and, resolutions proposed. Based upon
all this the most important thing that we have
to do now is, to my mind, to speed up any
action which will lead to the earliest implemen-
tation of the strong will and desire of the Con-
ference, so that the Republic of South Africa
abandons apartheid, which is against the
declared principles embodied in the Constitu-
tion of the United Nations Organisation.
Alternatively, if it is not willing to do this,
we must put it in complete isolation or expel
it from our Organisation. We hope that by
then this course will have been legalised by the
United Nations Organisation and that provi-
sion will have been made for such a course in
the Constitution of the I.L.O. I therefore
earnestly appeal to everybody in this Con-
ference to contribute as much as possible
in this direction, firstly by being true to the
aims of our Organisation to uphold peace,
freedom and human dignity.

In preparing my speech at the beginning of
last week, I intended to say how happy I was
to be present at a gathering where an African
had been appointed to the highest function
of this very important annual Conference. I
think this proves the great understanding and
generosity of the members who do not belong
to the Afro-Asian group. The present Con-
ference deals mostly with subjects related to
the developing countries and obviously it would
be advantageous to have as its President
someone coming from one of those regions, as
he would have the best idea of prevailing con-
tions and one could expect appropriate and
just decisions to be taken concerning technical
matters.

In view of what has happened in the last few
days, our newly elected President now has an
even harder task upon his shoulders. I wish
you all success, Mr. Dreyer. Having been
informed of your ability, capability and vast
experience, I am sure you will bring your great
task to a worthy conclusion.

It is a great pleasure for me—as it always
has been since I first came to Geneva in 1955—
to attend this annual Conference. I should like,
at the same time, to state how honoured I am
that my Government has appointed me for the
fourth time a member of the Indonesian dele-
tation representing the group of Indonesian
employers. I wish to connect these happy
sentiments with the present political, economic
and social situation prevailing in my country.
Indonesia is a country of about 100 million
people, where it is increasing yearly by 1.5 mil-
lion. As has always been said by outsiders, it
is a country with tremendous natural resources
and with many potentialities to support it in the

1 See Appendix I, pp. 464-465.
role which it will play in the near future. In this respect I would also like to refer, with your permission, to the activities of our energetic President, who is concerned with the well-being not only of his home country but of the whole world. He has a great understanding of the nations of East and West, of North and South. I am sure you know about his many travels to foreign countries, where he contacts all kinds of people—high-ranking state men and government officials, as well as scientists and technicians, and even in the street. I am sure you have heard of his missions and world-wide journeys. It may be recalled that, supported by the national leaders of India, the United Arab Republic, Burma and Ceylon, he initiated the convening of the historical Afro-Asian Conference of 1955. Since then, the impact of the "Bandung spirit" has always been felt in every international conference, and particularly in this I.L.O. gathering, in spite of many differences.

It is a great pleasure for me at this Conference to be among representatives from almost the whole world. These representatives consist of high-ranking government officials and distinguished employers' and employees' representatives. In the controversial world of today, where there is tension and hostility between nations, it is a great opportunity for us to exchange ideas within the scope of the International Labour Conference, which should really deal only with the technical field of labour-management relations and so on, and should be free from political issues. However, in spite of continuous appeals by the President that we should avoid making references of a political nature in our speeches, this is not the case. I therefore apologise to you, Mr. President, and especially to my fellow Employer delegates, if you consider that my introductory comments on the Director-General's Report, which I will start soon, contain a certain amount of political flavour also. I cannot help having been influenced by the deplorable incident which we all witnessed concerning the South African case. Also, there is another issue which has annoyed me every year since 1950 when tripartism was discussed.

It goes without saying that in aiming at a serene sphere for dealing with purely technical matters a good understanding and clearance as far as their political attitude is concerned among the participating delegates is a condition sine qua non. Therefore I would hereby like to appeal to everybody here in the holy surroundings of the Palais des Nations to contribute as much as possible to bridge over the political gaps by individual personal change and meeting of minds during and between the sessions, while having lunch and dinner together and in free time.

I myself have always considered it a worthy task to do as much as possible in that direction, aiming at a humble share in trying to ease the above-mentioned world tensions. In this light allow me to refer in the first place to the state philosophy now ruling in my country, the _Pantja Sila_ or the Five Principles. These include: one, recognition of Almighty Being; two, democracy; three, social justice; four, nationalism; five, humanism. These principles, general as they may appear, have proved in my country to be very useful relating to approaches to and solutions of major problems, either political or social. My esteemed Government chief delegate to this Conference, giving an example in solving labour-management problems, said: "Theoretically and practically there is no place for antagonism between the two functional social groups of workers and employers, or any difference of opinion to persist after representation and deliberation in a continuing effort to find a common ground of reconciliation." It is true indeed, while adding to this conception, that the revolution in my country has still to be carried through to achieve its final goals in the form of a prosperous and a just community, insisting that everybody pull his weight to achieve these objectives. The basic principles applied in labour-management relations have given it practical implications such as collective agreements and works councils, as they have been established in the state undertakings.

It is in that same framework that I would like to quote another passage of my Government delegate's speech: "Let us take free enterprise. Our economy is a socialist economy based on the state ownership of basic resources and depends for its functioning on a greater number of state activities than in most countries. Yet private enterprise finds an honourable place within the configuration to the extent that my fellow delegate and Employers' member comes from a highly active and 100 per cent. private sector". I would like to thank my Government's representative here in public for the kind words given to me as a representative of the whole Indonesian employers' group, especially to convince those who are still doubting, whether the "guided democracy and guided economy" in Indonesia works indeed.

I am the first to admit that my introduction is a rather lengthy one in commenting now on the Director-General's Report on technical matters. But I hope that what I have said will still have some value as a stepping-stone to Mr. David Morse's Report. Anyhow I wish to thank you for your patience shown so far in listing to my speech.

First of all, I wish to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by several previous speakers in congratulating the Director-General for his most valuable, enlightening and thought-provoking Report, which reflects the vast knowledge and wealth of experience he has acquired over the period of 15 years during which he has served as the highest functionary in the Office.

The Report covers so wide a field that it is not possible in a short address to deal adequately with all the aspects of the work of the I.L.O. to which it makes reference. I shall confine myself, therefore, to a few of these aspects, which to my mind are of the most importance, specially related to the situation and the need of the developing countries.

Because of the high importance of the content I wish to state here that both the national and international employers' associations with which I am associated have given special attention to studying and discussing all the matters thoroughly and systematically. I wish further to state that the Employers'
group in this Conference has set up several working committees to deal with and make conclusions on the discussions and the debates in the respective committees. For your information, I am happy to note that special headings have got the special attention of the group, namely (1) tripartism; (2) formulation of standards and general discussions not leading to standards; (3) relationship between the Conference and the Governing Body; (4) Conference organisation dealing with (a) periodicity; (b) help with costs of delegations; (c) resolutions; (d) organisation of work of committees; (5) composition of committees; (6) credentials; (7) other problems affecting organisation of work of the Conference; (8) revision of Conventions and Recommendations and application of Conventions; (9) Industrial Committees; (10) regional activities; (11) I.L.O. and the United Nations family; (12) technical assistance and other points. The mentioned working committees have not yet finished their task and the rapporteurs concerned used to inform the group about the progress of the discussions every morning. It is the intention of the group during the last days of the Conference to try to inform the plenary session of the stage which the conclusions of the several committees have reached and give what can be summarised by the group as its provisional record relating to the different aspects of heading placed before us in the Director-General's Report. By doing so it is the idea of the group to appoint our last speakers from the Employers' group to comment on the Director-General's Report, being the spokesmen of the said group. It is to my mind the most logical way to do so, referring to the tripartite nature of our Organisation. The most important things are the findings and the conclusions of the group rather than of the individuals, be they governments, employers or employees. By this we Employers are inviting the other groups, namely the Government (as far as possible, of course) and the Workers, to recommend the practical way I just introduced as a guide in the discussions and debate concerning a vast field of subjects which are of the most importance for all the three groups.

It is further my personal suggestion that the Governing Body after the Conference examine carefully all the deliberations, the pros and cons concerning several aspects of discussion and the conclusions so far made by the three groups. It may be recommended to the Governing Body as soon as possible to appoint the Employers' group, in this case of course of a tripartite nature.

As to my special interest in the conclusions of the working committees set up in the Employers' group, which I mostly join myself as a member and being active in the deliberations, I would like to summarise as follows:

Technical assistance is badly needed in the fields of vocational training, industrial relations (especially collective agreements and negotiations), social security, labour legislation and rural development.

It is desirable that workers' and employers' organisations should be consulted on every project by the setting up of national tripartite bodies and it is necessary to train people who would be able to act as instructors.

To prevent overlapping it is advisable to coordinate the activities of the Organisation and other specialised agencies. The I.L.O. should then have a leading role in that co-ordination. To seek efficiency it is worthwhile that the I.L.O. has an organ to follow up the carrying out of programmes.

Regarding the effectiveness of the Industrial Committees the following should be underlined: (1) maintenance of Industrial Committees which have given good results, although they have not achieved the purpose hoped for; (2) the question must be raised whether the results achieved are proportional to the cost which has been necessary; (3) study should be given to the means of ensuring that funds are used to the best advantage (ad hoc meetings, meetings of experts, seminars, etc.); (4) developing countries should be associated more with the work of the Industrial Committees; and (5) meetings of representatives both from industrial and developing countries should be held to discuss purely practical matters, and the economic situation of the developing countries should be borne in mind during these discussions.

Of great importance for the countries concerned are the regional conferences, when serious attention will be given to the following points: (1) regarding technical assistance it should be stressed that employers and workers of recipient countries should have some say in the priorities both of need and operations; (2) strengthening of the number of regional I.L.O. advisory committees, and greater use should be made in these of the tripartite system in the area involved; (3) the I.L.O. should improve its communication with employer bodies, particularly where they have I.L.O. centres established; (4) need for direct contact of I.L.O. with employer bodies, as some governments do not pass on to the employers and perhaps workers information and advice; (5) stress to the I.L.O. the need for urgent and accelerated activity in the development programmes, as this is necessary to raise the standard of living.

Regarding credentials, please kindly consider the following proposals:

(1) To object to every solution which will take the examination and even partial decision on credentials out of the hands of the Conference or a committee appointed by the Conference.

(2) In order to improve the procedure of the Credentials Committee, to recommend amendments to the Standing Orders: (a) in case credentials are not received within the time limit laid down in article 26, paragraph 1, of the Standing Orders (15 days before opening of the Conference) the representatives concerned should only be admitted as observers to the Conference; (b) in sending the credentials, governments should also indicate for non-governmental delegates which organisations were consulted, which organisations agreed to the nominations, and the qualifications and functions of the appointed non-governmental delegates.

Time does not permit me to deal with technical matters.

The PRESIDENT—No, I am sorry. Your time is up.
Almost 2,000 years after Christ came down to preach His mission of love, a Government made up of professed Christians daily mocks one of the principal teachings of Our Lord: Love one another. At this time when we are liquidating colonialism, when peoples that were formerly enemies are working together, when industrialised States are helping the less developed, in this day of space travel, the policy of apartheid is a criminal anachronism which endangers the peace of the world. Venezuela will certainly fight side by side with the African countries in their legitimate attempt to end once and for all such practices and finally to liquidate the last vestiges of colonialism.

The Government of Venezuela has carefully examined the Report placed before the delegates by the Director-General at this 47th Session of the Conference. The problem before us is whether the structure and operations of the I.L.O. are duly adjusted to the conditions of a changing world. Hence the particular importance of this year's Report, which is certainly an extremely useful document on the basis of which to consider—in the light of the present world situation—the direction which the I.L.O. should take and the most appropriate means in which it should employ in order that, after having contributed so much to the cause of social justice and peace, it may continue to be a high standard of living while the latter live in poverty; the solidarity which must unite all countries.

First of all, we think it is appropriate to review the objectives, methods and procedures proposed. The changes which have occurred in the world since the last such review took place fully justify the work undertaken at the present session.

Unfortunately, the short time at the disposal of each speaker makes it materially impossible for me to examine all the important questions dealt with in the Report regarding either the programmes or the structure of the I.L.O. My delegation has therefore welcomed the idea of a special procedure for the discussion of this year's Report so that the Conference at this session can have a broad exchange of views which may then serve as a guide for the subsequent work which we think should be undertaken by the Governing Body—and not by the special commission which has been proposed—namely that of assembling, classifying and commenting on the various opinions expressed in the debate, with a view to submitting a full report to the next session of the Conference.

Of course, many member States wish to take an active part in this discussion and express ideas which will contribute to determining the standards which are to guide the work of the Organisation in the future. It would be improper if excessive attachment to tradition should deprive them of the opportunity to express themselves fully.

Furthermore, one must remember the natural reluctance felt by many States to speak exclusively of the problems raised in the Report because they are thus unable to use this world platform to call attention to their own progress and their particular problems.

Having made these preliminary remarks, I must say that the maintenance of peace and the protection of freedom are fundamental principles of the policy of the Venezuelan Government. They figure in our Constitution and are strongly rooted in the feelings of our people. Venezuela has chosen the difficult and discreet task of carrying through its revolution within the framework of representative democracy. Acting at all times in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the Republic, the Government is engaged in reforming our national structures by democratic measures.

Agrarian reform is being carried out under a law that was prepared with the co-operation of all the political and economic sectors of the country and enacted with the approval of all the parties represented in Congress. Aimed at thorough reform of the conditions of life in rural areas and at increasing our agricultural output, the programme now in progress is not a mere redistribution of land. During the first four years of office of Mr. Betancourt's coalition Government, 637 peasant settlements have been completed for the benefit of 57,000 families, covering more than 1.5 million hectares, and it is planned to settle 42,000 more families in the present year.

My Government considers that the I.L.O. should attach to this aspect of social policy all the importance which it really has for the developing countries. We have urged the Governing Body to include the question of agrarian reform in the agenda of the Conference in the near future and I take this opportunity of repeating our proposal.

Reading that part of the Report which the Director-General devotes to the interdependence of the peoples, I cannot help remembering the illuminating lesson of His Holiness John XXIII, that great Pope, whose death has recently been mourned by all mankind. In hisencyclical "Mater et Magistra ", one of the most important documents of our age, he says that perhaps the greatest problem of today is that of the relations between the economically developing political communities and those which are in course of economic development, the former having a high standard of living while the latter live in poverty; the solidarity which must unite all human beings and make them peoples of a single family requires the political communities which have surplus resources not to remain indifferent to the position of those whose members are struggling against poverty and hunger and lack elementary human rights;
because of the increasing interdependence of
the peoples, there cannot be lasting and
fruitful peace between them if their economic
conditions are excessively unequal.

Of course, as the same encyclical says, help
given by the economically developed com-
munities should not serve as a pretext for
influencing the political situation in the de-
veloping communities with a view to dominance
of the latter.

A very important point in this connection is
that little or nothing can be gained from ambi-
tious and utopically unrealistic plans of public or
private investment if equitable arrangements
cannot be made for the maintenance of prices of
the goods exported by the developing countries
to the industrialised countries. Venezuela has
already taken a step of great importance in this
connection by promoting the establishment and
taking an active part in the work of the
Organisation of Petroleum-Exporting Coun-
tries, the objectives of which include stabilising
the prices of this important commodity. For a country which, like Venezuela,
has one of the highest indices of population in-
crease in the world, the problem of raising the
level of employment is of outstanding im-
portance.

As the Director-General rightly points out in
his Report, in these circumstances the objective
of higher levels of productive employment is
increasingly difficult to attain. However, we
are confident that the application of the
National Plan for 1963-66, prepared by the Co-
oordination and Planning Office, which is direct-
ly under the President of the Republic, will sub-
stantially reduce existing unemployment. With
the expected accelerated increase in output and
the direction that has been given to that part of
investment which has not yet been committed
to specific programmes, it is intended to reduce
unemployment from 13.6 per cent. in 1962
to 6.8 per cent. in 1966.

This plan, which has been and is the subject
of extensive free discussion among employers
and workers, has the following fundamental
objects: (1) maximum well-being for all
Venezuelans through full employment of our
working force and a fair distribution of wealth,
the growing resources of the various regions of
the country being used in the most efficient
way; (2) economic independence by appropri-
ate diversification of the economy and optimum
increase of the national product, particularly by
a better use of income obtained from appropri-
ate national participation in the mining in-
dustry.

The Government of Venezuela welcomes the
growing importance attached by the I.L.O. to
employment as an objective of economic de-
velopment, and it applauds the Governing
Body’s decision to invite all States Members to
take part with tripartite delegations in the
Preparatory Technical Conference on Employ-
ment Policy which has been and is the subject
of extensive free discussion among employers
and workers. Understanding the
growing resources of the various regions of
the country being used in the most efficient
way; (2) economic independence by appropri-
ate diversification of the economy and optimum
increase of the national product, particularly by
a better use of income obtained from appropri-
ate national participation in the mining in-
dustry.

The Government of Venezuela welcomes the
growing importance attached by the I.L.O. to
employment as an objective of economic de-
velopment, and it applauds the Governing
Body’s decision to invite all States Members to
take part with tripartite delegations in the
Preparatory Technical Conference on Employ-
ment Policy which is to meet at the end of 1963,
instead of inviting only a certain number of
countries as had originally been proposed.

However, it is sorry that the funds required
so that a meeting of experts on employment ob-
jectives in economic development could have
met, as suggested by the Director-General, have
not been included in the 1964 budget by the
Governing Body, although the 45th Session of
the Conference instructed the Office to prepare
a broad programme in this field.

We have read with much interest the com-
ments made in the Report regarding vocational
training, and we welcome the concern shown by
the Office for this problem. In Venezuela we
attach great importance to it. Through our
National Institute for Co-operative Education,
on which the Government, employers and
workers are represented, valuable progress has
already been made. I take this opportunity
of expressing my Government’s gratitude for
the technical assistance it has received from
the I.L.O. in this and other fields.

My Government shares the opinion expressed
by the Director-General regarding the impor-
tance of fiscal reform, agrarian reform, social
security and wage policy as instruments for
attacking and eliminating the great disparity
between the very rich and the very poor by
modifying the level of incomes and their distri-
bution. However, one must seriously ask
whether at this stage, or in the immediate future,
the I.L.O. will be able to give adequate tech-
nical co-operation in these two fields. We are
convinced that in some of them it is necessary
to investigate further and to provide further
opportunities for tripartite discussion in order
to bring about more effective technical co-
operation in the developing countries.

We therefore agree that at one of its next
sessions the Conference should study income
policy in connection with economic develop-
ment with a view to reaching agreement on
general principles, perhaps including a Recom-
mandation which could serve as guide both for
member States and for the Office.

Venezuela, which has a strong and powerful
trade union movement, supports in general the
remarks made in the relevant chapter of the
Report. Our trade union movement has
reached a high level of maturity. In 1962,
642 collective agreements were concluded, and
the policy of favouring free collective bar-
gaining without interference by the authorities
is being continued. Despite the activity in this
regard, last year no dispute had to be submitted
to arbitration and there were only eight strikes
during the year.

It is only fair to recognise that one of the most
important factors in Venezuela’s political
stability has been the good relations between
employers and workers. Understanding the
national interest very well, both groups have
strongly resisted the attempts directed from
abroad to suppress freedom and introduce a
totalitarian régime.

The Venezuelan trade union movement
seems ready to extend its activities to other
fields, such as the education and cultural
improvement of the workers, co-operative
fields, such as the education and cultural
improvement of the workers, co-operative
methods and training for management of
unions and undertakings.

The co-operative movement has spread
widely throughout the country. Whereas
there were only five co-operatives in 1957,
in 1961 there were over 100 in normal operation
and more than 50 in course of registration. An
interesting point is that in several occasions
where undertakings had failed, the workers
carried them on as co-operatives.

The observations made in Chapter IV of the
Report regarding missions of experts are
reasonable, but attention must be called to the risk for trade union independence which is involved in giving aid and stimulus to weak trade unions. Furthermore, expert missions must be closely related to the long-term planning of economic and social development.

As for the legal position and social conditions of the workers, my delegation considers that the I.L.O. should intensify its work in this field. It has been one of the I.L.O.'s most profitable programmes and it should not be neglected in the future. Without neglecting other more important aspects of this work, the tendency observed in recent years to give relatively less attention to these questions should be corrected.

Venezuela and the Latin American countries in general, because their industrial development is only beginning, do not for the present seem exposed to the problems of automation. However, it is appropriate to start planning now so that the unfavourable consequences of technological change can be avoided in good time.

Reference has been made to the need for diversifying education by modifying traditional curricula and adjusting these to regional requirements.

We have established a productivity institute, which is an independent corporation, part of its resources being provided by the State. Attitudes characteristic of a pre-industrial society continue to influence the views of some employers and workers, thus hampering the development of undertakings and due cooperation between management and labour at this stage of industrialisation. One of the main objects of the institute is to remove these obstacles and, by increasing productivity, to promote a general rise in the standard of living.

Regarding the structure of the I.L.O., I shall refer only to the matters I consider to be of greatest importance. In the first place, I wish to stress the value of greater participation of the less developed countries at all levels of the Organisation's work, enabling them to present their views and have a more complete feeling of collaboration.

In the second place, we believe that the regional activities of the Organisation must be expanded. There should be more frequent regional conferences, and it should be considered whether decisions adopted at such conferences should not be given, at the regional level, the same force as resolutions adopted by the International Labour Conference have at the world level.

Moreover, we consider that for a variety of reasons the persons entrusted with decisions on regional questions should be persons from the particular regions.

I should like to close by saying that we hope and believe that the present self-examination will make the Organisation more efficient and that, in close co-operation with the other organisations of the United Nations family, it will continue to be a powerful force in the great struggle for peace through social justice.

The PRESIDENT.—May I make one comment. If speakers wish to have a good interpretation of their speeches they should speak a little more slowly; but still, of course, they will have to remember the 15-minute time limit.

Interpretation from French : Mrs. NGUYÈN-Thi-Hai (Employers' adviser, Viet-Nam)—The employers of Viet-Nam would like to associate themselves with the preceding speakers in congratulating you, Mr. Dreyer, on your election as President.

Permit me first of all to say, Mr. Director-General, that the employers of Viet-Nam have read with the greatest interest your Report, which is of paramount importance for the future of the Organisation, and that they sincerely echo the sentiments of those speakers who have already congratulated you and thanked you for this highly valuable document.

There is no doubt that the I.L.O., with its 108 Members, coming from all regions of the world, is at a turning point in its history. The Director-General was perfectly right, therefore, in taking up for study in his Report the programme and structure of the I.L.O. as a whole in order to adapt the methods and resources of the Organisation to the new circumstances created by the march of time. It is particularly gratifying, too, to note that the Director-General has boldly departed from the well-trodden paths of routine in the way he has put the problems and in his clear desire to contribute positively to building up the Organisation.

We cannot fail to agree with the Director-General when he proposes a certain number of steps to improve the Organisation and the working methods of the Conference, the workload of which has to be lightened as much as possible. It is becoming clear that now that a number of countries are becoming independent and joining the Organisation, the organisation of the Conference is not only becoming more complex and unwieldy but the very appearance of the I.L.O. has changed.

I think everybody here is delighted to see so many new Members, including our own country. However, this larger membership has given rise to a larger number of acute practical problems. Since the duration of the Conference remains unchanged and it cannot be lengthened unduly, the agenda of the Conference is becoming heavier and heavier. Many committees have been set up, some of which comprise about 100 members. Speakers participating in the discussions on the Report are coming in ever greater numbers from year to year. All this limits, to some extent, the participation of member States, especially the developing countries which have small delegations owing to their distant geographical situation, and also because of the considerable expense of sending a tripartite delegation to Geneva. In such circumstances it is very difficult for them to contribute to discussions in committees and plenary meetings, and this is particularly serious when we consider that the international instruments being discussed might be of immediate and direct consequence to the economic and social policies of these countries.

Obviously, in such circumstances it is highly desirable to find a new formula to ease the workload of the Conference and to permit each member State to have an opportunity to discharge its obligations towards the Organisation.
Further, I should like to add that the Viet-Nam employers agree with many preceding speakers that we should maintain the annual sessions of the Conference because not only do these annual sessions constitute for those who are not members of the Governing Body (which is our case at present) a unique opportunity of participating in the work of the Organisation, but they also favour friendly contacts between various member States striving towards better comprehension and world peace. To achieve this purpose I think that the limited time of the Conference, which only lasts about three weeks, is too valuable for it to be wasted in political propaganda of no benefit to anybody. It is our duty to make the best use of this time to study, discuss and adopt measures which will ensure the well-being of the toiling masses, strengthen the fraternal bonds between countries and achieve a better understanding of the problems of each. We realise to what extent our problems are arduous, particularly for the smaller, low-income countries.

Everybody realises that many underdeveloped countries at the present time are up against difficult, even daunting, problems in order to diversify their traditional economies, and the results up to now have been more or less unsuccessful. They find themselves on the horns of a permanent dilemma: to reconcile the requirements of a progressive social policy with the requirements of an economy that has to expand rapidly. A number of countries have reached a stage of industrialisation thanks to incessant efforts and have now reached a level comparable to that of many highly industrialised countries in Europe and America; but there are many others which draw most of their resources from agriculture and which still have enormous difficulty in maintaining a reasonable rate of growth and in gradually raising the standard of living of their people, because of the continual depression—or, in some cases, the sharp drop—in the prices of raw material and agricultural produce.

I believe that the Conference should think more about these countries when framing international instruments which go far beyond the ability of the emergent countries to apply them honestly and loyally. As a result of the difference in the social and economic level of member States of the I.L.O., the literal application of certain international instruments framed by highly industrialised countries may entail grave consequences for the economy of under-industrialised or completely agricultural countries; in other words, low-income countries.

I should be very glad if the Conference would take account of this paramount fact and adopt in consequence a more flexible policy which would be more adapted to present trends, especially with regard to standards. I do not wish to impugn the standard-setting role of the I.L.O., but I think it would be highly desirable if the Organisation were to focus its efforts on basic questions of a general nature. Experience has shown us that for lack of realism many Conventions, if not a dead letter, have at least been applied unequally.

In this context I should like to draw attention to the success of the regional conferences, and particularly that of the Asian Regional Conference which was held in Melbourne last year. These conferences have enabled many of us to obtain a deeper knowledge of very useful specific matters such as the development of employers', workers' and technical training and so on. Permit me to say that the employers of Viet-Nam were very satisfied with the work and also with the Melbourne Resolution, and that they are desirous of having other such conferences being held more frequently than in the past. In their opinion, a regional conference at least once every three years would be highly desirable.

Naturally, as always, a financial problem arises in organising such a conference, but there is no doubt that the success of previous meetings more than justifies the financial burden. These regional meetings, without claiming to exert a direct influence either on the Governing Body or on the I.L.O., are extremely useful to the Organisation because very soon they will be called upon to play a more active role in the implementing of I.L.O. regional projects. This is particularly true of the activities of the regional commissions of the United Nations, such as the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, because of the technical assistance being granted to the developing countries which has been expanding somewhat over the past few years.

On this point it would be very useful if the I.L.O. were to maintain closer ties and a more active collaboration with the various regional technical commissions of the United Nations, through the channels either of the regional advisory committees or the local I.L.O. representatives. The employers of Viet-Nam hope that arrangements will be made in order to obtain a direct participation of the employers and workers of the regions concerned in studying technical assistance programmes, because, normally speaking, they are, if not the main beneficiaries, at least the most concerned in view of the role which the workers' and employers' organisations play in the economic development of their countries.

I should like to add that the principle of direct participation of employers and workers must come more to the fore in the regional activities of the I.L.O. Special consultations, permanent or regional, employers' and workers' organisations, will likewise be useful for the regional offices and Correspondents of
Mr. RAHMAN (Government delegate, Pakistan)—At the outset, allow me, Mr. President, to welcome you to the high position which you richly deserve and which has been rightly bestowed upon you by this Conference. With your past experience and admirable qualities, there is no doubt that you will conduct the affairs of this Conference in a worthy manner. I, on behalf of my country, my delegation and myself, wish you every success.

I also take pleasure in welcoming the new members of the Organisation and hope that in the years to come the nations struggling for freedom will be able to join our fold.

The Government of Pakistan has read the Report of the Director-General with great interest. Mr. David Morse has made a significant departure from his previous practice. He has submitted an extremely stimulating and comprehensive Report which is a convincing proof of the great contribution that the International Labour Organisation has been making in the field of the economic and social progress of mankind. He has put forward a new theme for our discussion. His Report is a masterly analysis of the entire field of work covered by the I.L.O. and he has ably presented the problems that require to be examined and solved in the light of the changing circumstances. It is a Report that is of great importance to all, inasmuch as it brings forth in great depth the wide variety of projects being introduced and the hopes and aspirations of the I.L.O. in the next ten years. One wonders whether the resources would be available to cover the operations outlined. However, the dynamic character of the Report cannot be denied and there cannot be two opinions that the calculated risk that he has taken in its presentation was worth taking. Like all bold and daring ventures, this document is going to be a landmark in the history of the I.L.O. and will raise controversies which we hope will make it possible "to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action".

One of the most important matters referred to by the Director-General in his Report is the urgent need to improve human resources for the development of economic and social conditions. The Government of Pakistan realises that the economic advancement of the country depends to a large measure on the proper development and utilisation of its manpower resources. The problem is being approached from a scientific angle, and far-reaching measures are being taken for the formulation of national policy for the conservation, training, development and effective utilisation of manpower. Along with the free employment service, machinery has been set up for the collection of manpower statistics and planning. We are grateful to the I.L.O. for assisting us in planning, setting up the National Manpower Council. The need for better utilisation of the labour force by creating high levels of productive employment and imparting vocational training has also been felt. The utility of in-service training and trade testing has been recognised. To overcome the shortage of technical know-how, an apprenticeship training scheme has been started. In the two Five-Year Plans, special allocations have been made for technical education at all levels, i.e. engineering, supervisory and skilled labour. Similarly, problems pertaining to productivity are also being tackled. But all this does not appear to be enough to meet our needs. A tremendous lot remains to be done in this field. The I.L.O. has to see what is the best way of meeting the need for technical assistance and vocational training in the developing countries so that within a short time they may enjoy the benefits of economic progress. In this, the essential factor is undoubtedly the need for the co-operation of the most advanced countries, which I am sure will readily be forthcoming.

Here I would like to emphasise that, while a number of countries gained freedom some years ago, they are still grappling with economic and social problems. They have yet to achieve economic advancement, for which sustained technical assistance is imperative. Furthermore, in determining the distribution of resources available for assistance, consideration must necessarily be given to the number of people who should benefit from such aid.

In the Director-General's Report, reference has been made to what is perhaps the most vital but controversial issue in the labour relations field, i.e. the role of the trade unions in economic development. A major problem in setting up a sound system of industrial relations in the developing countries is the lack of industrial tradition. Both the employers and the workers are newcomers in this field. It appears that the basic need for education of workers and employers has hitherto been neglected. While we in our country have started, in a small way, management development projects, personnel management courses, workers' education projects, etc., it is necessary that a comprehensive scheme in this regard be drawn up by the I.L.O. Such a scheme should be implemented in close consultation with the governments concerned, irrespective of whether they relate to the country as a whole or to the group of employers or the trade unions. This point needs to be emphasised because any direct approach by the I.L.O. to any group or organisation without consultation with, or the agreement of, the government would infringe the basic tripartite principles of the Organisation.

This brings me to the interrelated questions of wages and incomes policy. As very rightly pointed out by the Director-General, there are compelling reasons for considering how wages and incomes policy can be worked out in harmony with economic and social policy and development planning. We agree that the
structure of wages should provide adequate incentives for workers to acquire skills and undertake jobs which are useful for economic and social development. To this end, Minimum Wages Boards have been set up in both the wings of our country, and the Government has undertaken to provide guidance concerning the general level of wages considered compatible with the national goals laid down in the two Five-Year Plans. In this connection the various reforms introduced recently, particularly the land reforms, are significant. The wage structure of the country should be reasonably adjusted according to economic goals. With the assistance of the I.L.O. we have been able to evolve a method of determining scientifically the level of wages in various sectors, and I am glad to report that a social security scheme, which has an important role to play in industrial economy, will also be introduced shortly. The necessary legislation in this respect has already been promulgated.

I have no doubt that most delegates have given a great deal of thought to the question of the I.L.O.'s Conventions and Recommendations. On the face of it they look perfect, but in practice they have proved to be ambiguous. It is appreciated that owing to the tripartite character of the Organisation unanimity on controversial issues cannot be achieved without sacrificing clarity and precision. However desirable it may be to accommodate all points of view, the practicability of decisions should not be lost sight of; otherwise the result will be far from satisfactory. Conventions and Recommendations should invariably take into account the diverse economic and social conditions prevailing in the various parts of the world. This will enable countries to give effect to Recommendations or Conventions without its adversely affecting their economic or industrial growth. Here I might also suggest that in view of the changed conditions and circumstances and the enlarged membership of the I.L.O. it is considered necessary to review the Conventions and Recommendations in order to make the Organisation more meaningful.

The Director-General has aptly pointed out that the I.L.O. now stands at one of the critical points of its history. It is required that the work of the Organisation be reviewed, priorities laid down and, if necessary, new procedures and methods evolved so that the I.L.O. can respond to new conditions, fresh opportunities and unforeseen events. His exhaustive Report, which I dare say is the first of its kind in the history of the Organisation, needs thorough and detailed examination. The Conference, which as usual has a very heavy agenda and which has a larger membership than ever, may not be able to devote to the Report the full attention it deserves. It is perhaps too big a body to give the matter the detailed scrutiny it so obviously requires. I would suggest for the consideration of the Conference that the new Governing Body be entrusted with this task and asked to examine the Report and submit its views and recommendations to the Conference as early as possible. Keeping in view the importance of the Report, the Governing Body might be authorised to co-opt 12 additional members—six from the Government group and three each from the Employers' and Workers' groups. I trust that this representative body would accomplish the task in a praiseworthy manner.

The membership of the I.L.O. has increased considerably. It is appropriate that steps be taken to increase its effectiveness. The system of Regional Conferences to help the developing countries to discuss regional questions should be encouraged. More regional offices of the I.L.O. should be opened in Africa and Asia, and if finances do not permit the opening of new offices the existing regional offices should be reorganised and strengthened in such a way as to ensure that the developing countries are adequately benefited.

It may also be mentioned here that in the past the Industrial Committees have done very valuable work and have been instrumental in promoting better understanding of the economic and social problems of the less developed countries. There is therefore great need for enlarging the sphere of these Committees and the frequency of their meetings. The scope of these Committees could be expanded by including small-scale or cottage industries and matters pertaining to the development of the dairy and fruit industries.

Before I resume my seat, I reiterate our belief in the fundamental aims and principles of the I.L.O. The aims that were laid down almost half a century ago remain as laudable and noble as ever and have in fact gained significance and urgency with the passage of time. The achievements of the I.L.O. in this respect have been by no means small, and I am sure that the Organisation, with its dynamic character, will be successful in the pursuit of its policies. We can assure the I.L.O. of our wholehearted co-operation.

The PRESIDENT—Thank you for your personal remarks.

Interpretation from French: Mr. UNAL (Government delegate, Turkey)—Allow me first of all to thank the Director-General of the International Labour Office for his informative Report concerning the new course to be followed in the future activities of the I.L.O. On this occasion I should also like to pay tribute to the work done by the staff of the International Labour Office in providing us with such good documents.

As you know, the Director-General's Report deals with the topical issue of how to adapt the activities of the I.L.O. to the requirements of a changing world. It is undeniable that this question must be answered satisfactorily as soon as possible.

The Report is divided into two main parts, one dealing with the I.L.O.'s programme and the other with its structure. In the main it proposes the use of new methods to enable the I.L.O. to do what is expected of it. Until now its activities have been planned, in general, on a relatively piecemeal basis. Decisions on the various activities have been taken separately and have often been implemented in isolation from each other. In future they will be closely co-ordinated with the work of national and international agencies.

When the I.L.O. lends its technical co-operation to member States it is intended that
the economic and social policies of the countries concerned should be given even greater weight than in the past in the formulation of the I.L.O.'s plans. The special conditions, particularly economic development, will be taken into account, especially when economic development plans have been launched. That is why the I.L.O. intends to concentrate and direct its efforts not only towards the improvement of conditions of work and a fair allocation of incomes but also towards economic development, on which wage increases depend.

While it is true that a just distribution is essential for the maintenance of social peace, it is not less necessary to ensure that the action taken leads to an increase in incomes generally.

In order to safeguard the freedom and rights of the individual it will also be worth trying to increase the profitability of undertakings. Closer co-operation between the I.L.O. and the other international organisations along these lines is desirable. It should avoid the danger of duplication by various organisations, and should also allow savings to be made.

In his Report the Director-General also lays stress on the need for co-operation between ministries of labour and other ministries—industry, finance, economic affairs, and so on—and with the central planning authorities. We are particularly happy to find this view expressed in the Report, since this course has been followed in my country for over a year.

Turkey is now concentrating its efforts on economic and social matters. We have already achieved really satisfactory results through meetings organised among the ministries concerned, the central planning organisations, and workers' and employers' organisations. For example, the participation of workers' representatives in the proceedings of the committee set up to establish the principles that are to govern our foreign trade has been found to be of great value from the social and economic points of view. They proposed that certain products that could be manufactured by capable and well-qualified Turkish nationals should be deleted from the list of imports. Turkey can thus save a large amount of foreign exchange and thus provide jobs for workers in a new industry.

Meetings held between certain ministers and the representatives of employers' and workers' organisations have allowed certain social problems to be settled, particularly the question of co-management and profit sharing in public undertakings and the check-off of union dues. On the former question, a Bill is to be submitted to Parliament. Check-off already exists in government undertakings by ministerial decision. Another example of tripartite co-operation should also be mentioned in connection with a total revision of labour legislation in Turkey. This revision covers the Industrial Labour Code, the Maritime Labour Code, the social security legislation, employers' and workers' organisations, collective agreements, strikes and lockouts, and so on.

The despatch by the I.L.O. of a tripartite I.L.O. mission to Turkey just before Parliament considered Bills concerning employers' and workers' organisations, collective agreements, strikes and lockouts, was an example of international co-operation which was of great value to us, and we are grateful for it.

In this connection I should like to sum up the principles which underlie our recent legislation with regard to social progress in Turkey. This legislation allows no discrimination on grounds of race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin. Workers and employers, without distinction of any kind, are entitled without prior authorisation to form and join such organisations as trade unions, federations and confederations. These organisations have the right to draw up their rules and elect their representatives in full freedom. They are not subject to dissolution by administrative decision. They are free to affiliate to international employers' and workers' organisations. They have the right to acquire property, including real estate, on condition the purchase is in accordance with their rules and objectives. They may engage in trade on condition the profits are not distributed to members of the union even in the form of refunds of contributions. They are not subject to control by the Ministry of Labour. They are entitled to conclude collective agreements, to call strikes or lockouts, and to represent their members even before the courts. The parties may conclude agreements in an undertaking or in a particular industry. A collective agreement may be extended by decision of the Council of Ministers. Conciliation before a strike or lock-out is compulsory. Employers and workers respectively have equal rights to institute lockouts or call strikes. The strikes and lockouts must be announced in advance. The contract of employment is suspended during a strike or lockout.

The Social Security Bill lays down the most advanced social security standards in accordance with the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102). This Bill, and that to ratify Convention No. 102, will soon be approved by the national Parliament.

Under the Labour Bill all workers will be covered by the Labour Code, whereas the existing code applies only to undertakings employing ten workers, or four in certain cases. Non-manual workers, to whom the Labour Code does not apply at present, will also be covered by the new Labour Code. Employers are required to employ a certain percentage of invalid or disabled workers and ex-convicts. Employers are required to make a specified deposit to guarantee the payment of their workers' wages. Minimum wages are to be fixed for the country as a whole, or on a regional basis, by a special committee on which workers' and employers' representatives are to have an equal number of seats. Up until now, the fixing of minimum wages was entrusted to provincial boards. This gave rise to differences in wage rates from one town or region to another. Workers are granted an annual holiday of four weeks with pay. The Workers' right to time-and-a-half for overtime is recognised. All workers are entitled to a total of not less than 12 weeks' leave. It is illegal for an employer to give notice to a
woman during her absence on maternity leave, or at such a time that notice would expire while she is on such leave. It is prohibited to employ young persons below the age of 18 years or women on underground work and any form of night work, with certain exceptions where the night work of women is allowed in industry.

By a special occupational safety inspection Act, the Minister of Labour has secured the assistance of a sufficient number of engineers, chemists, physicians and so on, for the effective inspection of measures already taken, or to be taken, concerning occupational safety and health, with a view to reducing the number of occupational accidents, particularly in underground work.

The provisions of the Labour Code and of the Maritime Labour Code have now been entirely revised, and we shall thus soon be in a position to ratify several international labour Conventions.

I have tried to illustrate and uphold the underlying principles of the Director-General’s Report by examples chosen from the experience of my own country. I have been able up to now to speak in favour of this document. Allow me now to discuss a question of procedure.

I am referring to certain attitudes adopted by members of Conference committees with regard to proposals or amendments submitted to them. It seems that they are sometimes influenced by solidarity or by some particular commitment to the sponsor of the proposal or amendment, whereas Conventions and Recommendations must be prepared in the light of our convictions.

I readily recognise that it is not easy to arrive at a simple solution to this difficult problem, but I also think that at a time when the I.L.O. is searching for new ways of increasing its effectiveness it would be a good thing to consider this question.

Before I conclude I should like to thank the International Labour Office and its Istanbul Field Office for their support and technical assistance to Turkey in all fields, particularly as part of our programme of rural development, and particularly for the interest they are showing in the Labour Institute for the Near and Middle East in Istanbul. This Institute, which is subsidised by our Ministry of Labour, deals with occupational health and safety questions and also with the training of works safety officers. National and international co-operation has enabled this Institute to do fruitful work in the field of occupational safety.

Interpretation from German: Mr. SCHLOT-FELDT (Employers’ adviser, Federal Republic of Germany)—We are glad that the whole question of the structure and objectives of the I.L.O. should have been brought before the present session, and we should like to congratulate the Director-General on his comprehensive Report.

One can indeed wonder whether the I.L.O. is still adjusted to the new conditions of the world. I believe that we can answer the question in the whole in the affirmative, although in many important individual instances it may be necessary to strike out also on new matters. The I.L.O.’s function of promoting social progress has not altered since its foundation, and this is possible only within the framework of economic development. The I.L.O. has also a contribution to make to social peace, on the basis of which lasting social progress is alone conceivable. These high aims have not been modified over the years. Perhaps, indeed, they have never been more important than at present. The programmes and structure of the I.L.O. must serve these objectives.

The basic structural feature of the I.L.O. is its tripartite character, and this seems to us to be just as important in the present as it means a formal artificial principle of the structure of our Organisation. It corresponds to the social realities in the very great majority of countries of the world that the workers’ and employers’ representatives should have at least an equal right to speak when their own concerns are at stake. In modern industrial society the presence of two partners who, independently of one another and of the governments, handle their own affairs autonomously and with a full sense of responsibility, is the only possible means of ensuring freedom. If one of the partners is missing it is inevitable that the State will replace it, taking over full responsibility and thus prejudicing the freedom of action of the other partner. Descent into a totalitarian form of State is then inevitable. Finally, circumstances will arise in which it is necessary for the rulers of the moment to eliminate all freedom and surround the area which they control with corridors of death, with walls through a city in order to prevent people from going where they can shape their conditions of life and work in freedom.

I do not deny that there are States in which the present task of economic development raises special problems, which at the moment must be faced with special means, and that in some circumstances the ideal of co-operation can not yet be fully implemented everywhere. However, this does not mean that the principle of partnership, in independence and with equal rights for the two great parties in industry, the workers and the employers, and their cooperation on equal terms with governments is therefore wrong or that it need not be put into general effect in the long run. Every contribution which the International Labour Organisation can make to promote the spirit of cooperation between trade unions and employers is therefore a constructive contribution to the development of the future world society. I should therefore like to examine the question of the programmes and structure of the I.L.O. in the light of the question whether these are likely to bring about achievement of the objectives of the Organisation as I have defined them.

The annual Conference, both in the plenary sittings and still more in the committees, provides an opportunity of technical co-operation for the solution of current problems of social policy. It is to be regretted that the autonomy of the groups in the choice of their representatives in committees has been given up and replaced by a body which is not responsible to the Conference. In this connection I may mention that it seems to me extremely important that the Conference should retain its
full responsibility for matters of credentials and that, within the framework of the existing regulations, these procedures are being handled more efficiently than was formerly the case. However, the committees of the Conference have now reached a size which makes it virtually impossible to adjust differences of interest by means of negotiation. I think the time has come to consider whether procedures cannot be created by which, in preparing for committee decisions, greater use would be made of the possibility of establishing small working parties. In doing so, due regard should be had to the autonomy of the groups. It is evident that arrangements would have to be made to ensure contact between members of these working parties and their groups. A machinery for negotiation between the committees and the groups would thus be established which would resemble what almost all of us already know from collective bargaining in our own countries.

For my part I am bound to say that I have been a great believer in the idea of consultation between Workers' and Employers' representatives in the work of the Industrial Committees. This was the purpose of their establishment and, according to our experience, these Committees have done good work in the past. Nobody would claim that they have always reached optimum results, but I do not think their role should be regarded as already terminated. This should not prevent us from using other methods of work in the future in order to deal with the special problems of individual industries or occupations, particularly on a regional basis. The idea expressed in the Report (page 179) to convene representatives of developing countries with a few experts from industrialized countries seems to me to merit further examination. I am sure that if it were put into effect representatives of industry in my own country would be glad to co-operate should this be desired. In any case it seems to me necessary that such meetings should undertake not the elaboration of general standards of social policy, but an exchange of opinion on specific problems as they arise at the level of the undertaking.

The joint co-operation to which I referred in my opening remarks requires on both sides partners which have the necessary technical knowledge. In this connection the management, development programme of the I.L.O. can do valuable work in all parts of the world. German employers are prepared to co-operate in this programme. The same applies to the technical co-operation programmes which the I.L.O. carries out in various different fields. The necessity of associating employers and workers in the preparation of such programmes has been mentioned both by my colleagues of the receiving countries and by those of the countries which provide assistance. I should like to add from my own practical experience that the possibility of direct personal contributions by industrial undertakings in the developed countries will be all the greater to the extent that the I.L.O. succeeds in developing non-bureaucratic administrative procedures.

I have been able to speak of only a few of the many proposals discussed by the Director-General's comprehensive Report. Its scope indicates the extent and variety of the technical problems which face us. Let us approach their solution in a spirit of partnership and cooperation.

Mr. ATKINSON (Government delegate, New Zealand)—On behalf of New Zealand I wish to add my congratulations to the Director-General on his current Report, which is an outstanding document. The Director-General's exposition of the philosophy of this Organization and his assessment of the practical issues that stem from that philosophy provide such a comprehensive stocktaking of the present and assessment of the future that it is difficult to decide on which matters it is most profitable to concentrate.

The Director-General is asking member nations to assist in setting a course for the I.L.O. for the next decade. He is entitled to that assistance, but I am sure does not expect a blanket approval to everything he suggests. Like any administrator he would expect to be asked to reduce or reduce those activities that have become less essential and initiate or increase activities in those areas that have become of greater priority and to adapt his Organization accordingly.

The Director-General's five major groupings of problems for the future are reasonable and acceptable. Each in whole or part can be classified in our own thinking as essential or necessary or desirable. In international affairs, as in our national affairs, we must endeavour to do those things that are essential or necessary and we must plan also to do those that are desirable when we have the necessary finance and manpower.

This means that we should indicate to the Director-General, and through him to the Governing Body, our assessment of priorities. May I endeavour to do this on behalf of New Zealand?

In the first place, we believe that the I.L.O. should concentrate its efforts and resources on the needs of countries that are at present underdeveloped in comparison with many others. As a token of our own good faith in this regard New Zealand is making a considerable contribution—mainly through the Colombo Plan—towards the provision of finance, equipment and training for newly developing countries, particularly our neighbours in the South-West Pacific and South-East Asia.

With this first broad priority as a guide we believe that priority in the programme should be given to the following:

(1) Those activities of the I.L.O. that will assist in achieving each country's programme for economic development. If progress can be made on the economic front, there is a prospect of development on the social front. Essential in this area is the better utilisation of the labour force by creating higher levels of productive employment, the improvement of the quality of the labour force by vocational education and training, the fostering of popular support for the tasks of national development, and the participation of broad social groups in them. It is the labour ministries—as the Director-General says, it is the traditional point of contact for the I.L.O.—that must play their part once the national development plan has
been approved at the initiative of the economic and financial ministries.

Some of this activity is most effective, we believe, if it is tailored to the needs of each of the countries concerned and this seems preferable in the meantime to the development of highly centralised activities.

Rural development is an essential part of any programme of economic development and the I.L.O. must assist here too, but we suggest the closest collaboration possible with other appropriate agencies such as F.A.O.

The initiative of the United Nations in setting up regional institutes for training in economic development problems and planning is an indication of the importance placed on this aspect of national progress.

(2) Along with the achievements of national development programmes must come those developments in labour relations that are essential to the long-range fulfilment of such programmes and so avoid the frustration of national development by industrial strife.

In this area, where we believe, to trade union development, in a way that can avoid some of the difficulties that have and still beset industrial relations in many developed countries. Sound organisation and trained leadership are of prime importance. The I.L.O.'s advice on many aspects of union organisation and activities could do much to assist if it takes into account the historical background of labour relations in each area. Therefore much of this assistance should be direct and on the spot if asked for.

In this connection I might mention also the desirability of ensuring that Conventions are reasonably flexible and are kept abreast of changing times. In New Zealand, where we have achieved almost complete organisation of workers, our concern has passed from that of encouraging the growth of unions to that of protecting well-established unions from erosion by splinter groups. This is a position which is not quite compatible with the terms of the Freedom of Association and Right to Organise Conventions.

(3) New Zealand would also support the Director-General in his proposal that the I.L.O. should give consideration to the establishment of criteria for national incomes policies. This is a difficult field, but a vital one if all sectors of the community are going to co-operate in national development. "The cutting of the cake" is inherently contentious but probably less so if certain criteria are laid down and widely accepted. This task of consulting representatives of sectors of the community in developing an incomes policy can in itself lead to greater understanding and improved labour relations. We hope that the I.L.O. will give a high priority to this issue and, with the caution that is obviously necessary in this contentious field, endeavour to develop, as a result of the traditional tripartite discussions, Recommendations that can assist countries that desire to use them. This could be a base from which the structure of increased social justice could arise. Many may think we are naïve in believing that something can be achieved in this area—perhaps we are—but why not try? As far as other policy proposals are concerned we think that the I.L.O. function is one of linkage of sources of information and research rather than of establishing original work on its own account in these fields. We support extension of this linkage function but would suggest caution in any extension on the original research side where we are convinced that existing research institutions can be effectively used. In the developing countries we think there are activities of more basic importance than those concerned with automation and technological change.

We have deliberately so far not made any reference to the I.L.O.'s role of developing standards. While this will remain an important function of the Organisation, its purpose is to ensure minimum standards in many fields of human endeavour. Today the I.L.O. must move from minimum standards to Recommendations beyond the minimum required for social justice. We see the evolution from minimum standards to better standards for the worker. This is something we wholeheartedly support.

On the structure of the Organisation time will only permit the briefest of reference. We would support the following: (1) A reduction in the activities of Industrial Committees as such; (2) the establishment of subcommittees of the Governing Body, each to provide guidance to the activities of I.L.O. in specific fields of activity; (3) a five-yearly over-all appraisal of programme by the Conference; (4) moves to facilitate the business of the Conference and Conference committees while retaining the essential tripartite structure; (5) a systematic approach to the revision of existing Conventions and Recommendations; (6) the closest collaboration with other United Nations agencies in the planning of work programmes; (7) co-ordination of staffing and conditions of employment with other United Nations organisations and the greatest possible use of the International Civil Service Advisory Board.

With regard to the problems of collaboration and co-ordination, I read with close interest Chapter X of the Director-General's Report, in which he examines the role of the I.L.O. in the United Nations family. There are in this chapter a number of wise observations on the principles and practice of co-operation among the specialised agencies and on co-ordination of international effort. I should like to express my agreement with the principles of co-ordination formulated by the Director-General on page 196 of his Report, and in particular with his remark that "to an increasing extent this negative co-ordination, as it may be called, will not suffice, and it will be necessary to provide for measures of positive co-ordination whereby the members of the United Nations family responsible for different aspects of a problem combine their resources and energies to secure a common result ".

It seems to me that this positive approach to the complex problem of co-ordination of United Nations action is most judicious and promising.

While on the subject of co-ordination I should like to express the hope that the Director-General will give his full support during the discussions in the Advisory Committee on Co-ordination to the proposed
strengthening of the International Civil Service Advisory Board to the extent necessary to enable it to function as an independent body with wide and effective powers in respect of salaries and working conditions in United Nations organisations.

Whatever the changes in programme and organisation that are ultimately supported by the Conference, they are likely to make increased demands for finance. This means that the programme of work should, in our view, be so spaced over the years to follow that sudden and substantial extra demands for funds are not made on member nations. This matching of the work programme with the financial budget is something that we must leave to our board of directors, the Governing Body.

These are the comments I would make on behalf of New Zealand on what is undoubtedly a most valuable Report.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. EFREMENKO (Workers' delegate, Ukraine)—We are living at a time marked by the fulfilment of the brilliant prophecies of Karl Marx, that in a society free from exploitation there is a constant increase of productivity and reduction of hours of work, and talents are more fully developed. To quote Karl Marx: "The saving of working time is tantamount to an increase in free time, that is, for the full development of the individual, which in its turn, as the greatest productive force, stimulates labour productivity. From the point of view of the direct productive process this saving may be considered as the production of basic capital, and this basic capital is man himself."

Everybody can now see that even in the first phase of communism, under conditions of socialism, labour free from compulsion is forming new human qualities and stimulating an untold development of the personality and of society as a whole. The mighty stream of scientific and technical progress is making itself felt in the day-to-day life of man and helping to mould his ideas, dreams and concerns. Dreams and creative labour are inseparable. Socialist productive relationships have opened untold possibilities for awakening the creative forces of the whole people and of each man and woman individually.

It is with great emotion that I say this today, when our two Soviet cosmonauts, two simple Soviet citizens, have reached the supreme heights of contemporary science and human courage. Glory be to them, these new masters of space. All this calls for unity of the international workers' movement, in the I.L.O. also. The working class is actively supporting the programmes of the government in maintaining political independence and achieving economic independence, and is at the same time acting energetically against all anti-democratic and anti-national attacks by the reactionary wing of the bourgeoisie, which constitutes a threat to national independence.

We have heard from this tribune that the working class of the new countries is fighting for the nationalisation of undertakings belonging to foreign monopolies, for the formation and strengthening of the public sector, for radical land reform in the interests of the peasantry, for democratisation of the State and for an independent foreign policy. This line finds support throughout the broad masses of the population. It creates a positive basis for the consolidation of working-class unity and for consolidation of its union with all workers, and particularly with the peasantry. The demand to nationalise undertakings owned by foreign monopolies has become a standard part of the programmes of many trade unions in Asia, Africa and Latin America. There are very few programmes of trade union activities that do not include items concerning the fight against colonialism.

All this calls for unity of the international workers' movement, in the I.L.O. also. The mighty and united demonstration which took place here recently against racialism in South Africa makes this particularly clear. The vital need to defend the interests of the workers demands this unity of forces on other subjects as well and active efforts to find mutually acceptable means of helping the various trade unions to unite and not to be disunited, which would serve only the monopolist trusts and corporations.

Unfortunately, within the I.L.O. conditions have not yet been created for the representatives of trade unions of all trends to participate freely and equally in the Organisation on an equal footing. There is a wrongful policy in the I.L.O. to discriminate against the World Federation of Trade Unions, and this can be seen in the results of the voting for the Govern-
ing Body. As in previous years, the notorious reactionary circles in the I.L.O. have been attempting to keep out of the Governing Body these trade unions of the W.F.T.U., which comprise over 120 million workers. W.F.T.U. representatives are not only excluded from the Governing Body; they are not appointed to any temporary or permanent bodies of the Organisation, either on a tripartite basis or within the Workers' group itself. These trade unions are also effectively kept outside any of the advisory activities of the I.L.O.

What does this mean in practice? It means that any view expressed by the Workers' group in the Governing Body or elsewhere is in fact one-sided and not infrequently tendentious, because it does not take into account the ideas of the workers' representatives from all member States, who come from a wide range of unions.

On behalf of more than 12 million members of the Ukrainian trade unions, I declare that it is time to put an end to such discrimination. It is necessary to take decisive steps to ensure equal rights for all delegates to the Conference. I would like to refer to the possibilities in the Conference for discussing questions connected with the participation of the I.L.O. in maintaining peace. Unfortunately, the situation here is such that these questions are generally not placed on the agenda because they are not to the taste of everybody here. Up to now, there has only been one possibility for certain States to express opinions and for certain trade unions to state their opinions on such matters; this was through resolutions outside the agenda. True enough, this was a difficult, thorny path which was strewn with all sorts of procedural road blocks, even going so far as to impose the maximum limitations on the workers' right to lead a comfortable and decent life.

Existing practice in the Standing Orders Committee gives us reason to fear that resolutions on the role of the I.L.O. will draw up a clear programme of work and adapt its structure and methods in order fully to discharge its task of defending the rights and improving the conditions of the workers.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Ukrainian workers I would like to express the hope that the I.L.O. will draw up a clear programme of work and adapt its structure and methods in order fully to discharge its task of defending the rights and improving the conditions of the workers.

_interpretation from Spanish: Mr. Rivera (Government Delegate, Panama)_—I would like, as leader of my country's delegation, to extend my warm greetings to Mr. Dreyer on his elevation to the high post of President of the International Labour Conference.

The delegates who have preceded me in this discussion on the Director-General's Report have analysed it objectively and realistically and have referred to the points on which it is right and on which it is controversial, and to the forecasts which it includes. In our view, it is a well-prepared document which sums up the fundamental aspects of the subject and shows a highly constructive interest on the part of the International Labour Office in coping with the problems derived from the relations between capital and labour.

It is a well-known fact that often, if not always, these problems arise from a lack of understanding and selfishness, sometimes taken to inhuman lengths, on the part of the owners of capital, whose greed is such that they impose the maximum limitations on the workers' right to lead a comfortable and decent life.

This outlook of many capitalists, which is contrary to law and justice, has both kept the working class in poverty and largely contributed to holding up economic development and material and spiritual progress, with the inherent and serious physical and moral consequences.

Things are very different when you have justice, understanding, fairness and decent conditions, which ensure harmony and balance between capital and labour, those two great generators of wealth and welfare.

_in my position as a delegate and leader of my country's delegation on behalf of the Government, which is the proper intermediate one required by the circumstances and by the interests of a young nation, which is now beginning to develop after overcoming numerous political and economic obstacles and is concentrating on dealing with complicated internal and external problems in order to establish its sovereignty as a democratic nation and to ensure the maximum well-being of its inhabitants._

Although there is no racial discrimination in Panama, there has been exploitation of the workers by big firms, particularly by foreign businessmen who had settled in the country;
but, thanks to the action of the Government which has enacted and applied very just labour laws, these firms have begun to improve their conditions through higher wages and salaries and better conditions, although some people are still being a bit stubborn about the full application of the Wages Act.

To ensure the welfare of the workers and public health in general a Ministry of Labour, Social Insurance and Public Health was set up by Act of 1946. A labour court, attached to the Ministry, hears and acts on complaints submitted by the workers against their employers. Workmen's compensation insurance is also compulsory.

However, the Panamanians working in the Canal Zone, which is administered by the Government of the United States, resent the economic discrimination against them. Their right to equal pay for equal work and to the same conditions as are granted to United States workers is not recognised, although the Government of Panama has always pressed for this. However, it seems that this will be achieved through the latest representations which the Government has made.

The Government has also managed to have the Panamanian flag flown before the administrative offices of the Canal Zone as a sign of the sovereignty of Panama over this part of the territory of the Republic, since, under the treaty of 1903 between Panama and the United States, which was concluded for the opening of the canal, it is clearly provided that, in this strip or zone of Panamanian territory, the United States was to have jurisdiction with regard to sanitary, maintenance and operational arrangements connected with the canal, but Panama has not, on this account, lost its sovereignty over the zone.

The Government of Washington is more disposed to recognise this legitimate right of Panamanians than previous governments have been and it has agreed, through its representatives, to recognise this right and has agreed that our national flag should be raised over the offices in this zone and in other important spots.

We have also managed to restrict as much as possible the trading powers of the Canal Zone authorities, which were exercised to the detriment of Panamanian trade and employees in violation of the provisions of existing treaties which do not empower the United States Government to trade in this zone.

A Planning Bureau has been set up by the Government in the office of the President of the Republic of Panama to apply the decisions of the Contry of held at Punta del Este in Uruguay. This Bureau is in charge of the economic, political and social guidance of the nation and, through this new institution, which runs the planning required under the Alliance for Progress for my country, very important projects have been implemented. They include schools, access roads, health centres, people's housing, water and electricity supply and, now, the distribution of land to the landless peasants through well-planned agrarian reform, as well as what seems very urgent—the establishment of an industrial bank for economic development. This bank has adequate funds contributed by the Government, industrialists, the Alliance for Progress and the general public.

Political independence is natural to all peoples all over the world and, after that, it is natural that they should have economic independence, without which the former is incomplete, since the people are still tied to the interests or aims of foreigners; economic freedom is as necessary and as highly valued as political freedom, and the Panamanian Government and people are both engaged in achieving such economic freedom.

However, of course this economy must not operate for the exclusive benefit of a minority, but for the benefit of all, in order that those who have until now been deprived of the good things of life may share the fruits of capital and labour in accordance with social justice; because only thus can the fruits of capital and labour all be used for the general good.

To maintain a balance and good relations between these two great factors of progress, the nation has an Agrarian and a Labour Code. These codes confer on the Government the powers required to implement them and give the workers a guarantee of security.

Panama is a country with abundant natural resources, although they are not exploited, or they are exploited only on a very small scale. The country therefore needs foreign capital to help it in this task.

Timber suitable for furniture-making and industrial purposes, large quantities of rich plankton which provides nourishment for enormous quantities of high-grade fish, gold, manganese, bauxite and other minerals, as well as marble and clays, are other natural resources which should be brought into world trade through industrial exploitation.

In addition to this, the fertility of the soil in conjunction with the tropical climate in the plains and the temperate climate in the mountainous areas is suitable for tropical and subtropical agriculture. And in addition to all this there is the advantageous location of the country between the two big oceans and in the centre of the American Continent. All these factors afford good prospects for undertakings and for the workers the security for capital through the legislation for the protection of industry and with the guarantee of industrial peace and a stable social order.

All this has been taken into account by the Planning Bureau of the Office of the President of the Republic, which is directed by an official with great initiative, foresight and intelligence and enjoys the support of a team of capable and hard-working officials.

It is an office of the Government, presided over by Mr. Roberto F. Chiari, to use every means in its power to bring about a radical change in the economic, political, material, intellectual and moral situations, without the Panamanian people having to demand such a change: all it is asked to do is co-operate in this work for the common good.

The great international highway which will unite all the countries of the American Continent has now been opened to traffic through North and Central America as far as Panama, and at present plans are being made to extend it to the Republic of Colombia through the
Isthmus of Darien, under the auspices of the governments of the Latin American countries and that of the United States. We may obviously hope that, once this gap has been eliminated, the important road will help to accelerate the development of the American countries and to further extend the commercial, political and cultural relations already existing between the countries of Central America and Panama.

We are also studying at the moment a proposal made to Panama by the Government of the United States for the construction of a canal at sea level through the Isthmus of Darien with the help of nuclear power. As can be understood, this study is an extremely difficult matter owing to the numerous economic and political problems involved and the repercussions it will have on the future of the Panamanian nation.

I have expatiated on this question of communications owing to the close connection between them and the interests of employers and workers, which must be foreseen and safeguarded.

I shall sum up this statement by saying that thanks to the interest the Government of my country has shown in improving the conditions of the workers and the people in general we have managed to secure better wages and salaries, entitlement to holidays, notice of termination of employment, occupational accident insurance and greater consideration for the worker. A large number of comfortable and healthy dwellings have been built in the towns for low-income families. Health has been improved and health units with medical and nursing staff have been established in almost all the population centres. The number of schools and teachers has been doubled; agriculture and stock-raising have been developed; industries have been protected and access roads built to connect factories to the great inter-American highway which runs the whole length of the country; water and electric light have been supplied to almost all the villages. Much of this has been done with government funds and with the contribution of the Alliance for Progress made through the Electrification Board.

From this international tribunal of the International Labour Conference the Republic of Panama directs its steps in accordance with the march of time towards a better understanding between the worker and his employer. Social justice must lie in a just equilibrium, where the interests of both parties are duly safeguarded by law and the government provides the impetus, the driving force and the ultimate leadership for those two advancing forces.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the Genevese, wrote his Social Contract, which was one of the first beacons for the advancement of labour. May this session conclude by shedding further light. The governments which preserve a just balance between capital and labour will help to isolate and refute doctrines imposed from without and will simultaneously ensure the happiness of mankind.

Mr. SUDARWO (Workers' delegate, Indonesia)—It is indeed a great privilege for an Indonesian Workers' delegate to participate in this Conference and to join this illustrious company in discussing the Report of the Director-General to this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference and with pleasure congratulate the Director-General on the excellent Report he has placed before us. In this Report the Director-General points out that the International Labour Organisation has come to a turning point in its history. Let me say that I fully agree with this statement and am happy that this has been recognised.

New States with different political and economic structures have joined this Organisation. The changes brought about by the modified composition of the Organisation will undoubtedly make themselves felt, not in the aims of this body but surely in the ways used to achieve the needs as they are embodied in the Declaration of Philadelphia, to which I wish to adhere most emphatically. These changes, then, would mean a change in the philosophy and the policy of our Organisation.

But changes will also be imposed upon us and me from outside, from those new countries where millions and scores of millions of hitherto mute workers have become articulate in expressing to us their needs, anxieties, ideals and aspirations. It is evident that these dynamic forces will also prompt the Organisation to accept unavoidable changes and modifications. It takes wisdom and courage to accept and encourage new ideas, but with the help of us all we shall certainly be able to solve the problems which circumstances have placed before us.

For all that it is worth you will find the Indonesian labour movement, which I have the honour to represent, on your side, ready to make its contribution, however modest it may be. The Indonesian workers' movement was born in the heat of a decisive battle in our national history, and we still take our place in the forefront of the Indonesian revolution. But the Indonesian labour movement also claims to have its place in more peaceful pursuits towards reconstruction and nation-building, now that we have freed ourselves from the chains of colonialism.

The message our workers' movement has to carry is twofold. First, it has to fight for a higher standard of living for the working class; secondly, it has its legitimate responsibilities towards the community as a whole. By tradition the Indonesian workers' movement has been involved in state affairs. About 60 per cent. of the Indonesian economy is in the hands of the State, and as a full member of the enterprise councils established in state undertakings the Indonesian workers' movement is fully integrated with management. These circumstances make us wonder whether the classical interpretation of tripartism is a useful concept for our country.

In Indonesia the problem of labour-management relations is a psychological problem and has to be approached from that angle. We do not claim to have found all the best solutions ourselves, but the problems are still very much ahead. Therefore, we must count on the International Labour Organisation to help us in identifying and solving these problems by
finding new formulae and by trying new methods.

With the increased responsibilities of labour, I would think that the I.L.O. could also make a greater effort in helping to train our officers and leaders at all levels in workers' organisations. Knowing our needs best of all, I would think it desirable for the trade unions concerned to be consulted on the choice of experts and the curricula of the courses to be given.

In the case of vocational training the I.L.O. could help, not only in disseminating the number and kinds of skills, but also in programming courses and curricula with due regard to the demands in the labour market.

In Indonesia we are trying to combat underemployment in the rural areas by offering the rural population the opportunity to learn new skills through our organisation of mobile training units. These mobile training units are expected to increase productivity, and have in many instances proved to be very effective. Co-operatives, for example, have been using these skills for the setting up of small-scale industries. It would take too long for me to elaborate the many interesting aspects of these mobile units, but I could perhaps mention the fact that these units have a wider scope than that of vocational training. Apart from combating underemployment, they will also be an important social tool to curb uncontrolled urbanisation, demoralisation by unemployment, and hooliganism.

In order to increase our standard of living we have to industrialise in our country, which means that we have to increase our labour productivity and speed up vocational training at all levels of production. This point has been mentioned by the Director-General, and I think that the I.L.O. still has an immense role to play in this field.

Foreign aid alone is not enough to achieve social and economic progress in countries like ours. A healthy trade atmosphere is necessary. I only need remind you that a fall in the price of rubber—to mention one commodity—leads to the immediate suffering of thousands of workers.

If planning and integrated efforts is one of the answers to the problems in countries like ours, I wonder whether planned and integrated activities by the United Nations and its specialised agencies is not one of the answers at the international level.

Finally, I wish to state that the expectations of the Indonesian workers with regard to the International Labour Organisation are very great indeed. We wish this Organisation to be successful and effective, and with the help of you all I am sure that we shall overcome our difficulties.

(The Conference adjourned at 12.45 p.m.)
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President : Mr. Dreyer

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

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue discussion of the Director-General's Report.

**Interpretation from Portuguese : Mr. STAFFORD da SILVA (Workers' delegate, Brazil)—**
In the name of the Brazilian Workers' delegation I wish, first of all, to extend my warmest and most friendly greetings to all the workers of the world represented here today, our comrades and brothers in the struggle for peace and freedom. I should like also to greet the other delegates representing employers and government agencies. May I also express the hope that our work at this important meeting may be fruitful and make an effective contribution to better living and working conditions for all mankind.

Next I should like to present the congratulations of the Brazilian working class to the International Labour Organisation, whose efforts and successes in the fight for social justice and against poverty, privation and fear we acknowledge and applaud.

We know how noble the motives were which inspired the establishment of the I.L.O., as stated in the Preamble to its Constitution, and how high its purpose is, namely in brief, to establish universal peace based on social welfare.

We are here to bring you the support of the Brazilian workers in achieving these objectives.

The agenda of the session includes some very important items which our delegation is considering in the committees, and I should like to endorse the choice of such appropriate questions as termination of employment at the initiative of the employer, and employment injury benefits. However, regard should be had to the constant danger of confusing effects with causes, so that a problem is not correctly formulated and no satisfactory solution can be found.

In our country we have labour and social security legislation which may well be among the most advanced in the world. Some of the items on the agenda of the session might be considered to lack substantial value for us, since they are already covered in our legislation. Indeed, our social security regulations even provide for the participation of employees' representatives in the administration of social security institutions. And yet our people are poor; they suffer privation and many lack the minimum required to live in decent conditions. Why is this so, if we have detailed progressive legislation?

It is not difficult to understand when one knows that not all this extensive legislation has or can have effective application. Much of it remains on paper, forgotten, a dead letter. It is not useful because it does not correspond to the existing complex social situation, in which obsolete structures, motionless and stagnant, halt progress and strangle development. Only when these have set us free can the picture of Brazilian economic life be painted afresh and correspond to the glittering gold of its legislative frame. Brazilian workers are aware of this and, because they are, they have joined with the other sectors concerned, indeed with the whole nation, in the struggle for a number of basic reforms which, if put into practice, would permit application of our advanced laws to the people of Brazil.

This struggle of ours is closely related to the fight against the spoliation of our people by the big landowners and economic imperialists. The Brazilian working class has realised that it is indispensable to fight hard for an agrarian reform which would give the peasants access to ownership of the land they work, and thus increase farm production, give the rural population more purchasing power, and so enlarge the domestic market, with obvious repercussions on industrial development. We understand that such action would in the end provide conditions consistent with human dignity for a considerable part of the Brazilian population.

Foreign capital investment which is often detrimental to our economic interests, the constant bleeding of our economy by remittance of enormous profits and royalties abroad, the undervaluation of our exports and over-valuation of our imports—these are some of the problems which drive Brazilian workers to act, for we suffer, through the resulting currency depreciation, a constant decrease of our real wages. We are now fighting for effective application of the regulations on movements of foreign capital and for the establishment of monopolies over foreign trade and exchange operations, a progressive banking reform and a taxation reform, all of which are required for our development and—if introduced—would
eliminate bottlenecks and accelerate our economic growth.

Furthermore, Brazilian workers vigorously demand that the competent agencies should face the problem of the deterioration of the terms of trade between developed and under-developed countries. In our own case official data show that between 1953 and 1960 the volume of Brazilian trade with the United States increased by 20 per cent., while prices fell by 37 per cent. Our people demand that an immediate end be put to this undeniable exploitation.

It is precisely because we consider these basic reforms to be essential that we Brazilian workers see no merit in certain kinds of foreign aid, certain plans of which the origin is as clear as its purpose is obscure, such as the so-called Alliance for Progress, which claims to solve the whole problem of Latin American under-development. How can one defend this "alliance", or deny its uselessness, when in practice it amounts to mere charity? What is the use of installing water supply and drainage systems, of building houses and schools, of supplying farm surpluses, if the country's structure remains unaltered? What is the use of all these improvements in our towns and cities when the fields stand neglected and their population is frozen in poverty and underdevelopment?

The Brazilian people asks with suspicion whether it is a mere coincidence that in our country the advocates of the Alliance for Progress are precisely those who fight the hardest against basic reform. Interpreting this national belief the Brazilian Minister of Labour, at the recent Inter-American Conference in Bogotá, which I had the honour to attend as a workers' representative, asked the following questions: Was the Alliance for Progress made to serve the Latin American peoples or to enhance the privileges of minorities? Does it protect the interests of international groups or really seek the economic growth of Latin America?

Brazilian workers reject such a political instrument. They are able to lay bare its hidden purpose of dominance. I believe I am not wrong in stating that the Alliance for Progress has become meaningless, useless and consequently most unpopular in our country.

I believe I am not wrong in saying also that our people strongly reject the impositions of another organisation, the International Monetary Fund, whose financial policies have invariably brought chaos to the underdeveloped countries which adopted them. The Brazilian working class is therefore urging the Government to break off immediately its negotiations with the Fund because it believes that the real way to fight inflation is to carry out basic reforms rapidly, to free the country from the spoliations of the international trusts and to discontinue the privileges of certain out-of-date classes whose existence has no justification in present conditions.

The Brazilian Workers' delegation asks you to bear in mind that to pass laws or issue resolutions is useless if they cannot be put into practice. Moreover, the problems of Latin America, which have similar problems, so that when I speak for Brazil I may be taken as referring to the others also—legislation on employment relations and social security, however carefully and minutely drafted, will not be fully applied unless at the same time old structures are reformed and the resulting wrongs are corrected; otherwise the vigorous efforts of the labour movement will be frustrated or defeated. Every legislative scheme on this subject has been like a golden frame round a torn and faded painting.

As delegate of the workers of a Latin American country, I have two comments to make on the Director-General's Report.

This states that the time has come to discuss the way in which freedom of association can be rendered more effective in underdeveloped countries where the trade unions are weak and such industry as exists is mainly owned and operated by the State.

May I, with due respect, dissent from this opinion. We consider it on the one hand to be superficial and therefore timid, and on the other hand to be an over-generalisation of the problem. It is true that in a great part of our hemisphere the trade unions are subject to restriction. This is mainly due to oppression by anti-popular governments maintained by international trusts. I say that the Report over-generalises because in our country, which we agree and publicly acknowledge to be underdeveloped, the trade unions are not weak. They are highly active and, led by a combative new generation, they stand in the forefront of the fight for national emancipation. It is true that in Brazil, we are glad to say, a considerable number of our basic industries are operated by the Government, in certain instances as the result of a decision by the people. This applies in the case of Petrobras, our state oil monopoly, the establishment of which was a wise way of dealing with the problem. Sometimes such a step is taken to protect national sovereignty, which would never be secure if the country's wealth, national wealth for instance, were to fall into the hands of foreign capital or its domestic representatives. Nevertheless the unions of employees of the public undertakings are not weak or controlled by government agents. Unions like that of the Petrobras workers or the railway employees (the railways are now run by the Government) are outstandingly combative. They have joined all the other unions in the national campaign for basic reforms, defence of democratic freedoms and better economic and social conditions for their workers.

My second comment is a compliment for the interest which the Report shows in the international situation. It says that in October 1962 certain events brought us close to a nuclear war. I must make it clear here that the position of the Brazilian workers, approved at conferences and popular meetings, was one of fraternal solidarity and full support for the socialist republic of Cuba, which we think has a right to govern itself as it pleases. No one is entitled to deny it this self-determination. Our position in that regard is in line with the wise foreign policy of the Brazilian Government, characterised by respect for the popular will and transparency of action. To those who still sympathising with Cuba, Brazilian workers shared the general rejoicing when tension was relaxed and the conflict was peacefully settled.
At that time the firmness of the friends of peace led to the desired result, and the threat of universal destruction was avoided. We are confident that such situations will be avoided in the future. Ours is not a platonic optimism, it is based on the realities of the present-day world, in which the working class more and more clearly recognises the importance of active participation in solving grave international problems.

However, one cannot speak of defending or strengthening world peace without emphasising that it is first necessary to defend and strengthen the relations between all peoples. That the need for peaceful coexistence implies the need for disarmament is too clear to require elaboration. We regard the cause of peace as inseparable from a policy of general and complete disarmament.

As I am speaking of peace and friendship among the nations, you will permit me to pay a tribute, briefly but with deep emotion, to the imperishable memory of him who has been called the Pope of peace and of the people, the beloved John XXIII.

Brazilian workers will join their brothers throughout the world in the fight for security and prosperity, for a world without war and without hunger, without racial prejudice, without colonialism, without violence, injustice or discrimination; a world without exploited and without exploiters, the dream world of the workers of all countries which one day will come to pass—and may it be soon.

*Interpretation from Spanish* : Mr. ARTURO BENÍTEZ (Government delegate, Uruguay) — Before starting my brief remarks I should like to bring a cordial greeting to all the delegates to this important Conference. We may be separated by language but we are all united by the same high ideal of seeking and practising social justice for all peoples. We should also like to greet the authorities of the I.L.O. and all the skilled team of officials and experts who serve it with such efficiency and self-sacrifice. Next I should also like to call particular attention to the participation of women in this Conference, a proof of their emancipation from old prejudice which formerly prevented them from placing their talents at the service of social well-being.

I should now like to give you some of our reflections on the Director-General’s Report, with which we are in general agreement. We appreciate the valuable innovation of reviewing the previous activity of the I.L.O. and mentioning the difficulties, the successes and the failures in the course of applying the various programmes. It seems to us that the future programme indicated in the Report is an excellent one provided due stress is laid on the co-ordination of the work of the international agencies concerned with social matters and if due regard is had to regional considerations, for these are essential to successful development.

In particular, the Government of Uruguay would be glad to see a change in the present system of holding the annual sessions at Geneva. We think they might well be held at two-year intervals and, in exchange, regional meetings could be held in rotation in the four continents, one every six months, so as to make the proposed programmes more effective.

Uruguay has advanced labour legislation and the Government is constantly seeking to improve and perfect it either on its own initiative or on the basis of I.L.O. Conventions ratified by us. In addition to very many other provisions for the protection of the workers, we have in Uruguay national pensions, special protection for women and children, wage fixing by tripartite boards, collective agreements covering various labour questions, annual holidays with pay, retirement schemes, compensation for dismissal, a 36-hour weekly rest, general unemployment insurance, arrangements for the prevention and care of employment injuries, sickness insurance, and various other benefits to ensure a sufficiently high standard of life for the workers. However, Uruguay needs international technical assistance in order that its social and economic plans may be developed more in keeping with I.L.O. standards. The result of such assistance would be highly advantageous for productivity, which should be the driving force for the general progress which we seek.

At this particular moment my Government is in course of adopting several important measures for the economic improvement of the country, including extensive public works projects—hospitals, schools, roads, bridges, drainage, low-cost housing and others—which will provide employment for thousands of workers. We are also proceeding with a new land Act which will considerably improve the living conditions of the rural population as well as stimulating agricultural production. Uruguay has for many years had specific legislative provision for freedom of association which is effective—as evidenced by the fact that many delegates sent to Geneva have severely criticised their Government and endorsed these criticisms on their return to Uruguay, but that these persons have never suffered any consequence of such action. This broad freedom has a general character; it extends to the political, social and trade union fields and indeed to all aspects of national life.

Obviously the many important problems raised in the Report cannot be analysed in a brief speech and it is only possible to refer to a few main points. It may be said that on the whole the Office has succeeded in its generous task of reducing suffering and promoting social justice throughout the world. Much has been done, and more remains to be done. Promising signs of future success are provided by the entry of new nations into the orbit of the I.L.O., especially the underdeveloped countries which have broken some of the chains which bound them and now appear in the I.L.O. offering the contribution of their natural gifts in the promotion of social progress all over the world.

In the appendix to the Report reference is made to what has been done, in pursuance of the resolution concerning human rights adopted at the Forty-second Session of the Conference, and in co-operation with the United Nations, in the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedom on the basis of the dignity and worth of the human person, particularly as regards forced labour, protection against arbitrary arrest,
imprisonment and exile without due cause, and all other forms of arbitrary action, physical or moral ill-treatment, torture, etc. Observance of such standards of protection for elementary human rights should be constantly supervised by the I.L.O. and the United Nations so as to ensure that respect for these standards may be complete and to unmask those who seek to return to inquisition and slavery; if they are Members of the Organisation they should be expelled from it.

As more than 100 governments from all parts of the world are represented at the Conference, and although we have no doubt that delegates will insist on observance of the above resolution, I would like to remind you, in case anyone has forgotten it, that it is for governments to enforce international law for the protection of men and women and so to ensure fair and humanitarian treatment for all.

Implementation of resolutions of this kind also depends to a large extent on the employers, and I have no doubt that delegates in that group will also co-operate in this matter. Consequently we consider that, in addition to the future programme of the I.L.O., as indicated by the Director-General, there should be included a number of points which should be worked out and formulated by a body of experts.

The International Labour Organisation seeks the progress, happiness and welfare of workers at all levels and in all occupations. To be successful in this task, because happiness is indivisible, it is necessary to guide and protect men in all their activities, because men are part of the social community. It is not sufficient for the worker to enjoy sufficient economic means in payment for his labour unless he is at the same time trained for peaceful coexistence at his workplace and elsewhere. Transgression of the law and disturbance of the common well-being are still too frequent throughout the world.

I should like now to give some examples to indicate what I mean: traffic accidents, murders, brawls, assaults, and many other causes of injury take their heaviest toll on the numerically largest social group, the working class. Trade unions and their officers should be particularly concerned to train their members and should choose the best methods for this, to avoid every action involving physical or moral injury for any person; in this way the necessary human understanding and solidarity will be achieved. In correcting the evils I have referred to, use may be made of the high degree of the I.L.O. By of speeches, propaganda, observations and recommendations it may contribute to removing from the world scene customs and practices which impede the necessary brotherhood of man. However, in order to give effect to such an ambitious scheme it is necessary to create a favourable atmosphere so that the principles of solidarity may penetrate the mind of every man and woman; this will create a law within the human spirit and people will consequently act in the light of their conscience without the need for formal law or for police.

We shall thus have reached the spiritual unity of mankind and men and women will have the strength required to escape a repeti-

**Interpretation from Russian: Mr. POLYAKOV (Employers' delegate, U.S.S.R.)—At a turning point in the history of the I.L.O., at a time when the discussions and conclusions of the present Conference will largely determine its future and its success in carrying out its tasks, everyone and all those concerned with the work of the I.L.O. must pay special attention to all constructive ideas and suggestions expressed in the course of the present discussion. Such ideas and proposals must not aim at scoring points in a political struggle alien to the Organisation; in this we agree with the Director-General. They must be based only on full consideration of the interests of the millions of workers in all countries, the interests of peace and the development of international co-operation.

In this connection I would like with all clarity and firmness to state that the Employers' delegation of the U.S.S.R. fully supports the proposals made in the statement by Minister of the U.S.S.R. Volkov, and in the memorandum submitted by the Soviet Government delegation. These proposals give an outline of the basic tasks of the I.L.O.—peace, the fight against colonialism, and the improvement of working and living conditions of the workers—and contain the principles for democratising the structure and working methods of the threat of nuclear war which occurred in 1962 and to which the Director-General refers, and which might have destroyed 150 million people.

Finally, I would like to say that, in accordance with its own tradition and with directives given by the I.L.O., Uruguay is up to date as regards the matters on the agenda of this session. As regards finance I believe that the budget should be supported because it tends to extend the radius of action of the I.L.O. As for the information and reports on the application of Conventions and Recommendations, we have notified the most representative organisations of employers and workers as required, and the Government conforms with the rules by requesting parliamentary endorsement of the various instruments of the Conference and taking the appropriate administrative action. Prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery seems to us to be an advisable measure which will protect the workers and simplify procedures. The proposals regarding hygiene in commerce and offices also have our support. As regards termination of employment on the initiative of the employer, however, we are in favour of a Recommendation, because a Convention may give rise to difficulty if it is not accompanied by other action to prevent it from having undesired effects.

Lastly, I would repeat that we regard the I.L.O. as a powerful agent for examining the apprehensions of people all over the world and promoting elimination of the injustice still affecting subjugated peoples and those excluded from the progress of the modern age. I would like to thank you for your attention and to wish you all success in your respective countries. May you, however, keep your eyes fixed on the I.L.O. and work together on behalf of social peace.
of the I.L.O. They are capable of helping the Organisation to get out of the blind alley into which the enemies of international co-operation and the enemies of the workers have been trying to lead it, and on to the broad avenues of assistance in the effective economic and social advancement of the peoples.

These proposals fully correspond to the requirements of the present world situation, following the enormous transformations of the past 15 to 20 years. We see that in fact the I.L.O. is still barely reacting to the important events that are occurring in the world. Just reflect that, although socialist countries comprise one-third of humanity and account for 37 per cent. of the world's industrial output, the representatives of these countries are being obstinately kept out of the Employers' group in the Governing Body. Why is this? Just because it is advantageous for certain groups to keep out the Employers' representatives of the socialist countries for reasons, we may put it frankly, of a class character. Whose interests and whose positions is the Governing Body supposed to defend? The interests of peace? The interests of millions of workers? The interests of the struggle against colonialism? Maybe the Governing Body should defend the interests of a narrow group of capitalist employers, uphold the cold war, and serve as one of the last outposts of colonialism. In this case it would be clear why the Employers' representatives of the socialist countries are not allowed into the Governing Body.

But this is a contradiction of our Constitution, of the tasks of the I.L.O., and is in flagrant contradiction with the interests of the workers and of the interests of the countries represented at this Conference.

If an international organisation is to be truly democratic, it must not let one group of delegates deprive another group of the rights which are established in the Constitution, and which cover participation in all the organs of the Organisation.

The systematic refusal by the group of capitalist Employers to elect to the Governing Body any socialist countries, on the basis of purely political and other divergences, is anti-democratic, illegal and anti-constitutional. Since this leads to systematic violation of the normal working methods and regular rules of representation, I propose that the Organisation should take all measures, even if we have to change the Standing Orders and the Constitution, which would eliminate the possibility for the private Employers arbitrarily to prevent proportional representation of the socialist countries in the Governing Body.

Our Conference should convene a committee to work out suggestions to change the Constitution and the structure of the I.L.O. on the basis of democratic principles and with a view to adaptation to the changes which have taken place in the world, in the light of the need for equitable representation.

In setting up this committee, it would be necessary to ensure representation of the socialist countries, in order to consider labour relations in nationalised and state-controlled undertakings.

Further, as from 1964, it should be required that the Employers at the Conference represent all groups of employers in their countries, private capitalist, co-operative and state-run; otherwise the group of private employers which now make up less than 50 per cent. of the industrial resources of the world will soon cease to be representative at all, because even now only 40 per cent. of the workers in industry are engaged in private capitalist undertakings.

We think that it is absolutely essential, through the Constitution, to remove all those obstacles which have been set up by private individual employers in the way of our Conference's successful operation and to prevent state-controlled, co-operative and nationalised industries from being properly represented, or else two groups of employers should be set up, one of private capitalist employers and the other of the state-controlled, nationalised and co-operative employers.

Some preceding speakers have tried to frighten the Conference by speaking of an alleged threat from the socialist countries; but let us look at this matter a little more seriously, and leave aside all this talk about the threat of communism. All that is so out of date that no self-respecting person can still take such allegations seriously.

I fully understand that certain employers do not want mankind in its inexorable historical process of development to progress along the lines of nationalisation and public ownership of the means of production. This is understandable from the human point of view, but historical progress remains progress, and the process of nationalisation in a number of the capitalist countries and countries emerging from colonialism is becoming more intensive.

Even now, many millions of workers are engaged in such undertakings and are responsible for 60 per cent. of world production. Now the I.L.O. cannot ignore labour relations in such undertakings and concentrate exclusively on the problems of capitalist undertakings. The leaders of the I.L.O. must understand that we have to change and democratise the Constitution and Standing Orders of our Organisation which are hindering its work.

Many delegates are trying to avoid any discussion or any reference to what has been happening in the last few days of the Conference, and in the last few days, the Conference has been the witness of a genuine and tumultuous protest supported by many delegates against the inhuman colonialist policy of the Republic of South Africa. All people of good will protest against the apartheid policy which is being carried out by the colonialists. We must understand, particularly the leaders of the I.L.O., that the I.L.O. cannot continue with its policy of non-intervention in the burning problems of our age.

These brakes which are being applied on the I.L.O. by certain people, especially those who for many years have been occupying responsible posts and who have been turning the I.L.O. into their own private domain, can no longer keep mankind from striving towards peace and progress.

We have now reached a crisis which could have been avoided had more attention been paid to the opinions of many delegates who have spoken at past Conferences stating that there can be no remaining afloat from the events.
taking place in the world, that it is not good enough to keep a discreet silence on the burning problems we are facing today—peace, colonialism, and disarmament.

The will of many delegates is being ignored at our Conference. It is a fact that, up to the present moment, the memorandum of Minister of the U.S.S.R. Volkov has not been distributed and that hundreds of delegates at the Conference are waiting impatiently for this memorandum which has not been distributed to them.

In our opinion, the Conference must be on its guard against attempts to undermine the standard-setting work of the I.L.O. These attempts are not new and we are not taken unaware by them. There is nothing so surprising about the statement by Mr. Yllanes Ramos in the present Conference, for we know that in 1945 and 1946 he adopted a similar position when he proposed that we should do away with Conventions altogether and adopt only Recommendations. At that time the Conference rejected such suggestions and now their sponsor thinks it better to mask his objection to one of the most important aspects of I.L.O. activities. But we hope that now, as 17 years ago, the Organisation will once again refuse such attempts. The Conventions have always been a basic element in the I.L.O.'s standard-setting work and must continue to be so.

Life dictates that the I.L.O. must forge ahead, reflecting the march of history, and not fall back as proposed, for example, by Mr. Tata when talking about the composition of Conference committees. Through its decision taken in 1959, despite the opposition of the private Employers, the Conference took only half a step forward, although it was half a step in the right direction. Mr. Tata would like us to turn back again. Perhaps he is serious in this design, or perhaps he is only doing this as a tactical manoeuvre in an attempt to prevent any proper decision concerning our participation in all the organs of the I.L.O. In either case he should know that we are not weaklings; we will constantly defend our right to participate fully in all the organs of the I.L.O. and in all aspects of its work.

In our century of social, scientific and technical progress the future of the world causes great concern to millions of people. Consequently the efforts of all countries devoted to strengthening peace and averting any new war would correspond to the aspirations of all peoples throughout the world. It is therefore strange to read in the Director-General’s Report about “ positive ” aspects of the armaments race. We read in the Report: “ Not all of military expenditure is lost for economic purposes, however. Some by-products even emerge as assets.” We cannot go along with this in any circumstances. We cannot help expressing our astonishment at this statement by the Director-General. Nothing must be allowed to divert us from settling the major problem of our times, the problem of general and complete disarmament; nothing must obfuscate history of our mighty goal. In no circumstances can we agree to such an approach to the problem of disarmament and the struggle for peace. The I.L.O. must, as many delegates have insisted, raise its voice against the madness of the armaments race and in favour of lasting peace and general and complete disarmament.

Mr. DAVID (Workers’ delegate, Malaya)—While I deem it a great honour and privilege to be able to address this Conference as a representative of the workers of Malaya, I must also confess that I feel an even greater sense of duty and dedication at the opportunity given me by my fellow workers to speak on their behalf at this momentous period in the history of our country, Malaya, which is at present faced with grave internal and external problems. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. President, on being elected to preside over this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. On this same occasion I would like to place on record our deep appreciation of the dedicated service given by the Director-General during his tenure of office.

Before commenting on the Report proper, allow me to mention that I have been especially directed by the Malayan workers to place on record our appreciation of the unique Report of the Director-General, which demands careful deliberation by this Assembly, since the very existence of the working class and the human race depends to a great extent on how the future policy of the I.L.O. is shaped.

The Director-General has said in his Report that “ Much attention has been given to the extent of world expenditure on arms, estimated at roughly 120 billion dollars annually; and to the potential impact on the low-income countries if some substantial part of what this represents in productive capacity could be applied to economic development ” (page 14). This estimated amount of 120 billion could be used to save countless thousands of lives every year. Hunger, poverty and disease have been the predominant factors in many under-developed countries in Asia and Africa. These countries are crying out for vast economic resources in order to develop their economies and raise their standards of living to a decent level. The peoples of the developing countries do not want guns and ammunition; they want technical training and industrial tools; they want peace and prosperity and the elimination of suffering and misery.

What can be done? Social and employment security are lacking in many areas of the world. An important contribution to the solution of this problem is constituted by the recommendations of the I.L.O. report on social security, which had been shelved in Malaya. The Malayan Government had not discussed the question of social security for years until just recently it has been reopened for discussion. This report has a significant impact on the working class of the country, for the worker should feel secure during periods of sickness and unemployment and must be compensated for the contribution he has made to society during his working days.

However, the most notable contribution is the report of an I.L.O. mission on freedom of association which visited Malaya in 1961. The findings of the mission stand out in bold relief against the background of existing trade union and employment ordinances. The obser-
vations and advice contained in the report could contribute much to the strengthening and fostering of the growth of the trade union movement in Malaya. From its birth the trade union movement has had to struggle against varying degrees of restrictive government ordinances and employer hostility towards trade unions.

The present Trade Union Ordinance in Malaya is contrary to the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87). The Government has continued to refuse to ratify Convention No. 87, and the present Trade Union Ordinance has conferred both arbitrary powers to refuse registration to a union and also to cancel the registration of a union without giving adequate reasons. The present ordinance has hampered the normal growth of the trade union movement in Malaya. Ratification of the I.L.O. Convention on freedom of association remains an urgent necessity for the survival of organised labour in Malaya. Therefore the Malayan workers request the I.L.O. to exercise its influence on the Malayan Government to implement international labour Convention No. 87.

Returning to the Report of the Director-General, we welcome the challenging Introduction, which says that: "The I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history" and that it is within our, the delegates, power to determine "whether broad agreement on practical objectives and practical measures can be reached." In answer to the query whether we are prepared to "conceive the I.L.O. as a potent instrument for action on world social problems and as a potent bulwark for world peace" I must state here and now that this is our concept of the role of the I.L.O. today. We believe in social justice, which can only come about by finding solutions to world social problems such that no matter in which part of the world a worker lives he will enjoy the freedoms, economic standards and social benefits to which every human is entitled—that is, human rights.

This brings us to the all-important question: what are human rights? It is difficult to define them, but at least we can say that they are based on economic needs, social justice, law and public order. But until "human rights" includes a guarantee of individual expression and initiative, and the development of free associations, the protection of individual rights and freedoms, and the right of collective protest, we will not subscribe to the definition. It therefore follows that workers cannot and will not tolerate any law which curbs or limits their rights. Whatever these limiting laws may be called, they are obnoxious.

In discussing human rights, I must mention the Internal Security Act of 1960 and show how it hampers the organising of workers in Malaya. This Act has conferred overriding, autocratic powers on the police. Many trade unionists have been arrested under this law, and the few released have been inhumanely restricted in their movements. Upon release, they are not allowed to take part in trade union activities. The powers of arbitrary arrest and detention under this Act cannot be questioned in a court of law. This is a complete betrayal of justice.

How can trade unionism grow under such adverse conditions? Although we agree that social policies based on social needs must contribute to and be accepted as the first imperative by government for the preservation of the State, we also insist that this should not prevent a gradual structural change of economic power which, if divorced from human relations, could well be the end of all freedoms; for the attainment of new goals of social improvement is bound up with economic growth the world over.

In assessing the Director-General's Report, we must note that successful programming depends on determining priorities, and first among these is the economic development, both rural and urban, of human resources; of their skills and of their improvement; the distribution of wealth, sectional and per capita; the growth of trade unions and labour relations; the conditions and status of the worker; and the implications of automation and advanced technology. We have listed economic development both as urban as top priority, and we earnestly plead, in the interests of the human race as a whole, that the Conference give this its most urgent consideration. The world can be divided into two major groups: the haves and the have-nots. Among these are the highly industrialised countries of the West with per capita incomes of $3,000 and more a year, and the underdeveloped countries of the East with less than $10 a year. The longer we sit idle and theorise, the more explosive the situation becomes. Therefore, I plead the cause of the developing countries, no matter in which part of the world they may be, for what is at stake is not dollars but human values.

In the field of I.L.O. activities we are fully convinced that there is more room for the I.L.O. to assist African and Asian countries with technical know-how, and therefore to help save these countries from poverty and misery. Research activities should be on a wider basis, with emphasis on assessing the local situation in the light of local peculiarities and economic conditions. It is useless to compare the developing African and Asian countries with the highly industrialised countries. Their peculiar problems must be studied and suitable solutions found.

The problems facing developing countries are immense and varied. As has been pointed out in the Report, human "capital" has to be properly assessed before education and training can be planned and provided to improve employment prospects and increase incomes.

In my country today there is a very wide gap between rural and urban economies. It may be years before the social and economic imbalance is righted and, when it is, new problems will arise.

As the old order changes, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain the cohesion of the family unit. The pressure of a changing economy is evident everywhere, and the increasing tendency for the family unit to be disrupted is most noticeable, especially in urbanised areas. If this is the pace of development and progress, then it requires further study and research to correct the situation before it gets out of hand.

It is suggested in the Report that trade
unions in some countries have sought to play a more effective part in making decisions about national and regional development plans. In a number of countries they have also sought to play a greater role within individual undertakings, including the sharing of functions hitherto regarded as the prerogative of management. In my country this is still a far-distant cry. Employers as a group, with but few exceptions, are either indifferent or anti-trade union. The right to hire and fire is being used as a pretext to victimise trade unionists. Recognition of unions is withheld as long as possible. Victimization of union leaders is effected under the guise of reorganisation, and in some cases mischievous rumours about "undesirable subversives" are spread—all with the same motive of breaking the morale of the worker and of his union.

In brief, the position is that though it is the declared policy of the Government to encourage the growth of the trade unions, there is still a large sector of the employeers who have not accepted them as an integral part of society, thus denying labour its rightful place.

Industry still believes in exploiting—and continues to exploit—labour for its own selfish ends. Shop workers, road transport workers, contract labour, dock and waterfront workers, to mention just a few, are among those most exploited. Their conditions of service, hours of work, places of work, and housing, all need special study by the I.L.O. so that adequate provisions can be made in the International Labour Code. These are some of the important issues to be faced, and we fully concur with the Report that "if the I.L.O. does not deal with them, no other international organisation will, because none other has the I.L.O.'s special responsibility for workers' interests".

Accepting that as a maxim, the Malayan workers wish to add to that, as a corollary, resolution No. 45 concerning the establishment of commodity prices, which was passed by the Fourth Session of the I.L.O. Committee on Work on Plantations which met from 4 to 15 December 1961. We strongly and sincerely urge that this Conference give its closest and most urgent attention to stabilising the prices of basic commodities—be they food, vegetable or mineral—on which so much of the workers' interests and happiness depend. High finance and big business have held the Malayan and other workers to ransom for far too long, and it is time we called a halt. We ask for no aids nor any special favours, but we do demand a fair trade and stable prices for our tin and rubber. Aid without opportunity is pride without achievement, and no worker with any sense of honour and dignity will ever accept this kind of aid. We therefore plead that stabilisation of prices of basic commodities be treated as of the utmost importance and given the most urgent attention.

Malaya is a young nation where more than half the people are young and ambitious, with a burning desire to help themselves; they are, above all, ready to build institutions which would ensure for them full employment and economic stability. We also believe strongly in Asian-African workers' unity.

Before closing, I would therefore add that the Malayan workers join the world in condemning the South African Government for its apartheid policy and its inhuman racial discrimination. The policy of the South African Government undermines fundamental human values and respect for human beings. If world peace is truly desired, then mutual respect among human beings—whatever their colour, race, creed or nationality—must be maintained. The domination of one race by another will not be tolerated by the workers of the world, and should not be tolerated by governments or employers.

In closing, the workers of Malaya sincerely hope that the I.L.O. will continue to live up to its high ideals, so that workers everywhere will be assured of a bright future for all time.

Interpretation from German: Mr. BEERMANN (Workers' delegate, Federal Republic of Germany)—It is a great honour and pleasure for me to be able to speak on the Director-General's Report at the Conference.

I have been coming to this Conference regularly for several years. I have always studied the annual Reports of the Director-General with great care. As a rule they have been inspired by the desire to give a good analysis of existing problems and put forward proposals for their solution. The Reports have all sought to help human beings and to contribute to improving standards of living and work—the objective for which the I.L.O. was set up more than 40 years ago.

This year the Director-General has placed before the Conference a Report which deals with the programme and activities of the I.L.O. I should like first of all to thank the Director-General for recognising that the I.L.O. is faced with new tasks in the context of a changing and developing world.

I speak here as a trade union leader from the Federal Republic of Germany which was able, in 1951, to resume as successor to the German Reich a membership which had been interrupted by tragic political circumstances. The German trade unions have since then constantly sought to have the social provisions of the I.L.O. implemented in the Federal Republic.

The content of these provisions is not restricted to the Conventions and Recommendations. It must be sought also in the ideas acknowledged by the I.L.O., which indeed have their due place in the Report now before us. These ideas include the idea that the I.L.O., jointly with the United Nations and many of the specialised agencies, must seek peace and therefore aim at reducing world tensions.

Another such idea is the obligation of the I.L.O. to promote freedom and, consequently, freedom of association for workers. It is essential that the I.L.O. should pursue freedom and peace without regard to existing political tensions and should constantly aim at promoting the universality of these principles against all attempts at dominance and opportunist policies.

If the work of the I.L.O. in the future is to be as effective as we all wish then it will be necessary to strengthen and expand old methods as well as explore new ones. In this
connection I should like to say clearly that the tripartite structure of the I.L.O. is an absolute prerequisite for continued successful work. The I.L.O. is, in this connection, really in an exceptional position. Co-operation between governments, trade unions and employers as equal partners has greatly contributed to bringing the intentions of the founders of the I.L.O. nearer to implementation and to promoting social progress for all people in the world. This tripartite character is the best suited to achieve optimum solutions of social problems—solutions which can be prepared but not ultimately imposed. It is the function which has to be performed by the trade unions themselves in order to guarantee their own freedom and independence. This does not mean that previous help of the I.L.O. in this field was not welcome to the trade unions. The experience obtained by the I.L.O. in working out studies and materials on workers' education will always be welcome to the trade unions in their own work in the field of education. We are convinced that after thorough discussion of this matter with the Director-General and the organs of the I.L.O. good co-operation will be obtained.

Another important function of the Organisation is the elaboration of new social standards reflecting the present situation in the world. In doing so, it will be necessary to promote development in the industrial countries for the benefit of the working people there, and in the case of the developing countries to work out methods which will make it possible so to shape the economy of those countries in the interests of the people that they will not have to face the troubles which the populations of the industrialised countries had to undergo in the previous century.

For the industrialised countries it will become ever more necessary to examine the social consequences of technical progress and automation. The I.L.O. has dealt with this matter at many meetings and in many documents and we are grateful for this. It will have to reinforce this work still further in the future if the threat of unemployment, one of the scourges of mankind, is to be banished.

In the developing countries the co-operative organisations will have to play an important part in the economic and social development. In order to promote the co-operative idea in these countries the I.L.O. has placed the question of co-operatives on the agenda of many meetings. Public recognition of the value of co-operatives is expressed by the fact that today there is hardly a single country which has no co-operative societies. The establishment of consumers' and producers' co-operatives helps the developing countries to bring about a steady growth of their national economy and also leads to a more equitable distribution of the resultant social product.

The conventions and recommendations are the instruments of the Organisation. They have proved their value on the whole but lately one must criticise the tendency, which has strengthened, to make the material parts of conventions more and more flexible. As a trade unionist I believe that such intentions cannot be left unchallenged. It is most important for the workers that the I.L.O. should produce clear and intelligible standards.

Experience in recent years makes it clear that this question ought to be discussed in a tripartite committee. In this connection I do not mean that we should ignore the legitimate desire of the I.L.O. to enable the greatest possible number of member States to undertake ratifications. One should consider how ratification by States could be facilitated without weakening the content of the conventions.

In his present report the Director-General has certainly introduced a new chapter in the history of the I.L.O. As a German trade unionist, I can assure him we shall do all in our power to continue our work successfully, by constant exchanges of views with himself and his staff and by co-operation in the organs of the I.L.O.

Unfortunately we find that this work for human well-being still cannot be successfully carried out in many countries. In many parts of the world the conditions enabling free people and free trade unions to perform their repre-
sentative function in independence still do not exist.

In his Report the Director-General himself admits that the principles of freedom to work and freedom of association are not put into effect everywhere. Indeed, on page 18 of his Report he says: "It would be illusory to pretend that these three principles for which the I.L.O. stands are accepted and acted upon throughout the world today. They are accorded verbal recognition more widely than they are practised; and even where the words are accepted their meaning is sometimes for political expediency twisted out of recognition."

Unfortunately these remarks apply to a terrifying extent to the 17 million Germans who, in Central Germany, have to eke out their existence without freedom and self-determination under the yoke of a dictatorship.

I would be most grateful if all delegates of the Conference would contribute to the elimination of this great evil.

Interpretation from French: Mr. Kuntschen (Employers' delegate, Switzerland)—In Chapter IX of his Report, the Director-General deals with industrial and regional problems, in particular the question of the Industrial Committees.

Permit me to make a few remarks on principle in this connection. Whilst viewing with a favourable eye the activities of these Committees, the Report of the Director-General makes a number of suggestions with a view to reforming them and improving their role. We recognise that the experience of the Industrial Committees has not been unfavourable, and the Employers in principle are in favour of maintaining them. The Industrial Committees do present a number of advantages. In view of the growth of the Conference they make for a certain degree of decentralisation; they bring together delegates who are interested in the same problems, and they result in closer personal contacts. They also bring together specialists and therefore thus escape the influence of political pressures to a large extent. Let us note that the principle of tripartism is applied most completely and the autonomy of the groups is best safeguarded.

However, the hopes expressed when they were set up in 1945 have not been fully realised, and one cannot say that their experiences have been as favourable as those of the Joint Maritime Commission.

Naturally the Industrial Committees have no standard-setting activities, and we read in the Report of the Director-General that they do not "draft formal standard-setting instruments" and must not "attempt to reach firm agreements binding governments, employers and workers". The Committees—I shall return to this subject later—are above all trying to reach practical results and render direct services to those interested. Their work has also been hampered by the submission of a number of resolutions on subjects not on the agenda. Let us hope that members of these Committees discipline themselves in future in the interests of making their work more effective.

You all know that the Industrial Committees place considerable financial burdens on the I.L.O. and therefore on member States. In this situation it seems necessary to examine measures to see that all expenditure makes for a better yield. I think that it is in this sense that we should understand the observations and suggestions made by the Director-General's Report, which I would like to review briefly.

Regarding the periodicity of the sessions of the Committees and the convening of ad hoc meetings, we should see to it that all these meetings take place only when it is absolutely necessary to hold them and when we are certain of obtaining practical results. As for the ad hoc joint meetings of tripartite delegations from various Industrial Committees of the Director-General, it seems to me that they cannot be considered unless the agenda provides for more or less general problems common to the various sectors of industry, which can be discussed effectively by a meeting of all concerned. In other cases a separate Committee must be maintained for each sector.

The main concern in ensuring a better utilisation of funds, however, is for the Industrial Committees to achieve essentially practical results. They are only justified to the extent that they prove useful from the practical standpoint. Here again we think that by envisaging limited expert panels, new avenues of research, consultation with specialists, etc., the I.L.O. wishes to ensure that the work of the Industrial Committees will lead to essentially practical results.

In the same context we think the meetings of Industrial Committees have the advantage of giving the personnel of the Office a chance to get in direct contact with people with practical experience, particularly representatives of employers and workers. We recognise the efforts made by the I.L.O. to ensure reports serving as a basis for the work of Industrial Committees are relevant to practical conditions, but we think that these efforts must be further developed and that the presence of people with practical experience in the Industrial Committees should help the staff of the I.L.O. to get a better understanding of the needs of the industries.

Another very important problem is the need for the work of the Industrial Committees to give rise to practical results. I am thinking of the role the Committees can play in giving assistance to developing countries. In participating as a representative of the Governing Body in the work of a number of Industrial Committees, I notice with satisfaction how interested the representatives of developing countries were in the discussions of these Committees. We can all be gratified at this, and it is not without reason that the Director-General's Report asked whether "it might in some cases be appropriate to convene a gathering of representatives from such countries, meeting together with qualified experts in the industry concerned and with some representatives of industrialised countries".

This suggestion is worthy of thorough study and the means should be sought to give it the maximum practical effect. We should naturally avoid planning without proper preparation meetings of representatives of countries with a long industrial tradition and those whose industry is in its infancy. An exchange of experience in these circumstances cannot be
useful because of the difference in the conditions that prevail in the two categories of countries. We think, therefore, that we must envisage a solution on the following basis.

A first meeting could take place for a given industry among the representatives of the developing countries. This meeting would be held in a regional framework and would constitute a measure along the lines of those regional meetings referred to in the Director-General's Report. That meeting would formulate the views and the wishes of the representatives of developing countries, and after this initial stage questions deemed most important could be placed on the agenda of a larger meeting, which would include representatives of the industry in the developing countries and in the industrialised countries.

These meetings should not be too formal in character. Questions of organisation and procedure should not lead to a great waste of time. The meetings should rather be seminars making possible a free exchange of views and bringing to all concerned tangible results—in particular, giving help and advice to the younger industries. We greatly hope that these suggestions, which may be elaborated and improved upon, will meet with the approval of the developing countries, in the interests of the social and economic advancement of all peoples.

One last point: the Industrial Committee meetings are held regularly in Geneva except in cases where a government invites the Office to hold a meeting in its country, itself assuming the resulting additional expense. It seems that it would be useful in other cases to convene certain Industrial Committees in a country or region which is particularly interested; the financial question may, however, be an obstacle, since the country in question is not always able to bear the extra expenditure involved. We think, therefore, that the competent organs of the I.L.O. should seek a solution to this problem, so that in cases where this is justified the Industrial Committees could meet in a region where the relevant industry plays an important role and where the discussion would accordingly prove more fruitful if held on the spot.

Interpretation from German: Mr. HERMAN (Employers' delegate, Hungary)—The Director-General's Report deals each year with extremely important labour questions of world interest. As stated in the Introduction, this year is a particularly important one and is indeed a turning point in the life of the Organisation. I entirely endorse that statement by the Director-General. One can only support his attempt to leave well-trodden paths and seek new and better policies which have regard to the present world situation; the general yearning for peace, the idea of peaceful co-existence—in short, all the ideas which are supported by the broadest popular masses throughout the world.

We must support the Director-General in putting his intentions into effect, namely to defend the original mission of this Organisation which is called upon to perform such great tasks and not to allow it to be diverted by a small group representing special interests. There have been attempts in this direction in past years, particularly by some members of the group which styles itself the "free employers". This tendency has taken the form not only of disturbing the work of the Conference by artificially created problems but of repeatedly using means to induce the Conference to do things which are in conflict with the Constitution. Year after year the Conference and its various committees have been compelled to discuss the status of the Employers from the socialist countries, which was challenged by these people. I think it is time that people understood that in a socialist economy we employers have different functions and greater responsibilities than the employers in any capitalist economy. Our rights and duties are prescribed in the laws which define our scope and field of action.

In the socialist economy plans determine what and how much shall be produced, but the director has great freedom of movement to produce the output in the most rational way and in that manner most profitable to the national economy. We are responsible for the national economic property entrusted to us, for technical development, for rational investments, for the introduction of new and useful technology; but we are just as responsible for safeguarding the rights of our workpeople and for their technical training. We are responsible for the health of our workpeople, for their physical well-being and for the creation of socialist conditions of work. We maintain and run works nurseries and kindergartens and works convalescent homes, and we are responsible also for maintaining our pensioned ex-employees.

You need only a little objectivity to understand how unfounded and shameful the allegations against us have been and how different the real facts are. Our legal position and status, our functions and duties as socialist employers, can face any kind of competition. We are therefore to a large extent in agreement with the Director-General in his determination to keep order, to defeat out-of-place manoeuvres and to ensure the strictest respect for the Constitution.

We have read with the closest attention the very penetrating remarks of the Director-General regarding the distribution of the national income, the enormous difference in property levels and the reforms which appear necessary in connection therewith. The national income per head is the most usual index of economic prosperity, because it gives the most comprehensive picture of technical and economic development. Indeed, even education and health conditions depend, particularly in the early stages of development, to a large extent on the level of income. However, the average national income per head in the developing countries considerably distorts the true picture and, therefore, the Director-General's attempt at clarifying the picture is a right one.

As former colonies, the recently independent countries became auxiliaries to metropolitan economies. Their economic development therefore lacked balance. Consequently these countries are still to a large extent economically dependent. The object of their economic development is therefore to create a modern
economy which is not dependent on the economy of other countries.

The division of activities in the capitalist world economy has brought about a situation in which the economic structure of the underdeveloped countries developed in accordance with the needs of international monopolies. In most of those countries, consequently, the export sector moved away from the country’s own internal division of labour and has been largely dependent on international monopolies. As a consequence of the imbalance in the development of their domestic economies, many of these countries are obliged to import almost everything they require.

World price trends have hit them hard. Between 1951 and 1961 the prices of raw materials fell by 23.8 per cent., while prices of industrial products increased by 7.8 per cent. Such a movement in world market prices affects mainly countries with unbalanced economies.

Future development depends largely on the dynamism of their economic policies.

Accurate determination of the most important economic ratios is particularly important—for instance, the ratio of income to expenditure, savings and consumption, the ratio of investment for productive to that for non-productive purposes, and of agricultural production to industrial production. This determination is the task of the competent authorities, but research is necessary to ascertain and determine what alternatives exist, what decisions can and must be taken, because the efficiency and distribution of the national income is affected by a multitude of human and technical considerations.

The development of countries is a very complex task. It must be linked with technical assistance, technical training, co-operation in construction, and service, etc. Only in this way is it possible, instead of building up piles of machinery, to get undertakings equipped with modern methods and technically trained personnel into operation. It is well known that much experience and highly qualified personnel are required to set up and run an undertaking. The developing countries do not yet have these resources.

The greatest problem in the establishment of undertakings is therefore the imparting of know-how and experience. Without this, investment is no investment, and the undertaking is not an undertaking.

It is evident that the question of the choice of instruction personnel, training itself and its organisation also arises. Care must be taken that demonstration and practice do not take place in a strange environment and under artificial circumstances, that is to say, visual training material should not be used. One should not go on the assumption that countries should be offered convenient and cheap solutions. On the contrary, effective work must be done under factual conditions in imparting technical knowledge, in training local personnel, and in advising on modern management and organisation. The problem of training in the developing countries is a basic problem of economic and social development. Acceleration of economic development depends not only on the concentration of material means and their use, but on factors such as the organisation of scientific research, education, health, governmental and economic machinery. These factors are, however, closely linked with the standard of the manpower available—with “investment in manpower”.

The developing countries are struggling simultaneously against shortages and surpluses of manpower. There is a shortage of highly skilled workers and a surplus of unskilled, mostly agricultural, workers.

The problem of training is generally recognised but determining priorities is no easy matter. At the moment there is priority for secondary school training, for highly trained personnel are required in both the administrative and economic fields.

The training of skilled workers, foremen and technicians is of great importance, particularly in all key branches of industry. It is right that training should in general be given in the developing countries themselves but, of course, equipment and trained personnel should be provided for the purpose, by way of assistance.

Reading the Director-General’s Report, one might ask whether the Organisation is ready to perform such extensive and complex tasks. Is it equipped to grasp the economic and cultural situation of the developing countries and their relevant activities, to analyse their market situation and the claims of industrial countries, to understand their degree of industrial organisation, to ascertain the part they should play in world trade, to meet their educational and training requirements, to help in training technical and educational experts? Although we have not enough information on these matters, we may assume that the Organisation is capable of performing such functions.

I believe this question can be answered by a definite affirmative. To do so, however, the Organisation must change its former methods of work and must apply the experience gained in all fields of its activities in a harmonious way. In the Report there are signs of such tendencies. Therefore we will support the Director-General in such work so far as it lies within our power to do so.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA (Workers’ delegate, Mexico)—This year we have a special Report from the Director-General. In previous years he has dealt with human problems, but today we have to analyse a real volume which covers every aspect of the work of the Organisation, including proposals for procedural changes and even structural and programme changes.

In order to be in a position to analyse every aspect of this Report we should really need a great deal of time. Therefore, the time available for me will allow me to deal only with a few particular aspects of the Report.
Our Organisation is based on its Constitution and on the principles outlined in the Declaration of Philadelphia. Thus, governments which enter the Organisation accept all the obligations imposed upon them by the Constitution and by its underlying principles. We must therefore assume that governments must adjust their systems, and particularly their legislation, to these constitutional principles. It is therefore for the governments to adjust to the I.L.O. standards.

The tripartite principle should, in my opinion, have primary importance at all levels of work of the Organisation and in all aspects of its activities. This is a principle which cannot be infringed for reasons of mere convenience; much less can we allow our Organisation to be converted into a purely governmental organisation.

The Report refers to peace. It is true that we must all work for peace but, in the case of the I.L.O., I consider that this will be achieved more satisfactorily if we do not confuse our activities with those of the United Nations in the diplomatic field, since the peace at which the I.L.O. should aim is peace that can be based on social justice, or, in other words, peace that is to be achieved by the elimination of injustice, by the elimination of poverty and by the full enjoyment of human rights.

In the Director-General's Report certain proposals are also made which are quite unacceptable to me.

In the analysis of the work of the Industrial Commissions, which we all recognise to have been one of the most successful achievements of the I.L.O., there is a suggestion that their work should be restricted and that some of their work should be taken over by expert committees. In my opinion, this is not only contradictory but it would also lead to doing away with one of the most outstanding aspects of the tripartite work of the I.L.O.

It is also suggested that the powers of another tripartite body should be restricted, namely the Credentials Committee, by appointing an independent judicial authority. This absurd proposal is defended in the Report by the assertion that, while the Credentials Committee had "accepted in principle the position that freedom of association matters are not matters for consideration by the Credentials Committee, there have frequently been reports by one or more members of the Credentials Committees recommending invalidation on grounds which relate essentially to freedom of association. In these cases it has frequently happened ... "—and I emphasise "frequently"—"... it has frequently happened that the member of the Committee recommending invalidation has been an officer of the organisation lodging the complaint, or of an organisation affiliated therewith. Such a position is clearly incompatible with the requirements of judicial procedure."

I have acted as Workers' member of the Credentials Committee for seven years, from 1956 to 1962. I therefore consider that these imputations refer to me, and I should like to reply to them simply by giving you statistical information.

In the seven years during which I acted as a member of the Credentials Committee, it dealt with 90 cases of objections to credentials. Most of these were dealt with unanimously and the others were dealt with by a majority decision of the Committee, and in only one case, not "frequently" as is stated here, but in one case out of the 90, I submitted a minority report asking for the invalidation of the credentials.

Of course, the problems of the Credentials Committee would be very slight if all governments, when they appointed their delegations, took account of the Constitution of the I.L.O.

When one talks about the structure of the Organisation, the impression seems to emerge that its existing structure is inadequate, as is its programme, for the tasks now before us, and that it is necessary to change this in order to allow of effective action. I should like to state that I am quite sure that the existing structure and programme and principles of the I.L.O. are adequate and sufficient for all its tasks.

It is also said that certain improvements could be made in the procedure. I agree in this respect that we should improve, whenever appropriate, the procedure of our Organisation and, in speaking of procedure, I should like to refer to the procedure of the Conference itself.

In previous years, even when we discussed reports relating to particular subjects, we found that discussions proceeded at the same time in the plenary and in the various committees, and practice has taught us that this is totally undesirable, owing to the number of persons who have to attend meetings of committees and the small number who can attend the plenary sittings. It is not appropriate to work in this way. It looks as if it is just a matter of speaking for the record and as though there is no real discussion or any wish to hear any discussion of the Report.

I therefore consider that, if we want to improve the procedure (I am not referring to this year but to normal years), the Director-General's Report should be dealt with like all the other documents which are submitted to committees: it should be referred to a committee, it should be considered there, and the decision of the committee should come before the Conference. Then all the committees could meet at the same time, and this Conference could then discuss those matters when it has decisions referred to it by the committees.

Another matter which I think calls for improvement in the realm of procedure is the second discussion of all Conventions and Recommendations. This procedure is a very lengthy one for ensuring that an item on the agenda of the Conference leads to the adoption of an international instrument, and I think therefore that one discussion, of the extent of those we hold, is sufficient as a preliminary to the adoption of an instrument and that therefore it is unnecessary to have a second discussion.

The proposals made in the Report for the maximum decentralisation of the activities of the Organisation strike me as being fully justified. I am particularly in favour of giving due attention to regional activities and I therefore consider that the field offices should
have all the staff and equipment which they need to carry out their work in the various regions where they are located.

The Report recognises the very important work done by trade unions in the social field. Nowadays, the trade unions are the best instrument for the improvement of the living conditions of all their members and they are also concerned with the material and social progress of the community as a whole. They are valuable defenders of liberty and constant supporters of democracy.

However, it is a serious mistake to claim that the I.L.O. has done a lot and should continue its activities. This is the work of the trade unions, with which the I.L.O. should co-operate.

Another serious mistake, in my view, is to think that the growth of the trade union movement can be promoted through I.L.O. experts. The unions, when they are authentic, are established by the workers themselves, and the only thing that can halt their development is the restrictive legislation and police repression which they suffer from some quarters. The extensive field in which the I.L.O. has a great task to carry out is the promotion of trade union development. It is in the constant effort that it should make to ensure the true application of the international instruments which guarantee the right of association and collective bargaining.

A lot can be done to help us in America, and the I.L.O. has done a lot and should continue these efforts to a greater extent than before. In large areas the concentration of land ownership in a few hands ensures the continuance of economic and social backwardness. It is urgently necessary to accelerate agrarian reform where it has not yet been carried out. In some places the survival of colonial, oligarchic and dictatorial systems is a challenge to the Declaration of Philadelphia. The present President of Mexico has rightly said that only with freedom and democracy is it possible to achieve social justice.

Mr. REYES (Employers' delegate, Philippines)—To Denmark and President Erik Dreyer of this august assembly the Republic of the Philippines extends its most sincere and heartfelt congratulations. The delegation joins in the happiness they feel at this moment in seeing one of their ablest statesmen in this assembly. But we are glad to say that this is not our mission. It is not our intention to shop for what we can get from this Organisation, but to co-operate and offer through it or in bilateral agreements cleared through the I.L.O. whatever humble facilities we have and our technical talent to other nations which might find a use for them.

The Philippines is fortunate in having been the first former colony to achieve independence immediately after the Second World War. We have been equally blessed in that our growing pains did not include political upheavals, so enervating to the energies of a new nation. As a consequence, we have been able to concentrate relatively well on the fields of education and health, among other constructive endeavours.

We have more than 20 universities and several hundred more colleges at the university level. The courses of study and curricula are patterned on the leading institutions of learning in the United States. English is the language of instruction from the primary level to the university. Spanish is also taught in all colleges. Every year several thousand new engineers, physicians, chemists, agriculturists and other professionals graduate. Hundreds more continue their graduate studies and have further training in the United States and Europe. In the same way we gave and are still giving the services of our physicians to Viet-Nam in what is now well known as “Operation Brotherhood”, and to other countries, through private agreements. We are disposed to look favourably on ways whereby our technical men could be of help to our younger sister nations. Indeed our engineers, chemists, agriculturists, social workers and other technological men do not build missiles to go to the moon, but nor are those the immediate needs of the new States. They need roads, bridges, schools, rural development and small and medium-sized industries to meet the local demands, all of which are indispensable in the first steps of a new-born nation.

Our President Diosdado Macapagal has embarked on an ambitious five-year socio-economic programme designed to pull us out of the morass of lethargy and inaction that was our lot for several centuries. During the past 15 years we have been able to construct and install more industrial plants than during the preceding 100 years. In these factories the rights of labour are respected through labour unions and collective bargaining agreements with the management. We not only supply our local demand but also export our products, amounting to approximately $700 million per
annum. We are proud to claim that we have a free economy and have stabilised our currency to the point where it is now possible for investors to plan on a long-range basis.

We are now in the process of breaking up the institution of land tenancy so that each farmer may some day lay claim to ownership of the land he tills. And in so doing our country may justly and wholeheartedly join the concert of nations that believe and subscribe to the creed of social justice for all their citizens.

Highly industrialised countries, we were recently made to realise, have just as vital a need for their technical men as prospective beneficiary nations. In the process of further strengthening their economy to compete with the other affluent States, they find it extremely difficult to share their highly trained specialists with the less fortunate States. Under the circumstances, it is unavoidable that we of the developing regions should be thrown together in what might well be a self-help project among the economically smaller nations. We are willing to share our small gifts, our technical know-how and know-why, with the developing nations who may need them.

Our offer, then, of technical assistance to any country which desires it is on a "no-strings-attached" basis, and is meant more as a leavening or stimulating influence in the hope that other countries which are better placed economically may lend to the developing countries their technical know-how and resources.

The I.L.O. has its own technical assistance programme. Regrettably, but perhaps unavoidably, this assistance is the proverbial drop in the ocean. The few millions available are rationed among scores of developing nations, so that questions are often asked. Does the assistance really help? Does the assistance supply the need fast enough to assure and to promote the economic independence of the new nations? In our opinion the need is for more, here and now.

We have often wondered if the technical assistance that has hitherto been made available to member States has been effective in the sense that critical standards of evaluation have been set up to determine whether or not such assistance can be improved and if more suitable procedures in the selection of programmes can be made. The I.L.O. technical assistance programme has been in existence for a number of years now, and we believe it is time its records were evaluated to determine its effectiveness in helping member nations. Such a review must perforce include a comparison of the organisation's own work with similar and related work of the UN agencies.

In conclusion, we humbly submit this earnest appeal to the more developed countries that, in the spirit of comradeship and brotherhood among the nations of the earth, you—who are more favoured and are, with the world's acclamation, the true leaders in science and technology—should share your technical experts to enable these developing countries to keep pace with progress.

While you, the great powers of the world, continue with your race for supremacy in outer space, spare some of your talents to the developing countries so that they can look up to you not as masters of the universe but as friends of mankind.

Interpretation from French: Mr. ROB (Workers' delegate, Rumania)—The 47th Session of the International Labour Conference has been taking place in particularly abnormal conditions. Because of the events which have occurred, the Organisation appears in an unfavourable light, and seems to be incapable of breaking the deadlock of the development of the African people. How has this situation arisen? It is clear that it is the passive attitude and the attitude of ignoring the resolution adopted in 1961 concerning the Republic of South Africa, evinced by the leading organs of the I.L.O., which has allowed the perpetuation of a system condemned by most Members of the Organisation. The trade unions of the Rumanian People's Republic are fully behind the legislative struggle of the African people against racial discrimination and against all forms of colonialism, old or new.

The Director-General, in his speech from this platform, has shown that the resolution adopted in 1961 could be applied through different channels. I shall not analyse the measures he has put to us, as time is short, but was it really necessary for the African countries again to request that the leading organs of the Organisation implement a resolution which was adopted unanimously by the Members of the Organisation?

The crisis which the Organisation is undergoing at present shows that it is time to move into action, to act with courage and firmness in order to eradicate the vestiges of colonialism in all its forms, including the mentality of those who consider that the African peoples are not yet "mature" for full independence. Is it not instructive, with regard to the attitude of the I.L.O. towards colonialism, that although this system is condemned and is in its death throes, the famous colonial clause is still maintained in the I.L.O. Constitution?

As has been mentioned from this rostrum, the I.L.O. is in duty bound to respect its fundamental principles and, in common with all the specialised agencies of the United Nations, to help find a solution to the burning problems of our day.

There can be no solution to the colonial problem, nor an improvement in the living and working conditions of these peoples, unless the I.L.O. firmly condemns colonialism and neo-colonialism, which are not mentioned in the Director-General's Report, and without our Organisation envisaging practical steps in this connection.

We cannot maintain peace or bring about general disarmament so long as militarisation and the arms race are described as positive factors in economic development.

One of the important tasks of the I.L.O. is to describe the situation of the workers in various countries, to draft and execute operational programmes unanimously accepted, of a truly international and characterised by the full and equal rights of all member States. In this connection the I.L.O. should act to bring people together and not to separate them because, if we have
co-operation and understanding due to the fact that we have common objectives, the activities of the I.L.O. will be able to rely on the necessary support to enable them to become effective.

It is clear, therefore, that the I.L.O., while respecting its status as an international organisation, must not be subjected to a certain group of States such as the Common Market or the North Atlantic bloc, or to certain political or ideological conceptions which are against the Constitution and the principle of its universality. Our guidelines must be objectivity and impartiality.

The Director-General's Report, which stresses that the I.L.O. must not constitute an arena of ideological debates—an opinion which we fully share—ignores, however, the viewpoints of a large number of trade union organisations represented at the Conference. This is a flagrant and harmful contradiction. Although it is regrettable that over half of the workers belonging to trade unions are firmly against trade unions being firmly against trade unions, the reformist illusion concerning the identity of interests between workers and capitalists, yet this theory is circulated and presented as an ideology belonging to all Members of this Organisation.

The programmes of the I.L.O. also bear the hallmark of political conceptions of just one part of the Organisation; they have a unilateral character, and do not reflect all the problems which the workers of the world are demanding should be solved—problems such as the maintenance of peace, the right to organise, under the I.L.O., contacts and multilateral exchanges of view concerning questions of social security, vocational training, reduction in hours of work, and so on.

Although the Director-General's Report appeals to mutual understanding, we must note with regret that in the I.L.O. people still continue to discriminate against the trade union representatives of socialist countries. For this reason, and because of the absence of the World Federation of Trade Unions, which is the most powerful international trade union federation in the world, the I.L.O. is deprived of the possibility of utilising the experience of the majority of the workers belonging to trade unions.

The recent elections to the Governing Body are proof of the discrimination against the trade unions of socialist countries. The group of titular Workers' members now elected in no way represents the international trade union movement as a whole and consequently cannot participate as workers' representatives in the adoption of resolutions. In our opinion, the fact that all the titular members of the old Governing Body have been re-elected, except one who was known and appreciated for his contribution regarding the development of contacts between unions of different affiliations, is not a mere coincidence but the result of a deliberate policy designed to get rid of the representatives of the socialist countries and of all those who condemn the scission of the trade union movement from the working and directing organs of the I.L.O.

These are only some aspects which entirely justify the statement that the present structure of the I.L.O. is far from corresponding to the interests of the workers and of their trade union organisations throughout the world. In our opinion, this situation explains why the I.L.O. is not capable of producing programmes which reflect the aspirations of the workers. For these reasons I associate myself entirely with the opinion expressed here regarding the necessity above all of bringing about urgent changes in the structure of the Organisation with a view to obtaining programmes of activity which correspond to popular views and would thus be effective.

The I.L.O. is faced with a wide field of activity. Problems like liquidating unemployment, guaranteeing employment, ensuring a minimum wage, reducing hours of work, increasing wages, extending holidays with pay, improving the social insurance systems, helping the underdeveloped countries to liquidate the vestiges of colonialism, are only some fields in which the I.L.O. should make its contribution.

In the field of vocational training can one say that the I.L.O. has done all it could? Of course, such a question cannot be settled in a short period with the aid of the I.L.O. alone, but wouldn't it be right, as has been pointed out by other speakers, that the I.L.O. should deal not with the establishment of trade unions, as the Report proposes, but rather it should give effective aid to the workers for their vocational training?

The I.L.O. can also contribute largely to the education of young workers. In this regard I should like to recall the resolution adopted by the United Nations, on the proposal of the Rumanian Government, regarding the education of young persons in the spirit of peace and friendship between peoples. The I.L.O. could also contribute to organising meetings between workers on concrete subjects which concern them, such as automation and the action to be taken to prevent its having negative consequences on the workers' position.

The fact that the I.L.O. has never asked for the support of the trade unions of the socialist countries in the field of vocational training is another act of discrimination, all the more so because we all know the great economic expansion of these countries and their rich experience in this field which has been accompanied by a rapid growth of a large number of highly qualified persons.

The Report also deals with a question which is very much discussed in the I.L.O., namely trade union freedom in countries of a centralised economy, and the suggestion is made that there be a study of freedom of association in those countries. We consider that the inquiries carried out in these countries already have perfectly well and finally cleared up the question of freedom of association and they have invalidated the calumnies which have been delivered for decades through the I.L.O. against the socialist countries.

As regards the position of the Rumanian trade unions, those who visit our country have been able to be convinced by facts and not by the calumnies of the reactionary press, that our trade unions have extensive rights, play an active part in all fields, help in the solution of all the workers' problems, assist in the elaboration and supervision of the application of labour legislation, assist in the management...
of social insurance which is paid by the State and not by the workers, and contribute to the entire activity of our socialist state, the main objective of which is a constant improvement in the standard of living—material and cultural—of the people.

We regret that trade union inquiries have been suspended and we would like to suggest to the I.L.O. that such inquiries be made in countries where trade unionists are arrested and imprisoned, where strikes are considered felony and acts of sabotage, where peaceful workers' demonstrations are dispersed by the police with the aid of specially trained dogs, where governments intervene as mediators and force the strikers to resume work, where freedom of association is nothing but the freedom of the employer to increase his profits and freedom of the workers to suffer unemployment and even hunger.

To conclude, I express the hope that the proposals and suggestions made in the course of this discussion will have concrete effects, taking into account the transformations that have occurred in the world and that the I.L.O., once rid of the conservative spirit that has been a brake on its activity up till now, will justify the hopes of the workers and their trade union organisations throughout the world.

Interpretation from French: Mr. VER-SCHUEREN (Employers' delegate, Belgium)

—Like individuals, institutions which want to be effective must from time to time think over the value of their objectives and their means of action in relation to the changing world around them. The rule applies also to the International Labour Organisation, as events of the last few days have shown, and the Director-General therefore asks us this year to review our programmes and structures. The lucidity of this analysis is combined with a nobility of outlook, and he makes wise proposals which at the same time show a certain courage.

In the very first part of his Report we are faced with a new programme which fits into the unchanged framework of the essential principles laid down by the Constitution and by the Declaration of Philadelphia. It seems to me, and to my colleagues who here represent the employers of my country, that we could not have said this better or otherwise than he has: contribution of the I.L.O. to the maintenance of peace, but by the means appropriate to it and in its appointed field; promotion of liberty to work and of freedom of association; prime importance of social objectives also; formulation of a social policy directed towards material progress and towards the free development of the human personality, making due allowance for economic resources available and without endangering the political stability and universal interdependence of national and regional economies.

We have no reservations to make about this theme and the way the Director-General deals with it. According to the authors of the Report the implementation of this programme means that the I.L.O. must concentrate on five major fields of action: manpower, income, labour-management relations, status of the worker, and the repercussions of automation and technological change. I do not intend to challenge this classification any more than I have previous speakers, nor do I gain say the significance and interest of each of these fields. However, I intend to suggest that the Director-General should tread very warily indeed in the field of incomes. He apparently does not claim—at any rate he should not claim—that the I.L.O. is competent to define an incomes policy. The conception of such a policy is too closely linked to the fundamental economic choices for the I.L.O. to be able to take such an ambitious and adventurous course.

However, such caution will not prevent it from ensuring, more modestly perhaps, and more effectively, that the essential rights of social justice are observed in the field of remuneration.

I come now to the second part of the Report, which relates to the structure and functioning of the I.L.O. Is this structure still suited to its purpose? In that question lies one of the main justifications for this discussion. It is therefore surprising that the Director-General evades the discussion of an essential structural feature of our institution, that which gives it all its originality, namely tripartite representation of each national community.

The founders of the Organisation wished to bring together, within these codes, the three sectors of opinion expressing three forms of public responsibility. Let us consider this special feature which distinguishes the I.L.O. from other international institutions and, as was said by the Chairman of the Governing Body at the opening session of this Conference, shows its vitality. It is surely essential to safeguard this despite differences of economic systems. Several of my Employer colleagues have emphasised this, and I can only support their views and express my regret that in spite of his bold and clear-sighted approach to the problem the Director-General should have by-passed this particular problem, which is admittedly difficult but is of decisive importance for the very existence of the I.L.O. It will therefore not be possible to continue avoiding this issue and to make piecemeal and lop-sided reforms, which relate to dealing with these fundamental difficulties.

However, our duty to find a valid solution for this problem cannot lead us to neglect that of improving the work of the Organisation, particularly that of the annual Conference.

Several suggestions have already been made in the light of the situation outlined and the remedies advocated in the Report. I shall confine myself to dealing with two aspects of the proceedings of the Conference: the procedure for considering resolutions and the discussion of the Director-General's Report.

To enable participants to play an active part, to make the benefits of their imagination and experience available, to know what is in their minds, the creators of the Organisation gave them the right to take the initiative and to submit resolutions relating to questions not connected with an item on the agenda of the Conference. This right has turned out to be of undeniable value. However, the use that has been made of it over the last few years has been too often dictated by a desire for propaganda or prestige, which is not compatible
with the serious technical character our people have always tried to give to the work of this Organisation. The result has been an unprofitable and excessive burden on our Conference and on the staff of the International Labour Office, and even of a diversion from our main concern with labour matters into the political field.

The Director-General analyses this situation coolly, though he expresses some disappointment and advocates the adoption of proposals made by the Governing Body to alter our procedure.

In the Employers' group, which is sincerely attached to the proper working of this institution, the prevailing feeling is that although these proposals are not the only way of dealing with the situation they may bring about an improvement. In addition, we should hope the number of members of the Resolutions Committee could be fixed once and for all in order to avoid an elasticity which makes it easy to take advantage of changes in the political weather.

May I add an additional suggestion in order not to take up too much of the valuable time of this numerous gathering? It is that before a resolution is considered it should be required to have the additional signatures of a minimum number of members of the Conference, for example 20. This would ensure that the proposals in committee reflected at least the opinion of a fairly considerable section of this assembly.

With regard to what is traditionally known as the discussion on the Director-General's Report, it does not always take place in circumstances which add to the prestige of the Conference. This is not a personal opinion. There are many in all three groups who consider that too many speeches or parts of speeches are concerned mainly with the situation in particular countries or with the discussion of strictly political issues which are not relevant to the subject under discussion.

However, there can be no question of abolishing this discussion. It is in the interests of the I.L.O. and its Members that they should have this rostrum which is both an instrument for addressing the world and a listening post for the world. Here again the practice must be in accordance with the purpose of the instrument and must be in the interests of the Organisation. Accordingly, all speakers should first be very firmly urged to deal in their interventions with subjects which concern the Report, that is the activities of the I.L.O. and the particular subject which the Director-General has asked Members to think over.

They should also be urged to avoid strictly political subjects as well as statements dealing solely with the economic and social situation in their countries. Such statements can be issued in written form. I might, however, allow one exception to that last rule, for new Members which have recently entered the I.L.O. and which we should all be glad to know better.

Finally, the President should be under a formal obligation to stop any discussion or any statement not in accordance with these rules. It has been suggested that the Director-General's Report should be discussed at length only once every two years, and that a particular subject should be dealt with on that occasion. Support for this suggestion should not exclude the possibility of a limited exchange of views or, as has already been suggested, any special committee sitting for a short period, that is an examination of the Report on activities which the Director-General is required to draw up each year.

Those are a few thoughts—some general and some concrete—which my delegation has asked me to transmit to you, expressing the hope that the International Labour Organisation will, in spite of the difficulties with which it has had to cope, continue to perform its task as effectively as possible in accordance with the fundamental aspirations assigned to it by its founders, and that it will try to make the practical adjustments required by a changing world.

Mr. OLSZEWSKI (Employers' delegate, Poland)—The Report of the Director-General constitutes, in my opinion, a serious effort to bring out many problems and to adapt the programme and structure of the I.L.O. to changes occurring throughout the world. The Director-General is right in proposing that in the next few years the I.L.O. should embark on a programme of activity in the field of labour relations.

Today, when the world population is increasing at a rate of about 40 million a year, when only every fourth man eats his fill, while about 40 per cent. of mankind subsists on less than 2,300 calories a day, the problem of full employment, wages, labour relations and training necessitates a speedy solution.

In my country constant attention is devoted to these problems by both the Government and the leading economic organs. Of course, this interest arises out of reasons different from those obtaining in non-socialist countries. Under our system work has to be assured to each citizen. That right is guaranteed by our Constitution. The right mentioned by the Director-General to provide each man with training opportunities with access to employment and with an opportunity to enjoy an increased share of the benefit of production, is in my country a constitutional right fully respected and implemented.

Of course there are difficulties. Before the war 72 per cent. of the population of Poland lived in rural areas, and only 750,000 people were employed in industry. Today 62 per cent. of our population works outside agriculture, whereas more than 3,200,000 are employed in industry. The migration of the rural population to the towns to industrial centres—which, as is generally known, is due to the attraction exercised by industry and to better housing and social conditions obtaining in urban areas—also creates problems. In addition to new workshops, houses must be built and welfare, training, cultural and health services must be set up, requiring considerable effort and investment.

Such problems, as is pointed out by the Director-General, arise and will continue to arise in several other countries. The question as to how and by which means these problems should be solved so as to further economic
development of the countries and the welfare of the working man is still before us.

Another problem concerns the development of employment opportunities corresponding to population growth. Fritz Baade, in his book Der Weltlauf zum Jahre 2000 says that in about 40 years the world population will double and reach 6,000 million. In Poland the present annual population increase is about half a million. Young people of school age constitute one-fifth of our population. We have to provide them with employment, and also with living conditions better than ours.

By modernising the existing industrial undertakings, by introducing mechanisation, we prevent the creation of problems such as those described in Chapter VI of the Director-General's Report. Automation and technological changes are not allowed to create redundancy. On the contrary, they should increase the benefits of the working people. No wonder, therefore, that capital investments weigh heavily on our national economy. Their extent exerts sometimes a detrimental influence on the living standards of particular categories of the working people.

All economists, regardless of their political opinions, unanimously assert that only capital investments can lead to full employment and to decent standards of living, but the question of who should undertake such capital investments remains outstanding. Some representatives of the so-called "free employers" have stated from this rostrum that they will heal the world if only the structure of the I.L.O. remains unchanged. And yet Keynes says that the desire of an individual to increase his own personal wealth is usually stronger than the desire of the employer to increase, through capital investments, the national wealth. We learnt in pre-war Poland how right Keynes was.

The Director-General says: "If a human resources development strategy has now become a possibility for the developing countries, this is in large measure due to the growth of national economic development planning or programming." Similarly, the German economist Baade advises the developing countries to apply central planning, central financing of investments, and to create a strong public sector.

Are these affirmations to be considered as communist propaganda, as was expressed by the Employers' delegate from Argentina? We did not come here to make propaganda. We wish to exchange experience, to learn from and to co-operate with others. We consider, for instance, that we may make a useful contribution to the forthcoming Preparatory Technical Conference on Employment Policy. But full results can be achieved only if changes are brought about in the structure of the I.L.O.

Among the various deficiencies of the I.L.O.'s structure I should like to mention the position of socialist employers. The fact that in the Employers' group our candidates are not considered for appointment to Conference Committees, that without consultation they are appointed as substitute members and that only after a decision by the Appeals Board are they given two places of voting members, proves continual discrimination similar to the famous numerus clausus. All this happens today, when essential changes have occurred in the world—changes which the I.L.O. must take account of.

I am not the only one here to have doubts as to whether the representation of private employers is not outdated and whether it can today represent industry. The same doubts have been expressed by the British Minister of Labour, Mr. Hare. In the Times Review of Industry and Technology, in an article entitled "Employers in Disarray" we read: "...recently, Mr. Hare, the Minister of Labour, had the temerity to suggest that British employers' associations were not perfect."

In fact the main organisation of British employers, the British Employers' Confederation, deals with industrial relations concerning 70 per cent. of people employed in private enterprises. Even such a personality as the Director of the Confederation, Sir George Pollock, is unable to guarantee the coherence of the 1,800 organisations affiliated to the Confederation. Moreover, nationalised industries employing nearly 2 million workers belong to none of these organisations, which makes nonsense of the claim of the Confederation to represent industry as a whole. The situation is probably similar in other countries in which part of the national economy is in private hands. Therefore, the question is, who in the I.L.O. should speak on behalf of industry, of employment, training, welfare and other industrial problems? The representatives of management or the representatives of a narrow group of private employers? In my opinion, both. It is necessary to discuss this problem fully and to find a solution which would be to the advantage of working people. Representatives of socialist industry must obtain the place due to them and which corresponds to the importance of their industry. Socialist industry means more than one-third of the world industrial production. An end must be put to discrimination in the Employers' group. We must be adequately represented on the different bodies in the I.L.O., including the Governing Body and technical committees. Only when these problems are solved will the I.L.O. be able to fulfil its task.

We put at the disposal of the I.L.O. all our experience, but we claim equality of rights. We believe that the broadest international co-operation in all fields of constructive work is the only way to lead mankind to prosperity and to secure world peace.

(The Conference adjourned at 6 p.m.)
SIXTEENTH SITTING

Thursday, 20 June 1963, 10.15 a.m.

President : Mr. Dreyer

POINT OF ORDER : PROPOSAL TO ADJOURN THE 47TH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

The PRESIDENT—Before we proceed to the first item on our agenda this morning—the eighth report of the Selection Committee—Mr. Borisov, Government delegate, U.S.S.R., has the floor, on a point of order.

Interpretation from Russian : Mr. BORISOV (Government delegate, U.S.S.R.)—During the last few days we have taken part in a bitter political struggle, a struggle for justice, regarding certain high moral principles of human rights. Today a new element has occurred in this struggle. The delegations of the African countries to the 47th Session of the General Conference of the I.L.O. have decided not to take any further part in the work of the Conference and to leave Geneva. Everybody will understand that this decision was taken because the Conference appeared not to be able to satisfy their just demands regarding the elimination of the delegates of the Republic of South Africa from the Conference, and that the policy of racial discrimination in that country be ended.

In the new conditions, even if any decisions taken by the Conference were juridically correct, from the moral point of view they would not be valid or in accordance with the needs and demands of the present world. In this connection, at the request of a number of delegations of socialist countries we should like to make a proposal—namely, that the work of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference be suspended, that this Conference adjourn until the end of the year, that is, until November or December 1963. We are convinced that this would be in accordance with the desires and aspirations of the African peoples, and we are sure that in the six months that would elapse before the end of the year we would be in a position to meet the claims and the demands of the African countries. In other words I propose the adjournment of this session of the Conference until November or December of this year, 1963.

The PRESIDENT—You have all heard the proposal to adjourn the Conference submitted by the U.S.S.R. delegate. I think such a proposal must first be dealt with by the Selection Committee before it is taken up by the full Conference. Therefore, we will continue with the agenda for today's plenary sitting.

EIGHTH REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE 1: SUBMISSION

The PRESIDENT—The first point on the agenda is the eighth report of the Selection Committee. I call on the Chairman of the Selection Committee, Mr. Weaver, to come to the rostrum and submit this report.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—I have the honour to present the eighth report of the Selection Committee, which has been circulated as usual. This report is concerned only with a change in the composition of a committee of the Conference.

However, at a subsequent meeting of the Selection Committee, several amendments to the programme of meetings for 20 June 1963 were unanimously agreed to by the Selection Committee. If I may, I should like to give them to the Conference now so that they can be noted. They are as follows: firstly, the Standing Orders Committee, which is scheduled for 3 p.m. on Thursday, 20 June 1963, is postponed until tomorrow. The precise time of the meeting of the Standing Orders Committee (for the adoption of its report) on Friday, 21 June, will be fixed by the Selection Committee at its meeting this evening. Secondly, at 3.30 p.m. this afternoon, Thursday, 20 June 1963, there will be a report of the Finance Committee and the adoption of the budget. While this report of the Finance Committee is being considered by the plenary session, there will be an adjournment of the technical committees—just for the period while the Finance Committee report is being considered.

I ask the Conference to adopt this report.

The PRESIDENT—Are there any comments on the eighth report of the Selection Committee?

1 See Appendix I, p. 465.
Sixteenth Sitting

Motion to Adjourn the Sitting

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. GURINOVICH (Government delegate, Byelorussia) — In addition to what has already been stated here on the present position and the conditions in which we are continuing our work, I should like to point out that the Chairman of the Selection Committee has suggested that we should follow a rather unusual course, that is that we should change the agenda announced for today. I think that the most reasonable thing to do would be to accept the proposal made by the delegate of the U.S.S.R., and adjourn this plenary sitting, convene the Selection Committee, and consider immediately this proposal. I formally move that we adjourn and convene the Selection Committee as soon as possible.

The President — You have heard the proposal submitted by the Byelorussian representative that we should adjourn this sitting of the plenary Conference. I think this would be the right way to go about it, in order to give the Selection Committee an opportunity of discussing the two proposals which have been submitted here today. The Secretary-General says that it would be possible for the Selection Committee to meet now, and I will follow the procedure suggested by the Byelorussian delegate and adjourn this meeting. I do not know how long it will take for the Selection Committee to discuss these proposals which have been submitted to the Conference, and it is not possible for me to say when the plenary meeting can be continued, but we may well be able to continue later this morning. Therefore, I would ask delegates not to leave the building, so that they will be able to attend the plenary sitting of the Conference when the time comes.

(The sitting is suspended at 10.30 a.m. and resumed at 11.15 a.m.)

Eighth Report of the Selection Committee: Adoption

The President — Delegates will remember that the Chairman of the Selection Committee came to the rostrum and communicated two things to the plenary sitting. The first was the eighth report of the Selection Committee, which recommends that a change be made in the composition of the Committee on Termination of Employment — namely, that Mr. Choudhury of Pakistan be added to the Workers' deputy members. I asked if there were any comments on this report, and I repeat my question. Are there any comments on the report? If not, I will take it that the eighth report of the Selection Committee is adopted by the Conference.

(The report is adopted.)

Order of Work of the Conference

The President — The second thing the Chairman of the Selection Committee communicated to the Conference was the decision taken at its first meeting this morning to make some changes in the programme of the plenary sitting this afternoon — namely, that the report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives including the resolution concerning the adoption of the budget for the 46th financial period (1964) and the allocation of expenses among member States for 1964 should come before the plenary sitting at 3.30 this afternoon. This was a communication from the Selection Committee in accordance with article 4, paragraph 2, of the Standing Orders, in which it is stated that: "It shall be the duty of the Selection Committee to arrange the programme of the Conference, to fix the time and agenda for the plenary sittings . . . ."

This information from the Chairman of the Selection Committee need only be noted by the Conference.
The I.L.O. is now obviously "at one of the critical points of its history", as was stated by the Director-General in the Introduction to his Report. This is a logical consequence of the existing world situation. It is generally acknowledged that developments in this field are occurring much faster than was forecast when the machinery of international agencies was established. The condition of the modern world is marked in all respects by a vehement desire for change, and this session of the International Labour Conference has been the scene of some dramatic demonstrations of this desire. This historic situation makes it imperative for us to adjust the programmes and structure of the I.L.O. to the new situation resulting from these events. The Organisation is faced with the following alternatives: either it manages to co-ordinate, to finance, to operate, and the action it takes, to existing conditions, or it ceases to be an agency for the promotion of social justice and the improvement of the living conditions of the workers of the world.

The position I have just described has been clearly outlined by the Director-General, who in this way restates his commitment to human progress, which he has repeatedly stated during the 15 years in which he has so brilliantly performed the duties of his office.

The Report submitted to us is an accurate survey of all the problems with which it is urgent that the Organisation should now deal. It is also an invitation to all the Members of this Organisation to contribute effectively to the transformation of the I.L.O. into a suitable means of attaining the lofty objectives for which it was set up. I therefore think it is of fundamental importance for me to mention that it is necessary for the I.L.O. to extend its interpretation of its terms of reference, because the complexity of economic and social affairs in our time is such that there must be an adequate understanding of the factors involved. These factors are relevant to the assumptions that must be made for the attainment of the proposed goal in either field. It is not possible to view social affairs in isolation from the national economies which provide their environment. Nor is it possible to exclude the social aspect when considering the economic aspects of international relations.

I therefore wish to refer to the remark made in the Introduction to the Report with regard to the need for establishing reasonable terms for economic relations between developed and underdeveloped countries.

On this subject the recent Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labour, which was held in Bogotá under the auspices of the Organisation of American States, adopted as a principle of outstanding importance for the Latin American countries the need to correct the marked deterioration in the terms of trade for basic exports of Latin America and the growing limitations imposed on entry of the product of these countries into the world market by the continual fluctuations in export prices. This declaration, which refers to a deeply felt aspiration in Latin America, is also valid with regard to the economic relations in other parts of the world where the economic position is the same.

These parts of the world are obviously also concerned by the general objective stated in the Report we are considering.

The principle I have just mentioned is not only significant from the commercial point of view. Observance of this principle is essential if we want to have an economic structure directed towards social ends to allow the achievement of the peace and social justice for which this Organisation stands.

For the purpose of establishing an order of priority among the activities of the I.L.O. I therefore deem it necessary to highlight the importance of this principle and the need for our Organisation to show special concern for it.

With regard to the I.L.O.'s programme of activities I should like to emphasise the need for the Organisation to be, as stated in the Report, "an open forum for dialogue among differing social, political, economic and social forces". It should therefore always uphold the principle of the rule of law which calls for the just application of fair and reasonable rules. As a corollary to these principles it is necessary for the I.L.O. to ensure the proper application of the resolutions which have been adopted by the Conference in accordance with the special situation of some of the member States.

I should like now to express my agreement with the fundamental objectives set out in the programme of action described in the first chapter of the Report. These are directed towards strengthening the conditions required for the maintenance of peace, the protection of freedom and the elaboration of a social policy with the necessary economic infrastructure.

These objectives involve an ambitious programme and are the inseparable pillars of a coherent programme which requires the joint action of all the factors mentioned. I should like to refer to the importance of the principle defined as the primacy of social objectives, which is closely connected with the formulation of development programmes, these being an essential instrument for the progress of the nations.

With this object it will be necessary for the programmes at the international level, with the co-operation of the United Nations and the other specialised agencies, to be permanently directed towards a greater appreciation of the social factor; it is necessary that there should be co-ordination between the economic development programmes and the social objectives to which it must correspond.

I would like to repeat a principle adopted by the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labour in which, regarding the development of the Alliance for Progress, it was decided that there cannot be due economic and social planning unless the legitimate rights of labour are recognised and the aspirations of the workers are expressed in specific terms. I should like also to endorse the idea of balanced economic and social development to which the Director-General refers.

The programme set out in the Report involves a policy of promoting human rights, which coincides with major social trends, and in particular with the Christian social doctrine
so well defined by the distinguished Pope John XXIII in his great encyclical "Mater et Magistra".

In the application of the programme which I have outlined, and in accordance with the determination of priorities which would be required, I consider that these priorities should be established in accordance with the specific features and requirements of various parts of the world since the variety of situations and the different degree of development in the various States Members of the Organisation necessarily require that there should be a careful examination of local conditions in order to determine a corresponding order of priorities in each case.

It therefore seems a good thing to devote special attention to the features of various geographical areas. It would also be a good thing if the divisions of the International Labour Office were staffed with officials who have special direct knowledge of the problems of the various regions, in order that they may more effectively discharge their duties and meet the needs of the various member States.

With regard to the subject of the third chapter of the Report, namely incomes, we agree with the objective of ensuring a distribution of income in accordance with social justice and the protection of the most vulnerable groups.

I should like to mention the importance of social security as an ideal means of ensuring a fair distribution of incomes.

My delegation also notes the concern expressed in the Director-General's Report regarding this matter, for he feels that the development of social security demands an adjustment of the economic and social needs of our time in all countries whatever their degree of development. The distribution of income in accordance with the free play of economic forces can be adjusted by allocating a part of this income to the maintenance of the population and the free play of economic forces can be adjusted by allocating a part of this income to the maintenance of the population which cannot defend their own interests, and this ensures solidarity among the various generations.

Social security can and should contribute to general economic stability, since it has an effect on the economy and is itself affected by the economy. There can be no sound system of social security in a defective economic system, and the solidarity which a social security scheme represents is a reflection of a prosperous economy.

After an important meeting of experts on social security held in November 1962, the I.L.O. included in the agenda of this session of the Conference one of the subjects that had been submitted to the experts, and it is to be hoped the other subjects relating to old-age pensions, invalidity pensions and survivors' pensions will soon be brought before the Conference.

The I.L.O. can also contribute to regional development by including social security items on the agenda of regional conferences and also by organising regional seminars or by carrying out surveys and providing technical assistance to countries which require it. It would be a good thing if the rules governing technical assistance could be made more flexible in order to ensure more rapid action by the Organisation.

I should now like to refer briefly to the participation of trade unions in the implementation of I.L.O. programmes. The Argentine delegation thinks it is important that representative organisations of workers should be directly associated with the formulation of programmes for social and economic development as well as with the implementation of the operational programmes of the Organisation.

Particular value therefore attaches to the possibility of establishing methods of ensuring a closer link between the I.L.O. and trade unions. One should be careful to ensure that this participation is ensured and that the organisations concerned are genuinely representative.

The application of the programme outlined in the Director-General's Report and its practical effectiveness will depend on an adjustment to the urgent requirements of our time. It is therefore essential to reform the structure of the International Labour Office in order to ensure proper coordination in the various technical aspects of its work. It may perhaps accordingly be necessary to merge various divisions which are now operating separately and dealing with separate aspects of the same general problem. It will also be necessary to ensure immediate action in various geographical areas to carry out direct surveys and careful analyses of local situations in order that we may have the information needed for an effective technical assistance programme.

Finally, I should like to say that Argentina has faith in the I.L.O. as a suitable means for the bringing about of social justice, which is at the moment essential for peace, and for the achievement of the legitimate aspirations of the nations.

The President—The President has, in agreement with the Vice-Presidents of the Conference and in accordance with the Standing Orders (article 10), decided to permit a representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions to make a statement to the Conference. I call on Mr. Saillant to come to the rostrum.

Interpretation from French: Mr. SAILLANT (Representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions)—Mr. President, the events which have occurred at this 47th Session of the Conference in the last week or so show that the I.L.O. is not adjusted to the realities of today. In fact a constitutional crisis is now in existence within the I.L.O. We can thank the African delegations for having made this truth so clear. Our discussions show that the I.L.O. is faced with a dilemma: it must either seek to adjust the facts of our time to its own methods or, on the contrary, to adjust its methods, programme and structure rapidly to the clear facts.

The Director-General's Report helps us to fruitful thought. It seems indispensable that the I.L.O., when establishing its programme and its plan of action, should base itself on the present world situation and be inspired by the fundamental claims made by the workers and their trade union organisations.

The 44 years of existence of the I.L.O. prove that without an objective analysis of the
economic and social situation of the workers and their claims the I.L.O. cannot direct its activities effectively to the questions which are of concern to them; but the experience acquired by the I.L.O. throughout its existence also shows that without the constant pressure of the workers and their trade unions the work of the I.L.O. remains ineffective.

The great strikes of the workers that have taken place in recent months have fully shown how true this is. I am thinking particularly of the great strike of the French mine workers, that of the Italian metallurgical workers, that of the Japanese miners and the quite recent strike of the metallurgical workers in the German Federal Republic. Despite the resistance and attacks of monopolies, the workers of these industries, thanks to their united action, have been able to obtain positive results. The I.L.O. should record and take this into account. These struggles have proved there is no force which can prevent just claims from being successful. They have proved also that in the face of the obstruction or the offensive of the monopolies, the workers can only effectively act if they are united.

It is in the light of these realities and of the workers' struggles that the World Trade Unions Congress worked out in December 1961 a programme of action for the present defence of the interests and rights of the workers. On the basis of a thorough analysis of the workers' conditions, the programme formulates their basic claims and indicates the ways and means of getting them satisfied.

The I.L.O. could no doubt find useful inspiration in this programme with a view to drawing the main lines of its own plan to improve the conditions of the workers throughout the world. The trade union movement is such a force in the world that the I.L.O. can no longer co-operate with it in a paternalistic spirit or with reservations.

In the speeches made from this platform many representatives of the developing countries, and particularly of the African countries, have stressed the importance of technical assistance for such countries. In my opinion this is a field in which the I.L.O. could do more than it does. As an international organisation it could give technical assistance consistent with respect for the independence and sovereignty of each country, which is not always the case with help given by States dominated by private monopolies. While working out its technical assistance plan, which must be supervised by the annual Conference, the I.L.O. should choose its experts without discrimination, in order that the developing countries may profit by the experience obtained by the various countries of the world. In all cases national sovereignty must be respected.

While developing its operational activities, which are of particular concern to those countries, the I.L.O. must ensure that it does not become an organisation of a purely technocratic character. It must pursue its policy in the field of international legislation as one of its fundamental tasks.

The efficiency of a programme depends to a decisive extent on the means used to put it into effect. Stress must be laid on the interdependence between the purpose of I.L.O. action, its work for the workers on the one hand and its present structure and the need for fair representation in its various organs on the other. If the structure of the various organs of the I.L.O., with its anomalies and discriminations, remains as it is at present, how can one expect that programmes will be adjusted, or even changed and improved, to meet present conditions. Can the Organisation make any progress if it maintains the anti-democratic discriminations and privileges which are now so solidly rooted in it?

I should like to explain what I mean. People often ask how it is possible that after it has been in existence for almost half a century the I.L.O. should be unknown to the workers in various countries of the world. In many cases the workers have never been represented in this Organisation by their true spokesmen and have never been in a position to express their views and aspirations here. The existing method for appointing Workers' delegates and technical advisers is far from ensuring a just and genuine representation. Even in cases in which—as happens with the C.G.T. in France, the C.G.I.L. in Italy and the C.U.T.Ch. in Chile—there can be no possible doubt. In the I.L.O. there should be no privileged States or trade unions and other States and organisations which do not have the same rights.

Why is the notion of the most representative trade union not respected? Why has the I.L.O. remained passive for so many years before the violation of its own Constitution? Would it not be desirable for the Director-General to carry out an inquiry in certain countries with regard to the improper methods of appointing representatives of the workers to the Conference and with regard to the reasons for which these delegates are not representative? The results of such an inquiry might lead the Director-General to take measures to guarantee a fair representation of national organisations, and we would very much like this to be done.

Moreover, how can one speak of a Governing Body which "should be fully representative of the Organisation as a whole" (as is stated on page 126 of the Report) so long as anti-democratic privileges affect the composition of the Workers' group of the Governing Body? The existing Workers' group of the Governing Body represents only about 25 per cent. of the number of organised workers in the world, since the workers who belong to the W.F.T.U. and to most of the non-affiliated organisations are completely excluded from representation. This is not democracy: it is a farce and a travesty.

We insist once more that the Director-General should consider ways of ensuring fair representation. We propose the introduction of a system of proportional representation for the election of the Workers' group of the Governing Body. The Director-General could make proposals in this connection to the next session of the Conference.

The role that the I.L.O. should play in action against war, to safeguard peace and for the total liquidation of colonialism has been very rightly mentioned in the course of the discussions of this Conference. We regret that the many suggestions made in the Organisation to achieve this have had no
results, sometimes on the fallacious pretext that political issues should not be discussed here. The I.L.O. should make a very serious attempt, as quickly as possible, to make its contribution to the efforts to strengthen peace, especially in the field which is peculiar to the Organisation, namely the economic and social consequences of disarmament.

There are continuing conflicts in the world. I think it is impossible to pass over in silence the fact that the peoples still under the colonial yoke, as in Angola and South Africa and yet others, are heroically continuing the anti-colonial struggle. The assistance which must be given to those peoples is reflected in the decisions taken by the recent Addis Ababa Conference. The I.L.O. must make an effective contribution to this just cause of oppressed peoples. After so many efforts by the democratic forces within the I.L.O. the day has surely come for the immediate and final elimination of article 35 of the Constitution, which contains the notorious colonial clause. For over 15 years the W.F.T.U. has asked every year for its deletion.

The era of colonialism is now drawing to a close, but colonialist practices still persist. They are tenacious, and they take a multiplicity of forms. The policy of apartheid so brutally followed in South Africa has aroused the indignation of the African delegates and of all the progressive delegates who have attended this Conference. The W.F.T.U. expresses its solidarity with the workers and the people of South Africa. Last year the W.F.T.U. challenged the credentials of the South African delegation. That challenge was unsuccessful, and this year we renewed it.

The I.L.O. should consider immediately the introduction into the Preamble to the Constitution of provisions to prevent the admission to membership of the I.L.O. of governments which practise a policy of racial supremacy. The future of the I.L.O. depends on the contribution it will make to the solution of the major political, economic and social problems of our epoch which face the toiling masses of the whole world, the vanguard of mankind.

Interpretation from German: Mr. MONNING (Government delegate, Federal Republic of Germany)—In the name of my Government and my delegation I should like to congratulate you sincerely, Mr. President, on your election.

Once more the Report before us contains so many suggestions and discusses such important social questions that it is difficult for me in the short time at my disposal to deal with it to the extent that it merits. Back in the last third of the nineteenth century Germany was the first great industrial country of the world to seek an answer to the social problem in the elaboration of a comprehensive social security system, and so we can take the Director-General's suggestions as an endorsement of our experience in the social field. These promote development and encourage reflection.

I am very glad that the Director-General this year has taken up the problem of the structure and programme of the Organisation. I share his view that in the rapid development of our present-day world the Conference cannot deal annually with specific and successive proposals for revision. We think that once in every ten years the adaptation of the Organisation to the changed world situation should be considered as a whole. Stocktaking cannot be avoided in our time, particularly because, as the Director-General so rightly stresses, ideas about the application of the principles of the Declaration of Philadelphia are unfortunately divergent.

I come from a country in which the essential idea of freedom in social and political life was for long highly debated. It was this debate which taught us in Germany how closely freedom and human dignity, but also freedom and sound social development, are bound together. This freedom is indivisible. You cannot accept it in some aspects of society and deny it in others without losing this spiritual basis of our human order. We affirm freedom for employers and workers, freedom of decision for the parties to industry. Wages and conditions of work should also be determined by free negotiation between the parties.

Examination of the basic elements of a free society is appropriate in this Development Decade. The Director-General rightly quotes the remarks of the competent committee of the United Nations Economic and Social Council to the effect that there is in development policies a tendency to insist on material aspects and to allow human rights to slip into the background; but if man is used only as a production tool and not given the sympathetic consideration due to a free creature, then any assistance programme will be unsuccessful. The Federal German Government approves of the targets set by the United Nations in this decade for the performance of its great task. Recognising the importance of the human being as a free creature responsible to himself above all, it is endeavouring to give help in a form which will enable the traditional social structures of the developing countries to be amended cautiously and with a view to raising the standard of living of the working population. Measures to reinforce the inherent strength of the developing countries will come first.

We believe in training, training of employers in small and medium-sized undertakings and the creation of associations and of vocational training centres for skilled workers and technicians. The latter must be trained in large numbers because the economic development of a country depends to a large extent on the training of the population. A new programme of social and educational assistance is being added in the form of the German assistance scheme to traditional technical assistance. The Federal Republic has taken in about 32,000 nationals of non-European countries. Many of these are ordinary employed persons receiving the same payment as German workers,
because under our free system no distinction is made on account of religion, nationality or origin with regard to conditions of work. Many of these 32,000 friends from abroad are trainees who come to Germany for that purpose. After their training they go back home to transmit the knowledge and experience they have obtained, and we give this training gladly in order to help both them and the countries from which they come.

I have said that the economic development of a country is largely dependent on the level of training. I doubt, however, whether training and employment planning can really go hand in hand. The character and extent of the demand for manpower cannot be determined only by statistics. They depend on many imponderables. If training has to depend on long-term employment planning, then one will lose one's freedom to choose one's job, and we are attached to this in Germany. We have good experience with training in industry which retains the right to choose one's job and work place. We account for the high level of our skilled workers not only because of their natural diligence and dedication but because of our system of training, too. We are therefore glad that the I.L.O. is prepared systematically to favour training in the undertaking.

I would like to congratulate the Director-General particularly on his fine review of the problems of automation. We all aim at raising the standard of living of the vast masses of our people. Technical progress, including automation, is a course which will benefit mankind if rightly applied. Of course, employment structures alter rapidly, but in Germany automation has caused no particular difficulties. The few workers rendered redundant by technical change have been easily placed in other jobs because of our constant economic growth, which is not subject to central planning but to the right of each individual to plan and decide for himself, and no considerable unemployment has resulted. The disadvantages of automation, if they do occur, will require discussion between Members of the Organisation, and exchange of experience, and the I.L.O. can carry out useful research and transmission of experience in this regard.

In Germany we were glad that recently the I.L.O. has been exploring the causes of accidents and investigating accident statistics. The objective of such investigations has by no means been attained. We started the inquiries in order better to understand the causes of accidents with a view to improving our safety arrangements. After all, prevention is better than cure. The research work of the I.L.O. in this field will in no country be better appreciated or more openly supported than in industrialised Germany.

Additional research work by the Office requires a reduction of its general workload. I think we might well consider whether this revision should take the form of revision of the present annual periodicity of the Conference. I do not wish to refer to the financial reasons for this, which the Director-General has stated fully in his Report. I would like rather to refer to the argument of reducing that workload with a view to better performance of other work. There are at present 118 Conventions and about as many Recommendations. The Organisation has created a pretty complete system of social standards which, of course, needs constant examination with a view to improvement but hardly needs any further additions.

In these circumstances I believe that the standard-setting work of the Organisation could be kept at a level which would permit it to be dealt with at biennial Conferences. I suggest the new arrangement would not exclude the important work of examining whether or not existing Conventions are adjusted to present conditions. The Conference should ask the Governing Body to place proposals for review of specific instruments on its agenda regularly from year to year.

The Industrial Committees established since the war have become an important part of the Organisation. The Director-General's Report expresses some disappointment regarding their achievements. I do not deny that I think this is to some extent justified. However, I doubt whether it would be advisable to replace the sessions of Industrial Committees by meetings of experts. Even if such expert meetings were to be tripartite, their work would be less directly aimed at the applicability of the decisions than is that of the Industrial Committees. I am therefore not going to argue that the Industrial Committees should necessarily be eliminated but I think they might meet at longer intervals.

As for the credentials of delegates, we agree with the Director-General that the present procedure is unsatisfactory and a new one ought to be worked out. Unfortunately, I cannot support the proposal of the Director-General under which an independent legal organ would examine the credentials before they come to the Conference. I cannot support anything which would diminish the authority of the Conference as the supreme authority of the Organisation and I should be very glad if the Director-General could work out some other proposal.

If, encouraged by the Report, we are to consider how the work of the I.L.O. could be made more effective than in the past, we nevertheless continue to consider as of primary importance the determination and desire to promote the spread of social justice in the world and to help and advise, as best we can, those who as yet have little access to the fruits of world-wide economic growth.

The Federal Republic of Germany, a State based on law, inspired by social considerations and organised for political, economic and social freedom, remains true to its objective to promote greater equality between poor and rich, not only within its own frontiers but throughout the world, and to do so under the flag of freedom. We see in this world parliament an instrument helping to achieve our aim of a better world, and we shall not cease to give our help to and co-operate with the International Labour Organisation.

Mr. MAINWARING (Government delegate, Canada)—Mr. President, may I begin by
saying what a pleasure it is once more to work under your guidance, as I have so many times done in the past, however much one must deplore the circumstances which necessitated your election.

The object of this debate is to produce suggestions for improving the functioning of the I.L.O. It is only fair to begin by saying that we think the I.L.O. has done very well in the past and we are grateful to the Director-General for reminding us, as he did from this rostrum a few days ago, how much the I.L.O.'s past accomplishments, and our hopes for future progress, have been based on constitutional procedures and on respect for the rule of law.

I believe the Director-General has put before us a Report that will help us, not just at this Conference but for some time ahead, to build a stronger I.L.O.

Quite rightly he puts the first emphasis on the question of the I.L.O. programme. This part of the Report does contain a number of suggestions for new activities, but, if I understand correctly, it is not so much to propose new fields for work as it is to propose a better organisation of present I.L.O. activities.

One of the characteristics of the I.L.O. is its wide range of subject-matter and multitude of activities; and yet, since the resources that governments can put into the I.L.O. are not limitless, it is desirable to establish some order of priorities and concentrate as much as possible on the more essential matters. The Director-General offers a way of accomplishing this. He proposes, if I understand him correctly, that we group the major existing I.L.O. activities, together perhaps with certain new ones, into what he calls “constellations” of problems.

Now, whether or not one chooses to consider, as the Report proposes, that the number of problem areas should be set at five, or should be cut, four or five or some other number, is not the important question. What is important is the concept of thinking in terms of broad subject areas and grouping our dozens of individual problems within them. This could give us a more orderly, a more systematic, approach to our work. It could provide us with a framework which would enable us to make priority decisions. It might enable us to agree on the general aims and objectives of a number of programmes and, within each programme, to work out the necessary methods for achieving practical results.

These methods might include discussions at different levels, by committees of experts, regional groups or other bodies, the adoption of instruments where appropriate and the review of existing instruments where this becomes necessary. Obviously the methods include technical assistance, and the programme concept should provide a means of seeing various technical assistance activities in better perspective. They would also include research, and, allied to this, far better techniques than we have had so far for evaluating and measuring the success of our efforts. This in turn would help us to see what activities could be reduced or eliminated to allow the I.L.O. to concentrate its efforts on the tasks that deserve more money, more man-hours, spent on them.

If this programme concept is a good one, it would be necessary to consider how the programmes should be developed, administered and supervised.

We suggest that it might be useful to envisage special committees or standing bodies, with responsibilities for developing, reviewing and supervising these programmes, within the framework of the present Governing Body and Conference machinery.

The total range of interest of the I.L.O. is enormous; we have tended to go at its problems piecemeal. The formulation of a number of programmes, of which a few are being overhauled, reporting to a responsible standing committee, might enable us to tackle our wide-ranging subject-matter in a more realistic and effective manner.

This proposal has obvious implications for the structure of the I.L.O. I would not want to suggest piling a new set of meetings on top of the present ones. On the contrary, I believe the whole structure of I.L.O. meetings should be looked at, to see which are productive and doing a useful job and which, on the other hand, have become routine and of lower priority. The techniques by which meetings are conducted should also be looked at critically.

We endorse the proposal in Chapter VIII of the Report to review the Convention system. We would make a further suggestion. Some Conventions, by virtue of their subject-matter, are of special importance. A procedure might be found whereby we might formally recognise this fact so that ways and means might be developed of giving special attention to the way in which these few Conventions are being applied. This suggestion might involve some rearrangement of the work of the Committee of Experts and the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions.

Another possibility is that regional meetings should become more deeply involved in problems concerning the application of the more important Conventions. Regional meetings of experts might be asked to study the application of particular instruments. Their reports might come before the sessions of the regional conferences, which could consider ways and means of increasing the volume of ratifications, and where appropriate, could make suggestions for revision of some instruments.

The Director-General has also suggested the need to take a fresh look at the principle of an international instrument. What sort of purpose is a Convention supposed to serve, and what sort of purpose is a Recommendation supposed to serve? What is the difference between the two? What sort of subject-matter should go into a Convention, and what into a Recommendation? Anyone who has been on a committee engaged in drawing up an international instrument knows that there is no clear consensus of opinion on this point and that committees can get quite muddled over the problem. If we could get an agreed understanding as to the respective roles of Conventions and Recommendations I believe this would hold us in our work and prevent much argumentation. I believe it would be wise for a future Conference to try to agree to a statement on this point.

11
There is need for committees engaged in drawing up instruments to make the utmost effort to achieve a consensus of views in a spirit of co-operation. Very often an instrument may contain a few points, perhaps minor, which do not take adequate account of the needs and requirements of delegates from some countries —points which might have been amended if the committee had done its work better. An instrument which is not based on thorough discussion leading to a real sense of participation by the delegates is not going to have enough of their support and loyalty when they return home, and after all it is not the mere existence of an instrument that is important, it is the interest it commands in countries and the action taken to implement it.

We need more attention to the techniques by which our meetings can be made more effective particularly in the light of their increasing size. This calls, I believe, for a study by experts in communications, and such a study should extend to other types of I.L.O. meetings besides the Conference.

We believe that the ideas of the Director-General on industrial and regional problems merit further consideration. Such consideration might very well affect our views on the periodicity of the General Conference.

I have no time to say much about the important area of technical assistance, but I would like to say that we welcome wholeheartedly the Director-General's suggestion on pages 203-204 of the Report that a greater effort is needed in the way of a systematic evaluation of the contribution of operational programmes towards the broad goals of economic and social development. There is scope for the I.L.O. to do fundamental research here which would have an important positive influence not only on I.L.O. technical assistance but also on programmes carried on under other auspices.

This Conference expressed itself last year on the need for intensification of the whole I.L.O. research effort, and we look forward to seeing the Conference resolution translated into effective action. We welcome the Director-General's reference to the importance of close and effective co-operation and co-ordination between the I.L.O. and other members of the United Nations family. Increased standardisation of administrative rules and procedures is a most desirable objective.

My final observation deals with the problem which underlies much of the Director-General’s Report. This is the need to hold in mind at all times that the object of this Organisation is to raise standards of living and to foster social justice. What we must rely on is a gradual improvement in understanding of what this Organisation can do and what it cannot, and a voluntary effort from all sides to ease political tensions instead of aggravating them, to concentrate instead on the goals we have in common. One of the striking aspects of the modern world is the way in which governments, workers and employers in particular countries are learning to consult together on economic and social problems, to set forth joint aims for their countries and programmes for the fulfilment of those aims. This spirit, of groups with divergent backgrounds working together for a common cause, is the spirit we must foster internationally as well. The I.L.O. can help to point the way, but only if all of us are prepared to work for peaceful and positive aims and not for disruptive purposes.

(The Conference adjourned at 12.30 p.m.)
SEVENTEENTH SITTING

Thursday, 20 June 1963, 3 p.m.

President : Mr. Dreyer

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

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue discussion of the Director-General’s Report.

In agreement with the Vice-Presidents, and in accordance with the Standing Orders, article 14, paragraph 10, the President has decided to permit a representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions to make a speech here.

I call on Mr. Becu.

First, Mr. Routroy, Government delegate, India, has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. ROUTROY (Government delegate, India)—On 18 June 1963 a statement was read out to the Conference giving the position of the ten Asian countries, including India. Further to that statement, I have been asked by my Government to pledge complete solidarity with the African nations in their just struggle against the criminal policy of racial discrimination followed by the Government of South Africa. Consistent with our devout and time-honoured policy of combating racial discrimination, India has always been and will continue to be the supporter of nations which have been struggling to destroy this evil . . .

The PRESIDENT—that is not a point of order. You cannot continue. You cannot make this declaration now. We are discussing the Director-General’s Report, and I have called on the first speaker.

I would ask Mr. Becu, representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, to come to the rostrum.

Mr. BECU (Representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions)—May I recall that in my speech to the Conference last year I pleaded for a more dynamic approach to the I.L.O.’s tasks in dealing with the many urgent and weighty problems of a rapidly changing world. In giving us a condensed but impressive description of the I.L.O.’s record, and in submitting numerous suggestions for changes in stress and methods, the Director-General has certainly rendered a service to the Organisation and to those who, like us, wish to make the I.L.O. an even stronger instrument in our struggle for peace and social justice.

Since the I.L.O. has become a truly worldwide Organisation whose member countries are at different stages of economic and political development, nobody can close his eyes to the need for making a tremendous readjustment. If, therefore, we may disagree with certain proposals contained in the Report, this does not reflect a fundamental objection to the idea of change. We only differ with the approach suggested by the Director-General on certain extremely important problems.

We fully agree with the general trend of the Report in respect of the importance which is given to the problems of the developing countries. Thus, the chapters describing how the I.L.O. could help in mobilising human resources, in mapping out the route to fuller employment in the developing countries, have retained our fullest attention. But the I.L.O. should recognise that economic planning designed to enlist popular support presupposes the active participation of free trade unions in the elaboration and execution of economic plans. If not, the door will always be open for compulsory labour masquerading as a popular effort for national development. Likewise, we hold that the efforts of the I.L.O. in dealing with income policies emphasise the I.L.O.’s responsibility to encourage the development of fuller participation by employers’ and workers’ organisations in the determination of these policies.

This, of course, immediately raises the question of industrial relations and of freedom of association.

The standpoint of the I.L.O. on these issues is stated clearly enough in the Report. Yet, if one looks somewhat deeper into some of the projects which on the surface look very attractive, we detect some inconsistencies with this standpoint in the chapter dealing with the I.L.O.’s educational activities and missions of experts.

First of all, a very clear distinction must be drawn between workers’ education and trade union education. We have always felt that in workers’ education, as part of adult education, public authorities and universities can play an important role; the I.L.O. can no doubt also make a useful contribution in this field. But we insist that trade union training is and should remain the primary responsibility of the trade unions themselves. What does the Report mean when it talks about “providing techni-
cally sound and objectively orientated courses and acting independently of the ideological divisions in the trade union movement. There is only one basic ideological division to be recognised: that between a trade unionism free of government, employer or political party domination and a government or employer-sponsored trade unionism. Now this is the very case in which the I.L.O. is unable to act independently of ideological divisions since it cannot carry out any activity in any country without the consent of the governments. It would be a negation of all fundamental principles if the I.L.O. were to place government-sponsored trade unions and genuine trade unions on the same footing. In assisting the first, the I.L.O. can serve no useful purpose; and the genuine trade unions can develop their own training programmes with their own resources or with the help of their own international trade union organisations. The I.L.O. may of course facilitate trade union training by providing scholarships and by the money it is doing at present, but it would go too far if it decided to undertake trade union training itself.

We have similar fundamental objections to the plan of enlarging the scope of the I.L.O. expert missions by entrusting them with the task of advising organisations on trade union development. It should never be the job of the I.L.O. experts to intervene in trade union matters. Make no mistake about it: 90 per cent. of the job of developing a sound trade union movement has to be done by the people of a country themselves. There are limits to what can be done internationally to hasten development. International action must, if it is to be of any use, be undertaken by the international free trade union movement itself, carefully and with full respect for free trade union principles.

We find the same technocratic approach to the problems of the future in some other parts of the Report. We insist that the Conference, as the sovereign assembly of the I.L.O., must continue to have the right to make its own decisions in respect of credentials. We would oppose the handing over of certain functions of the Credentials Committee to an independent judicial body. This would, in our opinion, be a retrograde step tending to weaken the uniquely valuable tripartite structure of the I.L.O. On the other hand, of course, we would welcome appropriate means of speeding up procedure so that decisions can be reached at an early stage of the Conference.

Another proposal for leaning too much on the services of experts has to be strongly opposed by the free trade union movement. This concerns the Industrial Committees, which have done such an excellent job in the past. References in the Report to the "heterogeneous membership" or the "delicately balanced membership" of Industrial Committees making it difficult to arrive at decisions, seem to us to be like dragging a red herring across the trail. The advantages of going fast must be weighed against the advantages of democratic participation and democratically reached decisions, and there is no doubt about which free trade union movement considers to be right. Any new approach for dealing with industrial problems can only be supported if it tends to strengthen the tripartite character of the I.L.O. and expand activities.

Preparatory work by experts is not an evil in itself, as long as the Industrial Committees continue to make the decisions, rather than be replaced by learned reports.

In any event, the most important task of the I.L.O. remains the setting of standards and the control of their implementation. We should never lose sight of that fact, and the vast respect and enthusiasm which the free trade union organisations have always had for the I.L.O. has been based on its invaluable work in this field. In the developing world of today, in a world of uninterrupted technological progress, the need for adopting international social standards still remains.

The continuation of this traditional task of the I.L.O. raises, of course, the problem of implementation. We are not only concerned with the Conventions and Recommendations adopted at the Conference, but we are particularly interested in the strict observance of the basic principles for which the I.L.O. stands. It is, indeed, deplorable that these principles are constantly violated in a number of member States. Nobody should be surprised that there are moments of frustration when the existing legal and constitutional machinery seems to protect the worst offenders.

The I.C.F.T.U. never remained silent when these violations were taking place. Nor did we make any difference as to the nationality or ideology of the guilty party. Our record is clear and we do not have to hide behind a screen of demagogy.

Those who keep millions of workers under the iron rule of brutal dictatorship, denying them the right to strike as a crime against the State, making a mockery of freedom of information and of speech, have no right to come and pose here as the champion defenders of human rights and dignity.

It can only make us shiver with disgust when those people come to this rostrum and take us for ignorant or naïve people when they express their opposition to apartheid.

On this crucial problem the I.C.F.T.U. can stand proud of its action. Indeed the I.C.F.T.U. organised the first world-wide boycott of South African goods, thus gaining the support of men and women everywhere in the fight of the international free trade union movement against apartheid. The I.C.F.T.U.'s views on this matter were again brought to the attention of the United Nations in a recent memorandum calling for the ousting of the Government of South Africa from the family of nations and calling for concerted international action aimed at restoring democracy and social justice to that country without bloodshed.

Likewise, the I.C.F.T.U., in a public statement, gave its full support to the decisions taken by the Conference of Independent African States at Addis Ababa, particularly with regard to the economic sanctions and the embargo on the shipment of arms to South Africa.

Can all those who have come to the support of our African friends at this Conference say the same? Have they stopped trading with South Africa? Have they cancelled the orders for
military equipment? Have they closed their ports to South African ships? Perhaps Mr. Saillant could raise some of these questions with his friends.

Let us be frank on this issue. The Government of South Africa, as long as it imposes its shameful and inhuman policy of apartheid, is violating every principle of the I.L.O. and of the United Nations. Its place is no longer in the family of nations. The I.C.F.T.U. will support every measure and every concrete action leading to its well-deserved expulsion. We feel confident that this Conference will take the initiative in putting into motion all forces which will lead to that result.

It is our firm conviction that, in the interest of the working-class people, the democratic principles for which the I.L.O. stands should be upheld and its work continued unimpaired. Any weakening of the I.L.O. would bring only satisfaction to the South African régime, without helping the oppressed people in that country. We call therefore on all democratic forces to join with us.

Mr. PAPADOPOULOS (Minister of Labour and Social Insurance, Cyprus)—I have much honour and great pride in addressing such an impressive gathering and in reaffirming before you my country's devotion and commitment to the high principles which form the cornerstone and foundation of the functioning of the I.L.O.

Many distinguished speakers before me on this rostrum have asserted their adherence to the ideals and aims of the I.L.O. and have expressed their appreciation of the lucid exposition of the present and future orientations of the I.L.O. programmes as contained in the Director-General's Report. They were very right in doing so because I believe there is not much fault to be found in the statement of policies and principles made therein. It is, indeed, an admirable testament of faith and a laudable declaration of hope.

It is a gospel of moral values and social principles which could pave the way to a new world in which social justice, dignity of man, peace and freedom could reign supreme.

The problem does not lie in the principles but in their implementation and application. As a matter of fact, from our brief experience with the Organisation, we are inclined to the view that the principles guiding the functioning and very existence of the I.L.O. receive their due share in lip-service but are largely devoid of material content. Member countries are ready to subscribe to all the high ideals for which the I.L.O. stands, but reluctant to apply them in practice.

This very moment, the very existence of the I.L.O. as an effective Organisation is put in jeopardy because one member State is accused of violating fundamental principles of the I.L.O.

The I.L.O., we are told in the Director-General's Report, "represents and seeks to give effect within its own sphere to certain principles that are of universal value, such as 'freedom and dignity,... economic security and equal opportunity.'"

Yet one member country, the Republic of South Africa, which as a Member has vowed to respect these principles, having defied by its apartheid policies these very principles, having violated every moral and divine law in its treatment of human beings, having denied the right of human dignity to the majority of its people, was, only the other day, standing before us in defiance to a resolution of this same assembly, paying lip-service to the high principles of the I.L.O. which so unhesitatingly it has disregarded, whilst the I.L.O. finds itself unable to enforce compliance with and respect for not only its fundamental principles, but even obedience to its own previous decisions.

This leads us to wonder whether other principles or decisions of the I.L.O. could not be ignored by member States with the same immunity; makes us ponder over the futility of devoting much effort and time in the formulation of standards of behaviour at the international level when the countries who should apply these standards can simply ignore or violate them with impunity.

The time has perhaps come when the I.L.O. must shift the centre of gravity of its efforts and aims. The time has perhaps come when the I.L.O. should concern itself more with the practical application of its previous decisions rather than with the setting of standards.

The I.L.O., we are told in the Report of the Director-General, is based on three fundamental principles: the freedom of labour, which means respect for the worker as a person, the freedom of association and the primacy of social objectives. Yet it is illusory to pretend that these principles are accepted and acted upon throughout the world today.

They are accorded verbal recognition more widely than they are practised. Therefore, I believe that the new primary orientation of the I.L.O. should be the devising of ways and means for the practical implementation by member States of at least its fundamental principles and Conventions relating thereto. These fundamental principles or Conventions could be selected and enumerated and compliance with them made obligatory within a given period.

Failure to comply by Members, proven after careful scrutiny, should bring about disqualification from eligibility for election and later loss of voting rights.

On a similar occasion two years ago our Government delegate to this Conference expressed the thought that perhaps the I.L.O. had nearly spent its historic role as formulator of international standards of behaviour in its particular field of competence; and that it was opportune, perhaps, for a serious reappraisal of its mission in the changed and ever-changing world of our times.

Since, therefore, the Report of the Director-General opens wide the vital question as to whether the structure and activities of the I.L.O. are adequately adapted to the changing world conditions, I think that the time is very opportune for determining the new priorities of action.

These, I suggest, should be, firstly, the ensuring of compliance by member States with those of the Conventions that are of universal recognition fundamental to the existence of the I.L.O. and, secondly, the granting of far greater technical assistance to needy member States so that these States might be
enabled, through their own efforts, to give effect to the standards of behaviour in the labour field which have so thoroughly and extensively been set down by numerous Conventions and Recommendations.

Only thus can the I.L.O., in its own particular field, ensure wide acceptance of its fundamental principles and parallel social and economic growth of all the countries of the world.

As it is very aptly stated in the Director-General's Report, "All countries are now interdependent in the effort to achieve and sustain the high rates of economic growth which are necessary throughout the world in order to eliminate poverty, to improve social conditions and to sustain high levels of employment". We believe that for the richer countries of the world it is not only a duty but also an inescapable necessity to assist the economic growth of the poorer countries. We believe that no country in the world can for long and with impunity enjoy the fruits of its wealth and remain an affluent society while other countries of the world are left unaided to face poverty, starvation and need. Such an economic discrepancy is bound to ricochet against the wealthier countries and bring adverse financial repercussions on their own economy. The granting of such economic and technical assistance could be better channelled through international organisations such as the I.L.O. so that priorities may be better determined on an international basis and fuller utilisation be made.

My country does not seek a parasitic existence and does not intend to become a financial burden on any State or organisation. All we need is an initial aid so that we can help ourselves, through mobilisation and utilisation of our own manpower and material resources. The brief but commendable record of my country as an independent nation and the inherent national virtues which our long history, our ancient and glorious Hellenic civilisation, have bequeathed to our people is an incontestable assurance that any assistance given to us will be fully utilised so as to give far-reaching and cumulative results.

The five priorities listed by the Director-General for future I.L.O. programmes made themselves felt in my country, and in the same order of importance, as soon as the implementation of our first five-year programme for economic development was initiated. The projects envisaged by the plan brought home to us with shattering force the inadequacy of our manpower potentials for satisfying the skills necessary to translate plans on paper to material action. They also posed with poignancy the painful problem of reviewing and revising our traditionally classical education— with its disdain for manual work—to suit our technical needs for economic development.

It is in the diagnosis and solution of such problems that the division of the I.L.O. dealing with technical assistance can really excel. Better and more effective solutions may be found to these problems when they are viewed on a regional basis by countries in which similar conditions exist.

In this respect regional action is bound to assume increasing importance in the general field of activities of the Organisation. The devious, often arduous, way of going to the metropolis for assistance, guidance and advice lends support to the idea of further decentralisation, and the establishment of a regional office to serve the region from Syria to Morocco appears more than justified both from the point of view of geography and from that of common interests, specific needs and identical problems and circumstances.

With regard to the functions of the Credentials Committee, I agree wholeheartedly with the suggestion that certain of the present functions of this Committee could be better entrusted to an independent judicial body. To allege that this is a constitutional right inalienable from the rights of the Conference amounts to bypassing of the real issue, which is how to establish such a machinery as would ensure the independent consideration of complaints and relieve the members of the Committee from the possibility of extraneous pressures. Justice must not only be done but also be seen to be done.

In concluding, I wish to express the hope that this session may open new horizons for action by the I.L.O. for the achievement of a world of social justice and international tolerance.

There is nothing basically wrong with the structure or orientation of the Organisation—only with the attitudes of the Members. What is most needed is not a change of method but a change of heart.

The I.L.O., in view of its unique tripartite composition, is a strong rampart for the effective protection and safeguarding of fundamental human rights. Its foundations are sound. Its path is clear. It is up to us to fortify its position and make it the starting platform for a better, more equitable, happier world.

Report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives

The President—We will now deal with the second part of our agenda for this afternoon's meeting. That is the report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives. It has been published and is now before the Conference for consideration.

Motion to Postpone Consideration of the Question

The President—Mr. Chajn, Government delegate, Poland, has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. CHAJN (Government delegate, Poland)—At our meeting this morning you, Mr. President, adopted a decision whereby a change in the programme of the Selection Committee in order to place discussion of the budget on the agenda for this afternoon has been simply communicated to the Conference without discussion. I expected

1 See Appendix IV, p. 502.
that an explanation would be given after the statement by Mr. Borisov, the Government delegate of the Soviet Union, as to why no possibility was given to a number of delegates to attend the meeting of the Selection Committee which changed the agenda. Unfortunately such clarification has not been forthcoming. Now we are taking up the study of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives on the budget of the I.L.O.

As its study and adoption are matters of great importance for the over-all activities of our Organisation, I should like to draw attention to the circumstances prevailing when we are studying and adopting this instrument, perhaps the most important for the activities of our Organisation.

About 40 per cent. of the Members are absent from this afternoon’s meeting. A whole continent in fact, the continent of Africa, is absent. This young, dynamic and active continent is not present among us this afternoon. Is it possible to consider that such circumstances provide the necessary legal prerequisites for taking up the study of such an important instrument as the budget of our Organisation? What will people think if the I.L.O. adopts its budget in such abnormal circumstances?

Mr. Director-General, we understand full well that the Organisation needs its budget, and we do not intend to leave it high and dry without its budget. If after showing our full solidarity with the Africans we have come back to this hall, it is because we are in favour of constructive co-operation, and so that from this rostrum all the legitimate rights of the African delegates may be defended.

Once again we would like to assure our friends from Africa that in their legitimate demands they may always rely upon and count upon us. We are behind them with pride and shall continue to remain supporters of their legitimate demands. Here on Tuesday a number of delegates expressed their backing of the African countries.

The PRESIDENT—You have to speak to a point of order.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. CHAJN—Intending to speak on a formal proposal and I shall keep to the Standing Orders of our Organisation.

Here on Tuesday, as I was saying, many people expressed their solidarity with the peoples of Africa. They stated that . . .

The PRESIDENT—You must speak to a point of order. You cannot make any declaration besides that. Please stick to the motion of order you have raised.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. CHAJN—Since you will not allow me to defend my point of order, to justify it, I shall conclude by saying that on behalf of the Eastern European countries I ask you, Mr. President, on the basis of article 15, paragraph 2 (2) (b), to postpone consideration of this question until the Conference has decided on the fate of the proposal made this morning with reference to the deferment of the Conference for a few months.

I am aware that any postponement of the Conference will, from the point of view of the budget, lead to certain difficulties for the Organisation; but it seems to me that we have to overcome all obstacles in order to have the budget adopted by all Members in accordance with their right.

I would like to ask you to put this proposal to the vote.

The PRESIDENT—I would only answer the last speaker on his point of order by saying that it is the Selection Committee which, in accordance with article 4, paragraph 2, of the Standing Orders, has decided that the report of the Finance Committee of Government representatives should be dealt with at this afternoon’s sitting.

But now you have moved a motion to postpone consideration of the question. Is this motion seconded?

It is seconded.

I think it is my duty to put this motion to the vote. I hope that all members understand the content of the motion; it is to postpone consideration of the report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. The motion is rejected by 37 votes to 176, with 7 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—The motion is rejected.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE OF GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES (concl.): DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We proceed with the report of the Finance Committee of Government representatives. The general discussion is now open.

Mr. Director-General, we understand full well that the Organisation needs its budget, and we do not intend to leave it high and dry without its budget. If after showing our full solidarity with the Africans we have come back to this hall, it is because we are in favour of constructive co-operation, and so that from this rostrum all the legitimate rights of the African delegates may be defended.

Once again we would like to assure our friends from Africa that in their legitimate demands they may always rely upon and count upon us. We are behind them with pride and shall continue to remain supporters of their legitimate demands. Here on Tuesday a number of delegates expressed their backing of the African countries.

The PRESIDENT—You have to speak to a point of order.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. CHAJN—Intending to speak on a formal proposal and I shall keep to the Standing Orders of our Organisation.

Here on Tuesday, as I was saying, many people expressed their solidarity with the peoples of Africa. They stated that . . .

The PRESIDENT—You must speak to a point of order. You cannot make any declaration besides that. Please stick to the motion of order you have raised.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. CHAJN—Since you will not allow me to defend my point of order, to justify it, I shall conclude by saying that on behalf of the Eastern European countries I ask you, Mr. President, on the basis of article 15, paragraph 2 (2) (b), to postpone consideration of this question until the Conference has decided on the fate of the proposal made this morning with reference to the deferment of the Conference for a few months.

I am aware that any postponement of the Conference will, from the point of view of the budget, lead to certain difficulties for the Organisation; but it seems to me that we have to overcome all obstacles in order to have the budget adopted by all Members in accordance with their right.

I would like to ask you to put this proposal to the vote.

The PRESIDENT—I would only answer the last speaker on his point of order by saying that it is the Selection Committee which, in accordance with article 4, paragraph 2, of the Standing Orders, has decided that the report of the Finance Committee of Government representatives should be dealt with at this afternoon’s sitting.

But now you have moved a motion to postpone consideration of the question. Is this motion seconded?

It is seconded.

I think it is my duty to put this motion to the vote. I hope that all members understand the content of the motion; it is to postpone consideration of the report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. The motion is rejected by 37 votes to 176, with 7 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—The motion is rejected.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE OF GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES (concl.): DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We proceed with the report of the Finance Committee of Government representatives. The general discussion is now open.

Sir George POLLOCK (Employers' delegate, United Kingdom)—I never thought to develop the technique of speaking to a point of order and, therefore, what I want to say I can say quite shortly. Nor do I seek to curry favour with anybody and, therefore, what I want to say I can say quite simply. I simply take this opportunity of telling you that I propose, on behalf of the British employers, to vote in favour of the budget and I should like to explain why I do so.

It is the deep conviction of those whom I represent that we should do all that lies in our power to raise living standards throughout the world, to eradicate racialism, and to establish freedom—freedom under the rule of law. The Director-General of the I.L.O. is a man dedicated to these tasks. A tripartite organisation of governments, free employers and free and independent trade unions could and should do more than any other body in the world to influence thinking and by that, and other means, to assist in the attainment of these objectives.

It would be idle for me to pretend that recent events have not given rise to grave anxiety and some misgiving as to whether we—and you and I, the delegates in this Conference—are proceeding on the right lines. We must all
ponder deeply on these events in the hope that we can act in a way which is truly constructive as regards the future.

On this vote on the budget some delegates may wish to abstain because they find themselves in a genuine dilemma. With them I have some sympathy; I appreciate their difficulties. I think I understand those who are in a genuine dilemma. To abstain in those circumstances, but to vote by adverse vote or by manœuvre (whether it is a manœuvre on a point of order or a manœuvre of any other kind) to cut off the supply of funds to this Organisation, you know, can hardly be called constructive. It could be, and it is intended to be, destructive.

If we take a step backwards we shall all suffer in the long run, but it is not on a country like mine that the blow will fall first or heaviest. It will fall on those who, as nations, are young and weak. We should be hurting those whom we should help.

Mr. COLLISON (Workers' delegate, United Kingdom)—I come to the rostrum to speak on behalf of the Workers' group and to say that we give our full support to the budget proposals which are now before you. When I addressed the Finance Committee of Government Representatives the other day I noted with satisfaction that there was a tendency, a very pronounced tendency, for the three groups of the Governing Body, that is the Employers' group, the Government group and the Workers' group, and the Finance Committee, to come together in terms of principle and in terms of understanding the need for activities both in the field of standard-setting and in the field of operations, and I pointed out that our discussions in the Finance Committee and in the Governing Body were, in these days, more confined to questions of detail rather than to questions of principle and practice. This, I think, is a most welcome tendency, a most welcome development, because it does show very clearly that all those connected with the I.L.O. in all three groups do understand and underline the importance of the work which we are doing today in the world as it is today.

This leads me to say to you quite firmly that I agree entirely with what has just been said by Sir George Pollock, and I know this view is held by many members of this Conference: that it is absolutely important that we should on this occasion give our consent to the proposals now before us.

Quite frankly, I cannot understand how anyone can argue that we are helping our colleagues in the developing countries, and in particular in Africa, if we seek on this occasion to obstruct the passage of the proposal, and I would therefore ask the whole Conference to give its support to this budget; but, in particular, I am, on behalf of the Workers' group, asking all the Workers' delegates in this Conference to give their support to these proposals on this occasion.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. PITHART (Government delegate, Czechoslovakia)—The Government member for Poland was interrupted and was not able to finish his speech, so I would like to add a few words to his state-
ment. Any decision concerning the budget is always one of the most important questions at any international conference. The budget of an organisation reflects its future activities and operations. The same is true in the I.L.O. as in all other international organisations.

This presupposes that in such important matters as the discussion of the budget there should be a full participation of all member States, in particular those who are especially interested in the content of the budget, since they are to receive technical assistance and other help. But let us look at this half-empty room. Thirty-two delegations from Africa and other delegations from elsewhere, too, have left the 47th International Labour Conference. Their demands were legitimate, but our Conference was not able to meet their requirements.

It is for this reason that this morning, the delegate of the Soviet Union, on behalf of the group of socialist countries, moved a proposal that we interrupt the Conference for four to five months. However, this justified proposal has not given rise to any decision up to now.

How is it possible for us to discuss the budget issue if we have not taken a decision on such an important question as the proposal to postpone the Conference until such time as the African delegations, and those of other countries who have left the Conference, are given the possibility once again to take full part in its work?

For this reason I consider that it is premature at this time to discuss the budget, and I should like fully to support the proposal to take, first of all, a decision relating to the fate of the 47th International Labour Conference.

I do not intend in any way to create a situation whereby our Organisation would be entirely deprived of its budget, but I presume that the adoption of the budget in November, or, let us say, December will be sufficiently early for the Organisation to obtain all the financial resources necessary for its normal functioning.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. POZHARSKY (Government adviser, U.S.S.R.)—Today, something unexpected occurred in the Conference: It has been suggested that there be a change in procedure due to the exceptional circumstances prevailing, and therefore a motion has been made that we discuss and adopt the budget.

This morning, in no less exceptional circumstances, the Selection Committee was called upon to examine this proposal. This was done in such a precipitate manner that a number of members of the Committee were not aware of the fact that that meeting had been convened and were unable to take part in it. So there is an atmosphere of extraordinary haste surrounding this budget issue. It has already been stated from this rostrum that this morning, on behalf of a number of delegations—the group of socialist countries, in fact—a proposal was submitted that we suspend this session and resume it in a later stage in November or December of this year. This proposal is clearly justified, and we cannot consider that the General Conference, with its present membership, is sufficiently representative to take such a responsible decision. Nor can we reconcile ourselves to a situation in which the South
African Government, which is still blatantly pursuing its policy of racial segregation and apartheid, is represented in this Organisation and is responsible for the absence of many other delegations, thus depriving a very large section of our Conference of their votes.

We cannot subscribe to such measures which, directly or indirectly, represent an attempt to minimise the decision taken by the African States to refrain from further participation in the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. Their protest against the continuing racialism in South Africa is fully warranted, and we feel complete solidarity with the African peoples in their just demands, and are fully behind them in this matter.

With reference now to the budget, there has been some attempt to claim that unless the budget is adopted immediately the Organisation will be paralysed and its very existence jeopardised. It is on this pretext that these extraordinarily hasty measures have been designed. But in fact the position is not such.

The attempts to adopt the budget now, at this very meeting, are dictated by the desire to show that the withdrawal of the African countries has in fact changed nothing, that the I.L.O. is quite able to continue without Africa. Thus, if we take this decision in such circumstances we shall in fact be taking a political action directed against the peoples of Africa.

The Soviet delegation does not intend to participate in any way in such a measure. If our proposal had been accepted to suspend the Conference and resume it in normal circumstances at a later stage, in November or December, the Government delegation of the U.S.S.R. would have been able, in such normal circumstances, to state its opinion concerning the budget and make various remarks and criticisms of it. That has in fact been done in the Governing Body and in the Financial and Administrative Committee of the Governing Body, and the records and reports of those meetings show this clearly. Adoption of the budget in November or December 1963 would not have harmed the activities of the Office or the Action of the Organisation in any way, because this is the budget for 1964. This has already been made clear, but I wanted to emphasise this fact. I repeat that the budget issue is being turned here into a political issue directed against the African peoples, and listening to the concern expressed by various delegations we see rather concern to minimise and stultify the action of the African peoples.

In such circumstances our delegation does not feel able to participate in any discussion on the substance of our budget, nor can we vote on this matter. The Government delegation of the U.S.S.R. would like its non-participation to be placed on record, and I hope that the reasons that I have already given in this connection will be accurately and fully reflected in the record.

Mr. BERGENSTROM (Employers' delegate, Sweden)—The budget which we are discussing is the result of long and painful preparatory work. The initial budget proposals were submitted to the Financial and Administrative Committee of the Governing Body, where they were thoroughly scrutinised. In the light of this critical review, the Director-General of the I.L.O. put forward a revised draft budget taking account of the different views expressed and trying to achieve a reasonable compromise. The draft budget as revised was accepted as such a compromise in the Financial and Administrative Committee of the Governing Body and, after further scrutiny, by the Governing Body itself. At this Conference it has also been approved by the majority of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

As the preparatory proceedings have been satisfactorily reflected in the Conference documents I do not think it is necessary to go into any details at this stage. In an international organisation of the magnitude and complexity of the International Labour Organisation it is only natural that any budget must necessarily be a compromise between competing and incompatible interests and viewpoints, and it is in the nature of a compromise that nobody can be entirely satisfied with it. As you will see from the Conference documentation on the budget, the ten Employers' members of the Governing Body found the painfully elaborated budget to be an acceptable compromise. It may be objected that since we took that view in the Governing Body we bowed under the bridges of Geneva, to say the least, and we must ask ourselves whether the dramatic events of these last few days should lead us to an altered attitude towards the proposed budget. I think we should all cool down our minds, so to speak, and try to look at the situation objectively. Should we suddenly change our attitude towards the future of this Organisation, which is still our Organisation? For this is the issue involved; not technical questions such as concern the distribution of credits to more or less important budget items, but the very future of the I.L.O. If we can agree on an unbiased approach to the problem I think we must all admit that the I.L.O. has been a rather useful Organisation, to be credited with much valuable work, especially in the technical assistance field.

Let us have a long-term approach. Let us consider the essentials of the case. I am thinking particularly of my friends in Africa. I have visited their countries, and I know something about their problems and about the I.L.O. contribution towards the solution of these problems. Let us, therefore, give our wholehearted support to the future of our Organisation. This implies unanimous support for the 1964 budget. I appeal to you to vote in favour of the budget, and to do it now.

Interpretation from French: Mr. HAUCK (Government delegate, France)—I would not have come to this platform if I had not heard during this discussion what seemed to me a strange argument against voting for the budget at this sitting. We were told that to vote for the budget at this sitting would be an insult to the peoples of Africa. The other day I addressed a sincere appeal to our African friends asking them to stay with us. They chose a different course, and I am sure the great majority of you regret that very deeply. The great majority of us also want to continue to show evidence of friendship and solidarity. It is
certainly not by voting a budget in which the item next largest to that of salaries is the technical assistance item, $1,400,000 for practical activities—it is not by voting such a budget, I say, which would benefit all our African friends and those of other developing countries in the world, that we would insult our African friends. On the contrary, it would be evidence of solidarity and friendship which we would be giving them, even in their absence.

Therefore, if common sense is to triumph, and if we maintain as we should the normal operation of the I.L.O. in the service of all, we must rapidly vote the budget of the I.L.O., and that is the appeal I make to the Conference.

Mr. SLATER (Government delegate, United Kingdom)—First of all, I would like to indicate my full support for the budget before us. As Mr. Bergenström has made quite clear, this budget is the result of very careful scrutiny in the Financial and Administrative Committee of the Governing Body and in the Governing Body itself. Many of us criticised details. Many of us thought that certain projects and programmes might be reconsidered. Those queries were given very careful consideration by the Director-General, and the budget is the result of this second scrutiny and of very careful consideration by all those concerned.

Reference has been made by earlier speakers to the meeting of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives. I would draw your attention to the record of that meeting contained in the paper before you. It was unfortunate—and no one regrets it more than I—that there were no representatives of African governments present at that meeting. They were otherwise engaged, and I do not in the least criticise them for not being there, but I would draw your attention to the rather belated reference to this absence of the African governments and other representatives of Africa. No reference was made at the Finance Committee to the absence of African governments, although so much is being said now by certain delegates about the fact that those representatives are not here to consider the budget.

I may draw your attention also to paragraph 51 of the English text of that same paper. Much concern has been expressed here this afternoon by some delegates about not holding up the funds necessary to carry on the work of the I.L.O. It has been said that we can do this later. They are very concerned, however, that these funds should be available some time. As we read in paragraph 51, the U.S.S.R. delegate makes it very clear at that meeting—and if he is consistent he will surely do so at this meeting too—that he will vote against the budget. In other words, if he and others in the same group of countries voted against the budget and they were joined—as I think mistakenly—by enough people in this hall, then we would have no funds for the I.L.O. for next year. That is an example for you, which of course you will not follow. Let me stress again that certain delegates who now express their concern for the careful consideration of the I.L.O., for the welfare of African countries, and for the work which the I.L.O. can do, voted against the budget in the Finance Committee and presumably would do the same again in order to withdraw from the I.L.O. all funds for the work of the future.

One can say a lot about solidarity with African countries. The best way of showing our true solidarity with African countries is to supply the funds necessary to help them, and we can do that through the I.L.O. and through supporting this budget.

I ask all members in this hall to support the budget and to vote for it.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. VÉGH-GARZÓN (Employers’ delegate, Uruguay)—I come from Uruguay, an underdeveloped country in Latin America. I am sure I speak on behalf of my fellow delegates from Latin America when I say that we are very deeply involved in the approval of the budget of the I.L.O., which includes a technical assistance programme for Latin American countries. It is in our interests that this programme should continue to be applied.

I want to say that the manœuvre we are now witnessing is a manœuvre in the true sense of the word—to try to boycott or to prevent the adoption of the budget of the I.L.O. Although I view this with regret, I feel at the same time a certain satisfaction because the peoples of Latin America and those who have sometimes been mistaken or deceived can now distinguish their friends from their enemies. We are witnessing a propaganda which is said to be in favour of underdeveloped countries which are not present here to defend their views.

We come from underdeveloped countries and I am stating my opinion. Those who approve the budget are our friends, and those who do not vote for it are, as we know, enemies of the underdeveloped countries.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. ZÚÑIGA GARBÓN (Workers’ delegate, Ecuador)—The International Labour Organisation is the property of the world. No political party, no particular ideology can be regarded as the owner of the I.L.O. The Organisation, by its philosophy, is here to help the underdeveloped and dependent peoples which are living through the tragedy of poverty as victims of exploitation by the only enemy of society, imperialism, which plunders their wealth and leaves them in a state of horrible economic, political and social prostration.

Ecuador, like its sister countries of Latin America, a country which is starting its progress and needs technical assistance, all kinds of assistance from the International Labour Organisation. But it does not want help in the form of charity. It wants help in a spirit of social and human justice, for our countries would not need any assistance if the situation were different, nor shall we need assistance when political power and control over the national wealth are in the hands of the people and not the bankers, the monopolists, the people who really cause poverty and prostration among the peoples called underdeveloped or developing. In our eyes Cuba is an example of what a people can do when it brings about
the entire transformation of society, of what a people can do when it is freed from imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and is transformed into a free and prosperous national community joining the great forces of peace such as our friends, the friends of all the peoples of the world, the people of the Soviet Union, and the peoples of the socialist countries.

The PRESIDENT—May I remind the speaker that the subject under discussion is the report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. ZÚÑIGA GARZÓN—We are not against the budget; we are not against approval of the budget. We are against the procedure adopted for its approval. We wish the African countries to be present so that the budget may be the universal expression of what we all want as Members of the International Labour Organisation.

Interpretation from French: Mr. MÖRI (Workers' delegate, Switzerland)—It is obvious that I, too, am in favour of the adoption of the budget. As you have already been told, this budget has been very carefully scrutinised in the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. The fact is that to vote in favour of the budget does not amount to taking a stand against the African countries, as was stated a moment ago. It does not make a political issue of a purely technical matter, and when we are accused of trying to convert the budget into a political issue we are, or rather the International Labour Conference is, being treated as a senseless machine. Those who have made a shameful political exploitation of this issue are those who now oppose the budget.

You were told a moment ago that without a budget the Organisation would have to suspend its work as from 1 January next year. We have been very naïvely told that we could convene a further Conference at the end of this year, but those who know something about labour relations know that there is a contract of employment between the Director-General of the International Labour Office and the officials of the Office. There are rules to be observed and it is therefore absolutely essential on technical grounds that action should be taken if one wants to retain this staff and assure their livelihood. It is not only a matter of ensuring the livelihood of officials; it is also a matter of ensuring the performance of the economic and social tasks of this Organisation. My colleague, the Workers' delegate of Ecuador, a moment ago did not oppose the vote on the budget: he, too, made a political speech. The fact is that, as I have tried to do in the last few days, I should like to try once more to get rid of these political arguments, which are not of our making. We are still in favour of protecting the rights of African workers and the rights of workers all over the world and we still condemn, without any reservation, apartheid, wherever it may exist, particularly in the Republic of South Africa, as we have already said.

However, the time has now come to provide financial resources for this Organisation to enable it to perform its social tasks and to enable this laboratory of social development that is the I.L.O.—to function normally. I therefore ask you to vote for the budget and not to allow yourselves to be taken in by this fallacious propaganda whose proponents think that their golden opportunity has come—a view in which they are mistaken. The countries of Africa themselves will soon, I am sure, have clarified the issue.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mrs. RODRÍGUEZ HERNANDEZ (Government adviser, Cuba)—Contrary to what has been said and thought by Government and Workers' representatives who have spoken before me, we consider that to discuss and vote on the budget at this time and with such haste is a political act against our African friends who are absent. Therefore the Government delegation of Cuba will not vote for the budget, so as to express once more its fighting spirit of solidarity with the African countries and its opposition to the policy of racial discrimination followed by the Government of South Africa.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. VARA (Government adviser, Ecuador)—The Government delegation of Ecuador feels it imperative from the moral and political point of view to state its position with regard to the issue now under discussion. The Workers' delegate of Ecuador has stated his personal views because he belongs to a small but highly democratic country where people are free to express their ideas and their principles, but the attitude of the Government of Ecuador is, I repeat, one which must be defined in relation to this problem.

We have faith in human dignity. We know full well the unfortunate effects of racial discrimination, but we also have the deepest faith, the deepest belief, in the world-wide human and social task of the I.L.O.; and we are sure that the action of the International Labour Organisation as an institution is essential at this very important time in modern history. We therefore consider that a postponement or suspension of the operation of the financial action of the I.L.O. in its universal mission is incompatible with this mission. Social progress throughout the world cannot be postponed for reasons of a political or a financial character. Social progress must be continuous and permanent. A postponement of the I.L.O.'s activities would amount to an interruption of the social progress which is imperative in the modern world, and therefore, on behalf of the Government delegation of Ecuador, I support the voting of the I.L.O. budget, because its adoption would ensure the continuation of the essential social activities of the I.L.O. in all parts of the world.

Mr. SPARISI (Government delegate, Cyprus)—I represent a very small country in size, but we shall always try to make it a point to make our voice and our will power felt in the international associations devoted to peace. We also belong to a country which is unaligned and our effort
Record Vote on the Resolution Concerning the Adoption of the Budget for the 46th Financial Period (1964) and the Allocation of Expenses among Member States for 1964

The President—We will now proceed to take a record vote on the resolution concerning the adoption of the budget for the 46th financial period (1964) and the allocation of expenses among member States for 1964.

(A record vote is taken.)

The President—The result of the record vote is as follows: 184 votes for, 0 against, with 8 abstentions. This resolution, and, by that, the budget of the I.L.O., have been adopted.

Statement of the Position of the Government of India in Regard to the Participation in the Conference of the Delegation of the Republic of South Africa

The President—I call upon Mr. Routroy, Government delegate, India.

Mr. Routroy (Government delegate, India)—Mr. President, I thank you very much for the opportunity you have given me to clarify my position.

On 18 June 1963 a statement was read out to the Conference which stated the position of ten Asian countries, including India. Following upon that statement, I have been asked by my Government to pledge complete solidarity with the African nations in their just struggle against the criminal policy of racial discrimination followed by the Government of South Africa.

Consistent with our policy and our crusade against racial discrimination, India has always been, and will continue to be, in the ranks of those nations which have struggled to eradicate this evil and to see that any government which practises this evil will find no part amongst the civilised nations of the world in the I.L.O. or in any other organisation.

History is aware of the great ordeals which Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Indian nation, had to pass through in order to focus world attention on this problem and organise civil resistance against apartheid. Over the years we have taken every initiative in condemning apartheid in order to see this disgrace to human dignity removed from our midst without further delay. We therefore identify ourselves completely with this cause, which is as much ours as that of the African countries, and with any struggle to accelerate the process of achieving our common objective.

After giving very careful consideration to the whole situation we have decided that we shall not take part in the work of the Conference until successful steps are taken by the I.L.O. to resolve this crisis. In making this declaration we would like it to be clearly understood that we have no intention of prejudicing the future of the I.L.O., which is making such an important contribution to the promotion

1 See Appendix IV, p. 507, and Appendix XIII, p. 639.
2 The detailed results of the vote will be found on pp. 255-256.
of human rights and to the economic growth of the developing countries. But we feel that the time is propitious for the I.L.O. to rise to the occasion and find a solution to the dangerous problem posed by the continued membership of the Government of the Republic of South Africa in complete disregard of the expressed desire of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organisation.

**Point of Order: Request for Clarification on the Procedure Followed in the Taking of a Record Vote**

The President—I call on Mr. Ionasco, Government delegate, Rumania. Mr. Ionasco, do you want to explain your vote or to put a point of order?

Interpretation from French: Mr. IONASCO (Government delegate, Rumania)—According to article 14 of the Standing Orders and the custom of our Organisation, when somebody asks for the floor on a point of order he is given it at once. I find that article 14 of the Standing Orders provides that: “A delegate may at any time rise to a point of order, which shall be decided forthwith by the President.” I regret that with you in the Chair the Standing Orders have not been respected and I shall say now what I wanted to say when I asked for the floor.

Since things have come to such a pass I now raise this question: On what basis did you exclude the African countries during the voting on the budget? According to the formal declaration made to the Conference by the Government delegate of Nigeria, which is the only document on this matter available to the Conference, “The African delegations... Decide as a sign of protest to abstain from participating further in the deliberations of the 47th Session of the I.L.O. and to address an urgent appeal to all delegates of countries pledged to freedom, justice and peace to show their active support.” I ask you, Mr. President, to tell the Conference on what basis the African countries have been excluded from the vote when, according to the Standing Orders, they are merely abstaining from participating in the proceedings. I await your explanation.

The President—Perhaps you will take your seat; you cannot await my answer here.

Mr. Ionasco says that I did not respect the Standing Orders, but Mr. Ionasco raised a point of order after the voting had started. He has been coming here for several years and must therefore know that while we are voting no point of order can be raised. That is my first remark.

My second remark is that the reason for not calling the African States is that they have declared that they are not taking part in the Conference.

Interpretation from French: Mr. IONASCO—In the opinion of my delegation the reasons given in your explanation are arbitrary. The Constitution and the Standing Orders to which so many references have been made here are not observed. I refer to article 20 of the Standing Orders, paragraph 1 (3) of which lays down that “Any delegate who finally leaves the Conference before its termination and who gives formal notice of his departure to the Secretariat without authorising an adviser to act in his place shall be regarded as no longer attending the Conference for the purpose of calculating the quorum”. This article of the Standing Orders strictly governs the situation in such a case. If you have received any formal declaration on this matter in accordance with the Standing Orders, I would like you to inform the Conference.

The President—May I answer that the information received by the Secretary-General includes official statements made to him by representatives of the delegates concerned who called upon him on their behalf, statements made on behalf of certain of the delegates concerned in the debates in the plenary sittings, and public statements made on the premises of the Conference in facilities made available for the purpose by the Secretary-General of the Conference and in the presence of his representatives.

Interpretation from French: Mr. IONASCO—Once again, I think the Standing Orders give clear guidance in this situation. I cannot accept your interpretation and I consider that this is an arbitrary interpretation of our Constitution.

Now, with your permission, I should like to explain the attitude of our delegation as regards the question of the vote.

Interpretation from French: The President—Very well, you may do so if the Conference agrees.

Interpretation from French: Mr. IONASCO—I think it is my right. As regards the question of the budget which has just been adopted I shall be very brief. I should simply like to say that certain delegates have shown a tendency to interpret the attitude of the socialist countries and particularly the stand taken by my country in a way which does not correspond to the facts. We had proposed that consideration of this item should be postponed, but not because we are against the budget and against the estimates for technical assistance to countries in course of development. In any case, those estimates do not amount to more than 10 per cent. of the budget of the Organisation, but the reason why some delegates interpret our stand in this way is, I think, a different one. We should ask ourselves whether this situation is acceptable when these delegates refer to technical assistance to developing countries and at the same time give assistance by legislative means to the activities of the South African Government which is assassinating the African people. It is another form of assistance which is being granted in that way and I want to say that although there is a lot of talk here about human rights, nevertheless, when our Conference is called upon to take a definite attitude upon this matter people always take refuge in the philosophy and tradition of the I.L.O., and leave the people who are suffering in South Africa to the mercy of the South African Government.
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL: DISCUSSION (cont.)

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue discussion of the Director-General's Report.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. MONTT BALMACEDA (Employers' delegate, Chile)—The Report submitted to us by the Director-General on this occasion is not only a further excellent piece of work in the series which we have had the pleasure of examining each year, but today we are faced with something new and important. The I.L.O. has wisely called a halt and emerged with new life from these reflections ready once more to deal vigorously with the new circumstances which face it, however complex they may be.

On this occasion I shall refer briefly to two points. I have certain observations concerning the first chapter of the Report, and a few words to say on the situation of free enterprise in Chile generally and on the views of the employers of my country with regard to the I.L.O. and what they expect of it.

With regard to the tripartite character of the International Labour Organisation which is mentioned in the Introduction to the Report, and in spite of the repeated approval of these principles by the Conference, we consider that in view of the deplorable infringements which occur it will not be improper for us to stress the fact that this tripartite principle is basic to our Organisation. Any weakening of the principle would deprive the Organisation of its value and, even more serious, it would constitute a failure to recognise the framework in which society must operate towards its complete development.

A proper balance of the forces in society presupposes that, since the object of civil authority is to ensure the common good, such authority cannot, without violating fundamental rights, be exercised outside its appointed field. We are not so ingenuous as to refuse to recognise the tremendous importance of the State in running the social and economic affairs of the modern world. Nor do we ignore the duty of the public authorities in certain circumstances to protect the weakest members of society, but we decidedly and strongly declare that too much government can be detrimental to fundamental rights, especially the rights of free enterprise.

I represent the employers of a young country of 8 million inhabitants. We pride ourselves on our deep-rooted democratic tradition and political stability. Now, under the direction of a sound and capable popular government, it has begun an energetic drive for social welfare. Chilean free enterprise has not remained unmoved by this concern, although it always remains on its guard against the dangers of legislation which may not always be compatible with the spirit of free enterprise.

With regard to labour relations, Chile has advanced and realistic labour legislation. I can say emphatically that Chilean employers appreciate to the full the irreplaceable cooperation of labour. Our employers are always concerned to promote better management so that greater efficiency may be combined with a gradual improvement in the general condition of labour. In Chile there has existed for a number of years a Chilean Management Institute, whose work is an outstanding example of the keen interest shown by the employers of my country in ensuring that there are organisations in which relations between capital and labour, both represented by their human constituents, are as good as possible.

That is why the Chilean employers enthusiastically acclaim the interesting programmes along these lines suggested to us by the Director-General in his Report. I very sincerely thank the I.L.O. for its co-operation with Chile in the technical field, in the fields of vocational training and education, and for the other forms of assistance which we are sure there is still a lot to be done, and we trust that these fields will continue to receive special attention, and that it will be borne in mind that in countries in the course of development adequate practical assistance will be a valuable contribution to the general improvement in standards of living.

With regard to international instruments adopted by the International Labour Organisation, I shall not discuss the matters which have been referred to by Mr. Bergenström and Mr. Mishiro, the Employers' delegates of Sweden and Japan respectively, in the course of this discussion. However, we Chilean employers must emphasise the fact that such instruments, apart from the very praiseworthy intention of recording the universal trend in labour matters, must not be so rigid that their contents become incompatible with national legislation, even if such legislation in the main includes the benefits provided for in those international instruments. What is really serious is that the provisions of these instruments come into conflict even with the social, economic and institutional needs of certain countries in which fundamental rights are exercised without any limitation.

For example, the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations is continually making observations to my country with regard to Convention No. 11 concerning the rights of association and combination of agricultural workers, in spite of the sound arguments which have been put forward within that Committee and which our Government delegate, Mr. Torres Cereceda, has recently expanded with numerous examples. It is, I think, paradoxical that, while my country is receiving observations with regard to alleged failure to recognise certain rights of agricultural workers, the structural reforms undertaken in Chile include primarily agrarian reform, that is to say, measures taken to ensure that an increasingly large number of peasants will have ownership of their land. We respect international standards, but at the same time we are convinced that when it is not possible to apply such standards satisfactorily in all member States, owing to weaknesses in the instruments themselves, even in member
States which respect the essential rights upheld in the community in which the standards are to be applied, these standards are not only inoperative but—and this is much more serious—in most cases they produce the contrary effect to that intended.

In general this, I think, is applicable to all international life, because in the last resort what else is international life if not a dialogue among the nations, and if this dialogue is to take place without a firm resolve among those who take part to put themselves really in the other person's place, can one really speak of a genuine international community? Is it not the essence of any fruitful discussion that each of the parties should do his best to understand what is good in the essential realities of the other, and should generously help to enrich and develop that reality?

The circumstances of this epoch, in which frontiers and distances are being eliminated, lead us to open such a discussion, and we are prepared at any time to open such a discussion, thus facilitating the establishment of peace on earth, to which our beloved Pope John so often referred: Pope John, that wonderful apostle of a God made flesh in the history of this world to unite and save the human family through love.

Mr. Parodi quite rightly observed that Trinidad and Tobago: "The circumstances of this epoch, in which frontiers and distances are being eliminated, lead us to open such a discussion, thus facilitating the establishment of peace on earth, to which our beloved Pope John so often referred: Pope John, that wonderful apostle of a God made flesh in the history of this world to unite and save the human family through love."

The Director-General has again lived up to the tradition, for which he has become known, of providing this Conference with a concise, well-presented and balanced Report on the "Programme and Structure of the I.L.O.". My Government wishes to congratulate him and his staff for the careful amount of work and research which have gone into the production of so worthwhile a document.

A few days ago, in dealing with the crisis that developed, the Director-General, as Secretary-General of this Conference, laid before us a full and frank statement on the South African question. He carefully analysed the position and proposed certain positive measures which, in my view, if reasonably and assiduously pursued, can result in the beginning of a resolute onslaught on the policy of the South African Government and those who practise racialism in any other part of the world. We are all generally agreed that the policies of South Africa offend not only one nation or group of nations but the whole human race, and it behoves us to find practical measures to deal with what is undoubtedly a serious challenge to the world over. Mr. Parodi, my Government in the United Nations proposed positive suggestions to deal with this problem, and based on that approach the suggestions made by the Secretary-General could form a further basis on which this Organisation could pursue its objectives against the policy of apartheid.

With the limited time at my disposal I could only make a rather brief comment on certain aspects of the Report. The entire
Report is of the utmost interest and commands very serious study and discussion. My observations will, however, be confined to those items which at the present time appear to be the areas in which this Organisation, both in its programme and structure, can best be of assistance to countries in the process of developing such as Trinidad and Tobago.

My Government is particularly interested in the ideas contained in Chapter II of the Report, which deals with "Human Resources and Economic Development". The suggestion that the I.L.O. should give special priority in finding answers concerning the measures needed to ensure "the practical success of a human resources development policy" is indeed very welcome. In the language of the Report, my Government also recognises that "more and better training and education, as well as fuller popular support for development, can contribute to economic growth and thus to an expansion of employment".

In a country faced with the task of providing very substantial employment opportunities for a young and fast-growing population, any proposals which could emanate from this Organisation in helping to promote projects and measures for fuller employment would be of considerable assistance.

Note has also been taken of the reference to "development strategy" and the "growth of national economic development planning or programming". In this connection, my Government has already successfully completed its first Five-Year Development Programme and is at present on the threshold of the introduction of a second Five-Year Development Programme. Earlier this year my Government established a National Planning Commission, of which the Minister of Labour is a member, which has been charged with the responsibility "for the formulation of long-term, medium-term and annual plans for the improvement and expansion of the country's material resources; for the fullest development and utilisation of its human resources; and for the economic and social betterment of its people".

To this end, the National Planning Commission, working in consultation with the ministries of Government and, where necessary, with the private sector of the economy, "shall assess the human and material resources of the country and shall set up mutually consistent quantitative targets in both the economic and social fields and measures to achieve such targets".

In pursuance of the goal of the economic and social advancement of Trinidad and Tobago, my Government has established a National Economic Advisory Council comprising representatives from workers' organisations, employers' organisations and other groups such as agricultural societies, credit unions, farmers' associations and friendly societies. This Council will be consulted both in matters relating to economic development and also general matters on which the composition of the Council makes it qualified to deliberate.

Like most other governments new to the international scene, my Government is fully aware that the road of independence will not be devoid of certain difficulties, pitfalls and expansion of the country's material resources, "shall assess the human and material resources of the country and shall set up mutually consistent quantitative targets in both the economic and social fields and measures to achieve such targets".

In pursuance of the goal of the economic and social advancement of Trinidad and Tobago, my Government has established a National Economic Advisory Council comprising representatives from workers' organisations, employers' organisations and other groups such as agricultural societies, credit unions, farmers' associations and friendly societies. This Council will be consulted both in matters relating to economic development and also general matters on which the composition of the Council makes it qualified to deliberate.

Like most other governments new to the international scene, my Government is fully aware that the road of independence will not be devoid of certain difficulties, pitfalls and pressures from one source or another. It recognises, however, that in addition to the understanding and assistance which would be forthcoming from various sources, it can, as in the past, look to this Organisation for assistance and support. We therefore laud the bold proposals contained in the Report as positive means by which this Organisation can be of service to developing countries in maintaining their human resources "to accelerate economic development, and thereby the achievement of other social objectives".

Chapter IV of the Report which deals with "Trade Unions and Labour Relations" is also of significance, and my Government commends the thought that "the I.L.O. should, therefore, devise a strategy of action for the promotion of sound trade union development and viable systems of labour relations in countries pursuing the aims of rapid economic development".

While adhering to the principles of freedom of association for which this Organisation stands, every effort must be exercised towards the development of responsible and strong trade unions, unions which must be prepared to face up to the challenges of responsible thought and action in the pursuit of their aims and objectives. This is equally important for employers and employers' organisations, since they, too, must reassess their own policies and practices in the light of changing world conditions and the need to maintain national stability.

In consultation with the national workers' and employers' organisations my Government is actively pursuing a proposal for the establishment of a Labour College. I am therefore pleased to note the reference to "the development of trade unions in countries wishing to pursue rapid economic development in conditions of freedom". I wish therefore to commend the proposal for the integration of "the I.L.O.'s various instrumentalities of action: international standards, technical cooperation, educational and training activities, research work and the dissemination of information".

My Government agrees with the view that the I.L.O.'s programme in the labour relations field and its ability to help governments, employers and workers to find suitable answers to practical problems in the light of local needs will indeed help to increase the effectiveness of the Organisation, making it an even greater force in the promotion of industrial peace.

The Report has detailed a number of ideas through which the regional work of the Organisation can be both intensified and broadened. In conclusion I must say that Trinidad and Tobago, although small can and will achieve tremendous growth, taking its rightful place in the various international councils such as this august body is, and maintain its small but vital contribution towards international co-operation, the promotion of equality and the achievement
of a world community in which social justice is no longer an aim of policy but a reality.

The PRESIDENT—In agreement with the Vice-Presidents, I have in accordance with article 14, paragraph 10, of the Standing Orders decided to permit the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions to make a statement here. I call upon Mr. Eggermann, as the last speaker at this sitting.

Interpretation from French: Mr. EGGER-MANN (Representative of the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions)—The Report of the Director-General to the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference has given rise to considerable interest everywhere, thanks both to the number and to the importance of the issues it places before us, and I thank the Director-General for his Report.

The I.F.C.T.U. is particularly attached to the principles of freedom of association. We see in Convention No. 87 the standards which are laid down for this. It seems to us that this concept—which is clear and simple—of freedom of association does not come out so clearly in the Director-General's Report. We are convinced that if the I.L.O. continues to make concessions to trade union organisations which are dominated by their governments it will soon forfeit not only its revolutionary tripartite character but also its significance for the working classes. Tripartism means that the workers should be associated in all decisions of the I.L.O. It is not enough for them simply to be consulted. Even committees of experts must not depart from the principle of tripartism lest this lead, in a disguised form, to the "governmentalisation" of the I.L.O. The tripartite principle in no way detracts from the objective knowledge of the experts, whereas the absence of tripartism may well deprive them of the trust they need in order to fulfil their tasks.

We were very concerned in looking through the McNair Report some time ago. We are even more concerned today in looking at the number of governments which intend them­selves to run the trade union organisations. This number is increasing from day to day and a number of countries, such as Dahomey, even make so bold as to boast of the fact from this rostrum.

We are aware of the problems of the trade union movement. We know that it is weak in certain parts of the world. However, we must not forget that some generations ago the trade union movement was weak everywhere, but that did not prevent it from strengthening and playing a considerable role in the social and economic progress of all the industrialised countries.

The free trade union movement, of which the I.F.C.T.U. is an integral part, has drawn instruments within the framework of universal Conventions. This would make it possible, perhaps, to space the International Labour Conferences and to attribute to them the tasks of legislating and of controlling regional acti-

We are convinced that the I.L.O. should do much more to reinforce its action to protect everywhere the free exercise of trade union rights as defined in Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, since otherwise it might aggravate the crisis in which it has been for some years and lose the support of most of the workers of the world. The suggestions made by the Director-General could be supplemented as indicated by the Council of the I.F.C.T.U. at its recent session in Berlin on 18 January 1963.

We must now refer to the comments on workers' education in the Report. Let us make it clear from the outset that for us the training of trade union activists and leaders falls within the competence of the trade union organisa­tions, and must remain with them. It is not up to the I.L.O., or the governments, or the employers to undertake direct action in this field. This concept corresponds to the reso­lution on workers' education in Africa adopted by the First African Regional Conference of the I.L.O. in Lagos in 1960. Where national trade union organisations have not the means to ensure the training of enough trade unionists the international confederations are prepared to help them, but the bulk of the effort of the I.L.O. in the field of workers' education must help to support the efforts of these inter­national confederations and their affiliated or associated national groupings.

Naturally, a part of the I.L.O.'s very small budgetary allocations for workers' education could be devoted to meetings of experts or possibly to the education of training techni­cians, workers' education missions in certain countries where trade unions require such missions, and so forth, but this will always be the smallest part. In this connection we consider we should do much to improve the present practice. That would be one of the best ways for the I.L.O. to strengthen the trade union organisations in a large number of countries.

A number of measures advocated in the Report seem somewhat astonishing: that the I.L.O. should be wary of trying to promote trade union unity, especially in countries where the governments are all too prepared to impose it and suppress trade union freedom; that the I.L.O. should steer clear of any move to generalise the "check-off" system, or the registration of trade union organisations—because according to our experience these means are utilised in a number of countries to exert unjustified control of the trade union movement.

Permit us to say now a few words about the internal problems of the Organisation—first on the Conference and on regionalisation.

The present heritage of Conventions is already great enough to allow for regional­isation. This would partly replace the work of experts on the application of Conventions, because it would make it possible to draw up instruments of regional application. In our opinion the time is now ripe to set up a regional system, making it possible to conclude regional instruments within the framework of universal Conventions. This would make it possible,
vities. Indeed, some progress has been made in regionalisation, but, as the Director-General himself avows, this effort has been over-cautious, since it was not expected to have as much regionalisation as in the framework of the United Nations. If one compares, particularly from the standpoint of financial and personnel resources, the regional structures of the I.L.O. with those of the United Nations and certain other specialised agencies, one will note that the structures of the I.L.O. are clearly insufficient. It is indispensable to strengthen them, not only to meet the needs of increased regional activities but also to avoid the risk that, under the cover of the technical character of its activities or of greater co-ordination with the United Nations and other specialised agencies, the I.L.O. might be led to forget its tripartite make-up, because even in those regions a long way from the Geneva Headquarters tripartism constitutes a basic requirement of our Organisation.

In the same way, the limitation of the Industrial Committees just when these need regionalisation does not seem to us to be an acceptable initiative. We are sure that the problems of regionalisation and the operational programmes could have been solved much more easily if the I.L.O. had had the courage some years ago to set up a European consultative committee and had not left it to other organisations essentially economic in character of its activities or of greater co-ordination with the United Nations and other organisations as understood by the Constitution. The minimum requirements of these organisations as understood by the Constitution. The minimum requirements of these organisations have been established in Conventions No. 87 and No. 98, and the criteria established must govern the work of the Credentials Committee. Otherwise, there is a risk that the Conference, which adopted them, will be acting in contradiction with itself. Acceptance of these by the Credentials Committee does not call for a modification of the Constitution because this can be incorporated into the Standing Orders of the Conference. If the I.F.C.T.U. has not challenged all the credentials it might have done, this was not because it thought that all these were in order, but simply because it did not wish to complicate the discussion on questions of substance, which are difficult enough in themselves.

We urge that this be reflected upon. Let it not be said that this is a question of financial means. The question of the I.L.O. budget is beginning to take on the appearance of a scandal. Perhaps it is because the I.L.O. lacked vision, especially as regards regionalisation, and boldness in defence of its principles, that it has not found among its supporters and member States the necessary sympathy to increase its budget in accordance with its needs.

Finally, let us say a last word about the credentials of delegates to the Conference. Here again we must not forget that the delegations are tripartite. The commission of independent jurists suggested by the Director-General has some attraction when the verification of credentials, and consequently the right to challenge, is extended also to governments. However, whatever organ it is that investigates credentials will hardly be able to modify the present situation unless it has a fundamental law on which to base its jurisprudence.

The rules now in force seem insufficient. So far as the delegates of the most representative workers’ organisations are concerned, they certainly are. As for the verification of credentials, it is necessary to keep in mind the distinction between membership of the I.L.O. and the fact of sending a tripartite delegation to the Conference. In the first case, it is enough for the State in question to declare it will respect the Constitution; in the latter, delegates of employers and workers must be chosen from the most representative industrial organisations where such exist.

It is therefore of the greatest importance to define as clearly as possible what is meant by the most representative industrial organisations. Concerning representativeness we have a ruling by the International Court of Justice which lays down an initial principle of trade union freedom, that is the right to have several trade union movements. This ruling does not bear on the really industrial character of these organisations as understood by the Constitution. The minimum requirements of these organisations have been established in Conventions No. 87 and No. 98, and the criteria established must govern the work of the Credentials Committee. Otherwise, there is a risk that the Conference, which adopted them, will be acting in contradiction with itself. Acceptance of these by the Credentials Committee does not call for a modification of the Constitution because this can be incorporated into the Standing Orders of the Conference. If the I.F.C.T.U. has not challenged all the credentials it might have done, this was not because it thought that all these were in order, but simply because it did not wish to complicate the discussion on questions of substance, which are difficult enough in themselves.

This discussion is not terminated; it has barely begun. We trust it will continue and we intend to send a detailed memorandum to the Director-General to this effect. But let it continue with the firm intention of respecting the most basic principle of the I.L.O., which is tripartism. Even if the I.L.O. is universal it will not be great unless this condition is fulfilled.

I cannot conclude without expressing the full solidarity of the I.F.C.T.U. with the African peoples in their struggle against racial discrimination. The I.F.C.T.U., by virtue of its principles and all its activities, has always rejected racial discrimination wherever it may arise. We trust that the I.L.O. will not fail to take the necessary steps to ensure respect for the equality of everybody in all parts of the world, in all its structures and all its activities. In this action the I.F.C.T.U. will give the I.L.O. its fullest co-operation.

(The Conference adjourned at 6 p.m.)
Record Vote on the Resolution concerning the Adoption of the Budget for the 46th Financial Period (1964) and the Allocation of Expenses among Member States for 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Jamaica</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Villaveiran (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Coln (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Marshall (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Ocampo (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Pico (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Juhl-Christensen (G)</td>
<td>Mr. McPherson (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Josep (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Muro de Nadal (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Land (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Hayot (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Reyes (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alonso (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Nielsen (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Krier (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Hernandez (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Ecuador</th>
<th>Luxembourg</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bland (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Pallares Zaldumbide (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Kayser (G)</td>
<td>Mr. da Motta Veiga (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Furlonger (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Álvarado García (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Wijwertz (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ribeiro da Cunha (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Perrier (E)</td>
<td>Mr. G. de Monfort (C)</td>
<td>Mr. Hayot (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Morales de los Ríos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Monk (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Kuuukkanen (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Haraguichi (W)</td>
<td>Leitão (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Malaya</th>
<th>Republic of South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hempel (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Rinne (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Tambao (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Geyser (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kreun (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Kanerva (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Wong (G)</td>
<td>Mr. de Villiers (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mauter-Markhof (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Hetemäki (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Ubaidul (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Hamilton (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Altenberger (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Bouladoux (W)</td>
<td>Mr. van Tilburg (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Liebenberg (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Servais (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Mönning (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Father Stokman (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Gómez-Acebo y Santos (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Troclet (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ernet (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Beumer (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Azuá (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Verschueren (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Faubel (E)</td>
<td>Mr. van Boeckh (W)</td>
<td>Redondo (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. De Bock (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Boermann (W)</td>
<td>Mr. van Tilburg (W)</td>
<td>Mr. García (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Federal Republic of Germany</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Álvarez Afonso (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Mínguez (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Atkinson (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Holser (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. de Castro (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ernet (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Woods (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Saxon (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gonzales Blanc (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Faubel (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Fonnema (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Rentsch (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Muro de Nadal (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Boermann (W)</td>
<td>Mr. van Tilburg (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Boin (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Haythorne (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Stambelos (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Santos Coy (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Gómez-Acebo y Santos (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mainwaring (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Vilches (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Calderón Puig (G)</td>
<td>Ms. Azuá (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robinson (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Bardas (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Yllanes Ramos (G)</td>
<td>Redondo (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Morris (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Lasaar (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Sánchez Madariaga (W)</td>
<td>Mr. García (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceylon</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Sudan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wijewickerema (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Dupont-Willemijn (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Bull (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lasithiy (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Villela (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Bull (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Bahdan (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robinson (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Lasaar (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Bull (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thondaman (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Sánchez Madariaga (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Bull (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmed (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Torres Cereceda (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Núñez (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Rahaman (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Anil (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Huidobro Domínguez (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Benítez Boniț (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Ashraf (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Onbulak (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Montt Balmaceda (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Ghangour (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Wajid Ali (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Alam (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lennon (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Seyf (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Dölen (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Panama</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jaramillo Arrubla (G)</td>
<td>Mr. MacCarty (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Rivera (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ashraf (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arango (G)</td>
<td>Mr. O'Leary (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Calamari (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Wajid Ali (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Espinosa (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Coffe (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Aizpuru (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Liang (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Fitzpatrick (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Urriola (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Dölen (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Peru</th>
<th>Sudan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rodríguez Arce (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Messer (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Lettes (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. González Quirós (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Paduá (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Gonzalez Rosales (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmed (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gutiérrez Matarrita (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Hausman (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Aparicio Valdez (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. González Cubero (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Becker (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Aguilar Ladron de Guevara (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Peru</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sarris (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ago (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Lettes (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Shevket (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Payá (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Gonzalez Rosales (G)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmed (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Theoharides (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Campanella (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Aparicio Valdez (E)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ziafetides (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Marassa (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Aguilar Ladron de Guevara (W)</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmad (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See p. 248.
Venezuela:  
Mr. Aguilar (G)  
Mr. Dao (G)  
Mr. Martínez Espino (E)  
Mr. González Navarro (W)

Viet-Nam:  
Mr. Nguyễn (G)  
Mr. Phan (G)  
Mr. Trần (E)  
Mr. Đạm (W)

Against (0)

Abstentions (8)

Brasil:  
Mr. Stafford da Silva (W)

Ecuador:  
Mr. Zúñiga Garzón (W)

Burma:  
Mr. Tun Tin (G)  
Mr. Htaik (G)  
Mr. Maung (E)  
Mr. Maung Tin (W)

Indonesia:  
Mr. Godjali (G)  
Mr. Samil (G)
EIGHTEENTH SITTING

Friday, 21 June 1963, 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Dreyer

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE REGARDING RESOLUTIONS MOVED UNDER THE URGENCY PROCEDURE

The President—The first point on the agenda is a statement by the President of the Conference regarding resolutions moved under the urgency procedure, and the statement is as follows:

The Officers of the Conference have considered, in accordance with article 17, paragraph 2, of the Standing Orders, whether to permit the resolutions handed in at the thirteenth sitting on Tuesday morning, 18 June, by the Government delegates of Latin America and by Mr. Bouladoux, to be moved as a matter of urgency. Four meetings of the Officers were held to consider the question. The Government Vice-President was absent from the first of these meetings, and the second and third were adjourned at his request. At a meeting held on 20 June, the President and the Employers' and Workers' Vice-Presidents approved the moving of these resolutions. As the Government Vice-President withheld his concurrence, the resolutions cannot be considered under article 17 of the Standing Orders.

Before I call on the first speaker, I should like to say to delegates of the Conference that the resolutions are not before the Conference. Therefore, the substance of the resolutions cannot be discussed.

I call on Mr. Mori, Chairman of the Workers' group of the Conference.

Interpretation from French: Mr. Mori (Workers' delegate, Switzerland; Chairman of the Workers' group of the Conference)—Following your statement, I have one to make to the Conference. During an extraordinary meeting held yesterday evening at 5.30 p.m., the Workers' group of the Conference was informed by the Workers' Vice-President of the substance of the matter which has just been communicated to us on the resolutions submitted to the Conference under the urgency procedure provided for in the Standing Orders. With the exception of one vote, the Workers' group of the Conference unanimously asked me to tell this assembly of its great indignation concerning the dilatory procedure shown by Mr. Slipchenko, the Government Vice-President of the Conference. They also asked me to protest particularly against the veto which the Government Vice-President proposed concerning the receivability of the two resolutions submitted under this urgency procedure.

The first of these resolutions wished to set up again the machinery of the United Nations to eradicate apartheid. The other resolution went further, because it called for the placing on the agenda of the 48th International Labour Conference of a proposal to give the I.L.O. the authority to exclude completely, or temporarily, any State violating fundamental human rights.

During this Conference the representatives of the communist countries have indulged in noisy demonstrations of solidarity vis-à-vis the African countries that are victims of the abominable practice of apartheid, but when it was a question of moving from political propaganda to action the Communists shirked this responsibility, as has been demonstrated by the obstinate obstruction by the Government Vice-President of the Conference.

This systematic obstruction can no doubt be accounted for by the fact that the Communists feel that they can succeed in their imperialistic aims only in conditions of universal discontent, anarchy and disorder.

The Workers' group, as in the past, offers its full support to all those who, within the framework of the I.L.O. Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Conference, are prepared to help effectively the emergent countries, in particular the developing countries of Africa, to face up to the difficult problems—economic or social—before them. The Workers' group will co-operate with all those who are endeavouring to liberate certain peoples from the yoke of totalitarianism and from all forms of oppression and discrimination. The Workers' group is aware of the enormous contribution that the I.L.O. can make to this gradual triumph of a lasting peace based on social justice. That is why our Workers' group will always resolutely defend the International Labour Organisation.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. Calamar (Government delegate, Panama)—When we heard yesterday afternoon in the Selection Committee of the fate of the resolution submitted by the Latin American countries we could not fail to express our astonishment, first of all, our disagreement, and finally our protest at the position taken by the Government Vice-
President at the meeting of the Officers of the Conference, for this attitude made it impossible for our resolution to reach this assembly. Our resolution, we consider, was a positive approach to the very serious problem which had faced this Organisation in the last few days.

Having explained our position, I put a question, through the Chairman of the Committee, to the Government Vice-President. I asked if he would be good enough to tell us his reasons for stating that this resolution from the Latin American countries was not a matter of urgency.

Shyly, he gave the delegations present, including my own, considered that the Government Vice-President did not give a reply at all, let alone a satisfactory one, to the question put to him by myself on behalf of the Government delegation of Panama.

The Government Vice-President, incidentally, was called to order on a point of order in the meeting of the Selection Committee because his own speech was an anti-colonialist speech from the Latin American delegations present. He did not put forward this proposal before, it was anaemic. That means that his first answer. The delegation of Panama considers that he did reply in substance, for in his speech one found the answers.

The first was that the resolution was too late. The second was that our resolution was submitted when the African delegates were not in the Conference. The third reply was that it was an anaemic resolution (I do not remember the word but I understood him to mean that it was feeble). The fourth reply I shall mention later, at the end of my speech. I would like to analyse the first answer. The delegation of Panama considers that it was not too late, because in a delicate situation and in a moment of urgency, if you really want to solve the problem, any proposal is opportune.

Secondly, if the Latin American delegates did not put forward this proposal before, it was because we were studying the situation carefully, having regard to and respecting the position of our African friends. First it was for them to say their last word. If for any reason that did not lead to a solution, it would be for us to act and to offer our help. We knew that the Director-General had made a series of proposals to the African delegations and that they were holding meetings in order to study these. In these circumstances the Latin American delegations could do nothing and they had to wait, expecting our African friends to state their decision on the Director-General's proposals, so that we could act on lines which we considered the most just and constructive.

The proposal came at the precise time at which it had to be made, when the other proposals made did not seem to be likely to lead to a solution. I repeat that in an anxious moment such as we were placed in, any proposal is opportune, none is too late.

Secondly, the Government Vice-President said that this was a feeble resolution, an anaemic resolution. That means that his first argument had no validity because, being feeble, the proposal had been submitted at the appropriate moment, according to the Government Vice-President it would not have been valid. We insist that it was valid, because it was not the last word. We do not claim that the document is perfect. But we wished this document to come before the Conference and be discussed here, so that the Ukrainian delegation and other delegations from Eastern Europe could co-operate in order that this anaemic proposal might be made stronger and might become a powerful instrument for reaching a solution.

The door was open for discussion. We were prepared to accept all recommendations and amendments that might be proposed. This frank discussion which would have strengthened our resolution has been blocked by the Government Vice-President's action. We might in fact have provided a sound solution for the problem.

So I reject the argument that the resolution was anaemic.

Then the Government delegate of Ukraine, who is the Government Vice-President, said that we were tired of resolutions calling for study of the matter. I agree with that. But I believe that the reason is the fact that we have not co-operated so that the studies made through the resolutions that have been adopted, both here and in the United Nations, might come into force and have effect. They have remained at the stage of study because we have not co-operated and not accepted them as a preliminary to action.

Although the resolution adopted last year in the United Nations dealt with the matter, it left the measures to be taken in the hands of member States. You will remember that after expressing regret that the Government of South Africa had not had regard to the reiterated recommendations of the United Nations, both the General Assembly and the Security Council, to reject apartheid, the resolution asks States Members to take action such as breaking off diplomatic relations, closing their harbours to South African vessels and taking legislative action, and so on, so it was left in the hands of the States themselves.

Then a special committee was to be set up made up of representatives of member States to be appointed by the President of the Assembly. Among the terms of reference for this committee was one (in paragraph 8) that action should be taken, including sanctions, to oblige South Africa to give effect to the resolutions of the United Nations and of the Security Council on the matter and, if necessary, to consider giving effect to article 6 of the Charter. That was left to the Security Council. On the other hand, our resolution, because it is an urgency resolution, calls for a meeting of the Security Council within a brief period, for it says that in the next session—that is to say urgently—at its next session the Security Council should take the matter up as an urgent measure. After a number of introductory paragraphs stating, inter alia, that the I.L.O. had no provision in its Constitution enabling a member State to be expelled, whereas the Charter of the United Nations does have such a provision, article 6, which says that "A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation by the Security Council"
We say that in the introduction to our re-
solution because we want the Security Council
to conform to the Charter. You may say that the preamble of an international in-
strument or of a resolution does not have legal
force, but I insist, as many who speak with
authority, that it does have mandatory force
within the total context of the instrument, be-
cause the resolution itself is inspired by, or
better, based on, the spirit of the preamble.
You have to apply the mandatory part in the
spirit of the preamble.

The Security Council, when deciding, will
therefore have taken into account article 6,
which is referred to in our preamble which refers
to the urgent situation. I insist that the
Security Council and the General Assembly will
be in a position to take definite action in their
next sessions.

This was not the case with the United
Nations resolution which I have just analysed,
and which was mentioned by the Ukrainian
Government delegate in the Selection Com-
mitee last night.

I should like also to point out that the at-
titude to be taken by the Security Council and
the General Assembly would have had an
effect in all the specialised agencies. As it is the
mother organisation its effects would have been
universal. The door has been closed, also, to a
solution which would have been valuable for
the international community.

The Ukrainian Government delegate said
also that the resolution had been submitted
when our African friends were absent. That
is not true really : they were here in the meet-
ing when we submitted our resolution and they
had been informed of it. We do not attack the
African attitude because it seemed to us to be
in accordance with their own arguments. We
ourselves wished to make a proposal which was
constitutionally possible in this Organisation.

But even if the proposal had been put forward
in the absence of the African delegations, does
the problem of apartheid in South Africa affect
only the African countries? No, gentlemen.
I do not agree on this matter with the Govern-
ment delegate of Ukraine. The practice of apar-
thed, which is a very serious violation of human
rights, is a problem which affects the whole
international community; and therefore it is
proper that we here should seek a proper
solution for it even in the absence of our
African colleagues—and they, I think, should
recognise the rightness of such an action.

I suggest therefore that this problem is not
restricted to the African Continent, and that
we do not say that because the Africans are not
present we cannot seek a solution. You can
seek a solution, because it is a matter
affecting the conscience of all mankind and
therefore, whatever solution we find, if it
satisfies them, it will also satisfy the world and
the international community.

I should like to say once more, as I said in
the Selection Committee, that we regret the
step which has been taken because it points to
the introduction of a veto in this Organi-
sation. Whatever may be the harm in the United
Nations until the General Assembly declared that it would have authority
to act if the Security Council was blocked by
a veto. If the veto were reasonable there might
perhaps be something to be said for it, but
when it is used for political reasons only it is
an instrument which deserves repudiation by
all.

I hope that the day will come when, in a
more democratic manner, we shall reform our
Constitution so that a case in which there is
a lack of unanimity can be brought before a
plenary sitting of the Conference, in order
that a decision can be taken upon it and so
that the attitude of one man, the desire of a
single person, even if he is a Vice-President or
President, cannot be imposed on the majority
of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT—Before calling on the
next speaker I should like to repeat what I
said earlier: that the two resolutions are not
before the Conference and that the substance
of the two resolutions cannot be discussed by
the Conference. That means also that the
movers of the resolutions cannot present the
content of the resolutions to the Conference.
Mr. Calamari went, perhaps, a little too far
in that direction.

Mr. ROBINSON (Employers' delegate, Ca-
 nada; Vice-President of the Conference)—
There is no need for me to emphasise the
importance of the remarks which have been
made and which will be made with reference
to the statement of the President. My purpose
in talking is to add some rather unlovely flesh
to the sturdy bones of his statement. I should
like to give a recital of the events which took
place, in somewhat more detail than you have
heard.

As the President has said, the Government
Vice-President was not present at the first
meeting which was held on the 18th. The
next meeting was held at 9.30 on the morning
of the 19th, and all the Officers of the Con-
ferece were present. That meeting could not
do more than undertake a general discussion
of the resolutions before it, because the
Government Vice-President insisted upon a
Russian translation of the resolutions. The
next meeting was held late that afternoon,
following a meeting of the Selection Committee.
At that meeting the Officers of the Conference,
except the Government Vice-President, were
prepared to take a decision. That decision we
could not take because of Mr. Slipchenko's
point that a press conference was then being
held by the African delegations, that we did
not know the outcome or what was being
talked about at that press conference and that,
quite conceivably, the developments of that
press conference could affect the decisions
of the Officers of the Conference. I must say
that Mr. Slipchenko was the only one who
held that opinion, but, in view of the fact that
unanimity is required for a decision to transmit
the resolutions to the Selection Committee for
action, there was nothing that we could do
but accept his proposal that we postpone
further discussion until the following day.
We met at 9.30 and, again at Mr. Slip-
chenko's request the meeting was adjourned
until 12.30 yesterday, 20 June. At that meeting
the decision was taken of which you are aware.
I do not think I need to emphasise that the
failure to transmit the resolution to the Selec-
tion Committee came as a shock and a surprise to all the Officers who heard Mr. Slipchenko's statement. Naturally we were interested in his reasons. I must say that Mr. Slipchenko and the other Officers agreed that it was not the function of the Conference Officers to pass judgment on the merits of the resolutions, only to determine whether they related to matters of urgency.

Here we tried to find out just what his reasons were for vetoing the reference to the resolutions of the Selection Committee. I hope that I am being fair in this, but my notes indicate that there were four reasons that he gave.

First, that there was a proposal before the Conference to adjourn and in those circumstances it would be idle to present the resolutions to the Selection Committee for action until that matter had been settled.

Secondly—and this is not entirely consistent with the attitude that there should be no judgment on the merits of the resolutions—that the resolutions had no substance.

Thirdly, there was an implication that the resolutions were moved for the purpose of saving some national reputations.

Fourthly, the point was made, and emphasised, that the subject-matter of the resolutions had been debated at great length two years previously and that it was no longer of importance to continue to debate them.

Again, I repeat, these points came to us as a great surprise.

Some direct questions were asked of Mr. Slipchenko. He was asked, did he consider that the subject-matter of the resolutions was not a matter of urgency? His direct answer to the question was that they were not matters of urgency. He was then asked directly, was he voting that they should not be received and transmitted to the Selection Committee and he said directly that he was so voting. After that there was nothing much the Officers could do but report the results of the discussion.

As I say, these things came to us as a great surprise. We wondered just exactly how they happened to come about. It seems to us—or to me at least—that it forms part of a pattern which has been developed by Mr. Slipchenko, in consultation with his confrères from the countries of Eastern Europe. I think other delegates have noted this pattern, and one of them has very appropriately referred to it as an orchestration. Certainly the parts seem to fit together. If this is the case it would seem that the veto of the transmittal of the resolutions to the Selection Committee is a movement in a 1963 concerto of discord.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BOULA-DOUX—I wonder how members of the Conference can assess or appreciate the observations made by the Government Vice-President when he advocated rejection of the urgent character of this resolution. How can members of the Conference appreciate that if they are not aware of the text?

The PRESIDENT—I have repeatedly said that the resolutions are not before the Conference and that means that the text of the resolutions cannot be presented to the Conference by the movers.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BOULA-DOUX—I would like to refer to the statement you made which tells us that the Government Vice-President does not think the consideration of these resolutions is urgent; that is, he opposed the urgency procedure for these resolutions. I would like to know what is the point of this discussion for the members of the Conference if they are not at least acquainted with the text of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT—You will have to accept my ruling.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BOULA-DOUX—I would like you to tell by what other means than from this rostrum I am to inform members of the Conference. Do you wish me to make a categorical statement? I ask how it is possible for me, except from this rostrum, to tell the members of the Conference what was the text of my resolution.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BOULA-DOUX—I shall therefore confine myself to explaining why I do not agree with the attitude taken up by the Government Vice-President. I must ask the members of the Conference to excuse me if these explanations are not clear, since they have not the text of my resolution before them.

When these discussions took place we were all very much upset and there were very varied reactions. Some members of the Conference made verbal statements from the platform. Others walked out after the African delegates. I myself thought it was more appropriate to submit a resolution which would avoid a repetition of such a situation in the future.

This resolution the Government Vice-President considered to be unsuitable for the urgency procedure although the Vice-President in question had been among those who demonstrated most noisily by every possible means their solidarity with the African peoples; a solidarity which, I repeat, took the form solely of verbal statements or movements in the lobbies of the Conference. But at the stage when two texts—you have fortunately heard the excellent resolution submitted by Mr. Calamari—were submitted and would have enabled the Conference to express its solidarity positively and practically, when this could have led
to proceedings that would have prevented the recurrence of such demonstrations, then the Government Vice-President, who had been so noisy in his support for the African States, stated that this was not urgent and simply not relevant. I think this is completely illogical.

I will not go into the details of the arguments put forward by Mr. Calamari and Mr. Robinson, but it is a fact that Mr. Slipchenko’s remarks when he refused to consider these resolutions as urgent were inadequate, illogical and thoroughly paradoxical. That he should tell us that we must refer to substantive resolution and, at the same time, say that it is not urgent—

that, I think, is contrary to common sense and is absolutely illogical. That he should also tell us that nothing was done about the 1961 resolution and therefore there was no point in adopting a resolution; that he should have refused to consider a resolution which is drafted precisely in such terms that it would be bound to secure results, since it was a matter of enabling a State to be expelled temporarily or permanently if it persistently and deliberately violated the fundamental principles of human rights which are fundamental to the I.L.O.,

that, I repeat, seems to me contrary to common sense and completely illogical.

We drew up this resolution, in fact, because we had found that since 1961 no real action had been taken on the resolution then voted. Why had it not been acted on? Simply because the Constitution (and that was the first and essential paragraph of my preamble) had no clause which allowed disciplinary action to be taken against such States, as was proved by the absence of any action taken on the 1961 resolution.

I think that the stand taken by the Ukrainian Government Vice-President is illogical. On the one hand he says no action was taken on the 1961 resolution and, on the other, he refuses to give immediate consideration to a resolution which would automatically ensure that action would be taken, by revision of the Constitution. I think that is a thoroughly illogical attitude.

Perhaps the strongest argument is to say that these resolutions were anaemic. Mr. Calamari defended his resolution but I have not been able to read mine, so you do not know the content. But I wonder whether the opposition of the Government Vice-President was not due to the fact that my resolution, far from being anaemic, was perhaps too vigorous. Perhaps some people would not have adopted it enthusiastically: after all we all condemn apartheid and the violation of human rights, whatever form they may take and wherever they occur. It might well, in certain cases, affect countries other than the Republic of South Africa.

I do not want to go outside the terms of reference of this discussion, but if you had the text of my resolution you might perhaps understand why Mr. Slipschenko described it as anaemic, in order to find some reason to reject it, because in fact certain aspects of it made him uneasy.

It has also been said that we wished to make this an issue of prestige. No; that is proved by the fact that I waited until the African delegates had assumed their own responsibilities and taken a stand before I came to the rostrum to put this resolution. I made a mistake in not reading it at the time, but I wanted to make it clear that I was not bringing the slightest pressure to bear on the Africans. It was not blackmail; I wanted to allow them to take their own decisions. We might have hoped that others would have walked out, those who have prevented the normal working of the Conference. It is not an issue of prestige for us but of a desire to obtain some result.

What is the position now? Are we going to break up without taking positive and concrete action, having done no more than assert our solidarity in words? Are we going to find another way of asserting our solidarity with the African nations? Cannot the discussion be improved, a formula devised? I am not qualified in procedural matters, but I cannot believe there are not some people here in this hall who could find means of reviving (if I may use the word) one of the resolutions or devising a new one.

I should like to say, like Mr. Calamari, that as far as I am concerned and also so far as the Workers’ group is concerned for whom I believe I can speak, we are ready to make a great effort at reconciliation so that an undisputed text may be adopted, a concrete and positive resolution, and not just words and advice laid end to end.

I shall conclude by expressing the hope, mingled with a certain amount of disquiet, that this Conference will not break up without having taken these positive and practical steps to demonstrate its solidarity, without having shown a real wish to find some means of making it understood once and for all that the practice of such racial policies is absolutely incompatible with membership of any organisation in the United Nations family.

I think that the stand taken by the Ukrainian Government Vice-President is illogical. On the one hand he says no action was taken on the 1961 resolution and, on the other, he refuses to give immediate consideration to a resolution which would automatically ensure that action would be taken, by revision of the Constitution. I think that is a thoroughly illogical attitude.

Perhaps the strongest argument is to say that these resolutions were anaemic. Mr. Calamari defended his resolution but I have not been able to read mine, so you do not know the content. But I wonder whether the opposition of the Government Vice-President was not due to the fact that my resolution, far from being anaemic, was perhaps too vigorous. Perhaps some people would not have adopted it enthusiastically; after all we all condemn apartheid and the violation of human rights, whatever form they may take and wherever they occur. It might well, in certain cases, affect countries other than the Republic of South Africa.

I do not want to go outside the terms of reference of this discussion, but if you had the text of my resolution you might perhaps understand why Mr. Slipschenko described it as anaemic, in order to find some reason to reject it, because in fact certain aspects of it made him uneasy.

It has also been said that we wished to make this an issue of prestige. No; that is proved by the fact that I waited until the African delegates had assumed their own responsibilities and taken a stand before I came to the rostrum to put this resolution. I made a mistake in not reading it at the time, but I wanted to make it clear that I was not bringing the slightest pressure to bear on the Africans. It was not blackmail; I wanted to allow them to take their own decisions. We might have hoped that others would have walked out, those who have prevented the normal working of the Conference. It is not an issue of prestige for us but of a desire to obtain some result.

What is the position now? Are we going to break up without taking positive and concrete action, having done no more than assert our solidarity in words? Are we going to find another way of asserting our solidarity with the African nations? Cannot the discussion be improved, a formula devised? I am not qualified in procedural matters, but I cannot believe there are not some people here in this hall who could find means of reviving (if I may use the word) one of the resolutions or devising a new one.

I should like to say, like Mr. Calamari, that as far as I am concerned and also so far as the Workers’ group is concerned for whom I believe I can speak, we are ready to make a great effort at reconciliation so that an undisputed text may be adopted, a concrete and positive resolution, and not just words and advice laid end to end.

I shall conclude by expressing the hope, mingled with a certain amount of disquiet, that this Conference will not break up without having taken these positive and practical steps to demonstrate its solidarity, without having shown a real wish to find some means of making it understood once and for all that the practice of such racial policies is absolutely incompatible with membership of any organisation in the United Nations family.
Can we describe any condemnation of *apartheid*, not only condemnation but a demand for the eradication of *apartheid*, as not being urgent? Of course it is urgent, extremely urgent. It is because the resolutions mentioned, although they were submitted to us under the urgency procedure, do not insist on the measures which should be taken urgently that they do not provide a solution to these problems.

Yes, today *apartheid* is the most ferocious fascist form of discrimination and racial oppression. It has been raised to the level of a national policy. *Apartheid* is not something new. It has existed for years now. Is it something new for the International Labour Organisation? No, it is not. The matter was brought up in a concrete form two years ago. What has been done in those two years to satisfy the legitimate demands of the Africans? A very convincing answer to this has been given by the Africans themselves in this hall—we heard it two days ago—a very impassioned and convincing answer. What was said? What did they demand? They demanded that, once and for all, an end should be put to the policy of *apartheid*, this blot on the escutcheon of mankind.

I am deeply convinced myself that the action taken by the African delegates here was perfectly justified. It was a natural reaction. It was a very burning and meaningful form of protest.

Why did they act in this way? Well, as I see things, the political inertia of the I.L.O., as is witnessed by these fruitless two years, induced the Africans to do what they did, to take the step which they took here.

Now, what position do we find ourselves in at this time? Yesterday I stated, and I think correctly, that our Conference has been amputated. I think the word is appropriate. Just look around you. I think you have a very potent demonstration of this amputation. Look how our ranks are depleted: is this not amputation of the Conference? Clearly so. Thus, our Conference, as we see clearly, has ceased to be a representative body.

Those who have come to this rostrum before me this morning have defended a policy which is completely unjustified, which tends to avoid, under various pretexts, giving effect to the 1961 resolution. They have closed their eyes to the fact that this is a resolution which has already been in existence for two years.

What do the Africans themselves say in this connection? They made their position and their demands perfectly clear in the declaration of the representatives of African countries which was read out here from this platform by Mr. Johnson. In this declaration they stated “... that it has been proved definitely that these elementary principles”—freedom, human rights, etc.—“are being violated daily in the Republic of South Africa to the detriment of the indigenous population by arbitrary arrest, detention and exile, and also by the violation of other fundamental freedoms proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.”

The Africans tell us this themselves. What have we heard this morning from the representative of Panama, the author of one of the resolutions? I will not quote from the resolu-

tion, but the gist of his proposal is that we should study the situation. How can we study something that is quite clear? What is the point of doing so? Surely the Africans are in a better position than the representative of Panama, which is quite a long way from Africa, to understand the situation on the African Continent. The Africans say it has been decisively shown, decisively proved, and now you want to start to study the position. What is the point? The time has come to act upon the Africans’ suggestions.

Further, in the declaration the African delegations referred—and this is very important—to the “passive and inadmissible attitude adopted by the executive authorities of the I.L.O.”. Does not this attempt to get a resolution adopted now imply that an effort is being made, for reasons of prestige, to save face, to be wise after the event?

At the press conference that was held here the African delegations stated quite clearly that they were against a resolution and you who claim to be speaking on behalf of the Africans say that you are in favour of it. But if you respect the wishes of the people you call your African friends—we often hear those words “our African friends” here—why are you going against their wishes? Why are you trying to replace the 1961 resolution by a new one, an anaemic one—that is the adjective that has been used here? Such a resolution would be tantamount to a retreat for our Conference. It would mean that we are not tackling this very important question.

I regret Mr. Faupl’s remark yesterday, when the temperature was high, as Mr. Aga said, to the effect that he did not know whether this plan was worked out in Lagos or in Moscow. I would say to Mr. Faupl, who is one of my colleagues among the Officers of the Conference, that this is an insult to the peoples of Africa. They are no longer wearing napkins; these are politically mature people who know what they are about. They have ancient civilisations behind them—civilisations perhaps even more ancient than some of those represented by certain delegates here. However, I do not wish to injure any country. Every civilisation has contributed its share to the total heritage of mankind. We would not mind if it were said that that is the case in Moscow, in Kiev and in other towns, because throughout our country there is unanimous support for the struggle against colonialism. We are all in favour of the final liquidation of colonialism wherever it may occur.

The PRESIDENT—Would you please conclude your remarks as soon as possible.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. SLIPCHENKO—I shall try to comply with your request. Perhaps I am in a somewhat privileged position since I am answering several speakers.

Those are my reasons for voting against these resolutions being presented here, because I find this camouflage unacceptable. We read here about the need to refer this question to the Security Council in one of the resolutions. It is too late to do this; the Africans themselves
have done it already. There is no point in repeating what has already been done.

In connection with what Mr. Bouladoux said about the prestige of certain countries, I would say to him that the fight is now on other grounds. This legitimate struggle of the African peoples will certainly end in complete triumph, and I wish them every success in their valiant fight.

Mr. FAUPL (Workers' delegate, United States; Vice-President of the Conference)—As has already been explained by the President, I voted with the President and the Vice-President from the Employers' group in favour of the receivability of the resolution. I voted with them in the conviction that we had not done enough and that more must be done, but that it must be done by orderly procedure and not in an attempt to destroy the Constitution and Standing Orders of this Organisation.

In the course of discussing the receivability, Mr. Slipchenko, who referred to me by name several times, made the statement that there was no longer any urgency and that it was therefore not necessary to deal with this resolution. What has happened in South Africa since last week? Has apartheid suddenly disappeared since last week, that there is no longer any urgency? You know that last week we had a demonstration. My group joined in that demonstration, and if I had not been in the Chair I too would have joined my group in that demonstration. So at least I do not have dual standards.

It is not only a question of South Africa; it is a question of human rights in other parts of the world. I shall not go into the details of the resolution as the Chair has made it plain that we must not discuss the substance of it. There is, however, the question of human rights in other parts of the world. Millions of people behind the "wall of shame" are being suppressed by those who claim that they are bringing a new type of democracy to the I.L.O. If this democracy is so successful, why do they have to have a wall? A system which wants to conquer the world should not have to shut itself up in brick walls.

I very much regret that we could not get unanimity. Mr. Slipchenko pointed out that the resolution was anaemic because it did not go far enough, and therefore it was not considered urgent. As I told Mr. Slipchenko last night, if the resolution was anaemic those points which he thought were anaemic could have been strengthened in a discussion before the appropriate committee and by amendment. This is something which was not explained. You know what has taken place. Mr. Slipchenko and his associates, who have referred to the Constitution of the I.L.O. and its by-laws as pieces of paper, availed themselves of those pieces of paper when it was opportune to make a "one-man troika", if you please, and those who want to do something are paralysed by that one person. Is this what we call democracy? I say to you, if the resolution was anaemic, then I think your delegation ought to wire home to Moscow for a blood transfusion in support of the arguments you have used in preventing this Conference from considering a resolution which was submitted in good faith and confidence to help the oppressed people of South Africa.

The PRESIDENT—I have no further speakers on my list. The Conference will take note of the statement made by the President of the Conference.

First and Second Reports of the Credentials Committee 1: Submission and Noting

The PRESIDENT—We will now proceed to the next point on the agenda. I call on the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, Mr. Barboza-Carneiro, to come to the rostrum and present the first and second reports of the Credentials Committee.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO (Government delegate, Brazil; Chairman of the Credentials Committee)—I have the honour to submit to the Conference the first report of the Credentials Committee, which has been circulated.

You will find a section dealing with the composition of the Conference and the quorum. You will also find the decisions of the Credentials Committee regarding objections to the nomination of the Chinese delegation, the Workers' delegate of France and the Workers' delegate of Israel. You will also find the Committee's observations on the communications concerning the Workers' delegations of Chile and Uruguay.

The decisions were all unanimous, so that the Conference only needs to take note of this report.

I will now submit to the Conference the second report of the Credentials Committee, which has been distributed. This report contains the Committee's decisions regarding the objection to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Cyprus, the Workers' delegation of Spain, and the Workers' delegation of Portugal.

In this case also the decisions were all unanimous, and so the Conference is asked merely to take note of the report.

The PRESIDENT—These reports of the Credentials Committee are both unanimous, as the Chairman of the Credentials Committee has said. The Conference will therefore take note of these two reports.

(The reports are noted.)

Third Report of the Credentials Committee 2: Submission, Discussion and Noting

The PRESIDENT—I ask Mr. Barboza-Carneiro, Chairman of the Committee, to submit the third report of the Credentials Committee.

1 See Appendix II, pp. 469, 472.
2 See Appendix II, p. 474.
Mr. LIEBENBERG (Workers' delegate, Republic of South Africa)—I regret to have to intervene, but I think it is an unreasonable ruling to tell people to vote unless they have heard the argument preceding the vote and I would request that the Chairman give another ruling. I would move that the discussion of the minority report be suspended until such time as all delegates can be present. I think they should hear the argument before they are required to vote.

The PRESIDENT—It is a matter of time. We are late and it is necessary for the committees to work. I think it would be desirable to continue here without disturbing the work of the committees before it is necessary, that is to say, when the vote is taken. Therefore I ask Mr. Sánchez Madariaga to go on.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA (Workers' delegate, Mexico; member of the Credentials Committee)—The minority report which I am taking the liberty of submitting to the Conference in very summary form gives the main reasons which led me to submit this minority report.

In my opinion there are new developments, events and important resolutions, such as that adopted by the United Nations after the last session of the Conference, and these enable the Workers' member of the Credentials Committee to take the view that since there are new facts it is also possible to rely on those facts and to take a decision different from that taken last year. Therefore, I consider that this year we have reasons for adopting the findings which I am submitting to you, particularly having regard to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in the month of November. On 6 November 1962 the Assembly drew the attention of all member States to the need to take measures that would put an end to the situation existing in South Africa as a result of the action of the Government of South Africa, which continues to neglect totally its obligations under the United Nations Charter. This resolution states that this contempt is also a deliberately aggravating factor in the racial issue, since increasingly ruthless measures are being applied and they are accompanied by violence and bloodshed.

I consider that when the General Assembly of the United Nations, the principal world body, took cognizance of this resolution it undoubtedly had all the evidence and had undoubtedly carried out all the investigations that enabled it to reach the conclusion it did. If it is true that the prevailing situation is increasingly serious, so much so that, as stated in paragraph 3, international peace and security are endangered, then I consider that we cannot ignore these resolutions, which are a sufficient basis to establish that there are very important new facts which enable the Committee, or at least the Workers' member, to come to an objective decision that the situation is not the same as in previous years.
Moreover, the Credentials Committee itself in previous years has drawn the attention of the South African Government to the fact that it should consult the most representative of the workers' organisations of that country when it appoints the Workers' delegate to this Conference, and the South African Government has also neglected these recommendations. In reply to a special request made by the Credentials Committee this year it replied that it had not consulted the South African Congress of Trade Unions. We feel we cannot continue asking them indefinitely to make such consultations. We must take a more definite attitude in defence of the dignity and respectability of the Organisation.

Moreover, their insistence in not accepting the recommendation of the Conference that they should withdraw from our Organisation is also, in my opinion, a fact which shows that this Government does not want on any account to give our Organisation the respect which its decisions deserve.

Similarly, I greatly regret that there should have been no formal objection to the actual Government delegates and that the only objections should have been to the credentials of the Workers' delegate. If there had been such a formal objection to the credentials of the Government delegates, I would have been even more pleased to state my opinion that the credentials of this delegation should be invalidated, because it is fundamentally the Government of this country which is responsible for the policy of discrimination which is now being followed, and therefore I request all members of the Conference who are in this hall to approve this minority report which will mean that, in accordance with our Standing Orders and Constitution, it will be possible to take positive action in relation to the intransigent attitude of the South African Government and to compel it to withdraw from our Organisation.

Mr. PERERA (Employers' adviser, Malaga; member of the Credentials Committee)—May I start by saying that I share with the Chairman of this Committee the same regret that we could not join Mr. Sánchez Madariaga, Workers' member of the Committee, in the recommendation he has made. It is only a few days ago that the Director-General, in one of the most moving speeches that I have heard him make to this Conference, begged this Conference to follow the rule of law; and that is fundamentally the reason which led both the Chairman and myself to submit the majority report we did.

The powers of this Conference to invalidate credentials are quite clearly laid down in article 3 of the Constitution. I refer here to paragraph 9, which says that the Conference may, subject to two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present being in favour, "refuse to admit any delegate or adviser whom it deems not to have been nominated" —I stress the words that follow— "in accordance with this article."

We are therefore limited in our powers to examining the question of whether, in the case of the credentials of any delegate or adviser to whose nomination objection has been taken, such nomination has been made in accordance with article 3 of the Constitution. The substantive reasons given by the Workers' member, true though they may be, important though they may be, that there are today in South Africa practices and policies which we all deplore and condemn are unfortunately not reasons which this Conference—or for that matter the Credentials Committee—can take into account in considering these matters.

I would like at this stage to go back a little into history. I would like to refer to the efforts made in the Governing Body by certain Employers' members, notably Mr. Tata, to have this article changed so that this Conference would have the power to apply effectively the sanctions provided by this credentials procedure in cases where the national policies of a member State are incompatible with the fundamental principles upon which this Organisation is based.

I would also like to refer to the fact that in 1961, when the resolution presented by the Government delegates of Nigeria for the withdrawal of the Republic of South Africa from this Organisation was under consideration, the Employers' members of the Committee submitted an amendment asking the Governing Body to present proposals to the Conference to amend the Constitution so that this power could be given to the Conference and its Credentials Committee.

I would add that what we asked then is substantially what I understand Mr. Bouladoux, Workers' delegate of France, has asked for in the resolution which has been blocked by those who purport to champion the causes of the peoples of Africa. This amendment was unfortunately opposed not merely by some members of the Resolutions Committee but also by the sponsors of the resolution, and, under pressure from other members of the Committee, the Employers' Vice-Chairman withdrew the amendment; but in doing so he said—and this is important—that it was essential that the possibility of applying sanctions to Members whose declared policies were incompatible with the basic principles of the I.L.O. should be studied.

That is the situation today. We still have article 3 as it stood, we still have the Standing Orders as they stood, and under these provisions it is not possible—and this is the considered view of the Chairman and myself—to take into account either the policies of the Government or the fact that the United Nations has condemned those policies in considering the credentials. The only matter which we were able to take into account was whether the Workers' delegate of South Africa was nominated in agreement with the most representative organisations.

For many years the Credentials Committee, of which I was myself a member in 1961, has pressed the Government of the Republic of South Africa to consult a particular organisation which claimed to be the only multi-racial one in the country. Nevertheless that consultation has not taken place. We have to bear in mind, however, that from the figure given by the objecting organisation itself it is not possible for us to say that the two organisations
We had to take account of the advisory opinion on the subject way back in the twenties, in which the Permanent Court of International Justice laid down the rules to be followed by a government in making these nominations where there was a plurality of organisations representing either employers or workers.

We are therefore in the position that whereas sentiment, the strong desire to uphold the principles of the I.L.O., and the feeling that both of us, the Chairman and myself, very glad to have been able to recommend to the Conference that the credentials should be invalidated we are not legally in a position to do so.

May I say to the Workers, among whom I hope I count many friends and among whom there are many for whom I have the greatest respect, that we are completely in sympathy with them in condemning what has happened; but as was said earlier, I think by Mr. Faupl, we must proceed in this matter constitutionally, and constitutionally we are tied by those few words "nominated in accordance with this article". We are therefore precluded from taking into account the many important, serious matters which Mr. Sánchez Madariaga has referred to. If we could have taken them into account (I am sure I can speak for the Chairman in this matter) both the Chairman and myself would have had no hesitation whatsoever in recommending invalidation. In the circumstances we could not do so, and this, I may say, is the view of the Employers' group—I speak, of course, of the free employers.

In the circumstances, in accordance with our policy that we must proceed constitutionally, that the rule of law must prevail, it is our intention to abstain from the vote on this report.

Mr. COLLISON (Workers' delegate, United Kingdom)—I have been asked to come to the rostrum by the Chairman of the Workers' group, Mr. Jean Môrì, to speak in the name of the Workers' group of the Conference. I want to make it clear at the outset that I and my group agree with Mr. Perera when he says that these issues have to be discussed and resolved on a constitutional and lawful basis. We entirely agree; there is no difference of opinion about that. The difference of opinion is simply on the basis of the interpretation of the law, and it is for these reasons that the Workers' group takes up a different position and it is for these reasons that Mr. Sánchez Madariaga issued his minority report. I have made it clear, I think, that we understand the points that are being made by Mr. Perera, but we disagree with him.

We cannot agree, to start with, that the situation this year is the same as it was last year. As we all know, far from acting on or even seriously considering the resolutions of the United Nations and the I.L.O. the South African Government has recently passed laws which are even more inhuman than before, and it is for this reason that workers' organisations and trade union centres all over the world, including the British Trades Union Congress, have publicly condemned the actions of the South African Government.

Quite apart from this question of general government policy there are, we feel, substantial reasons for supporting the minority report. With regard to the Workers' delegate, we do not recognise his organisation as representative of the workers of South Africa. There are genuinely representative organisations in South Africa whose views are ignored or suppressed by the Government. As to one of these bodies, in paragraph 5 of the report we see that the South African Government delegate stated that it was not consulted. I will read paragraph 5, to save your doing it yourselves:

"In a written statement that he was good enough to supply to the Committee at the latter's request, the Head of the delegation of the Republic of South Africa to the present session of the Conference informed the Committee that the South African Congress of Trade Unions was not consulted in connection with the nomination of the Workers' delegation for the reasons indicated in reply to previous objections by the Congress."

This was despite the request made in previous years that this organisation should be consulted.

As to the second organisation, that organisation was consulted but, although it has a much larger membership and is multi-racial, it was only accorded the status of adviser to the delegate. The Workers' group asks itself why. We believe the answer is because on previous occasions representatives of that organisation have publicly condemned apartheid and criticised their own Government from this rostrum. It so happens that the adviser at this year's Conference is the same man who had the courage to do that two years ago. We give him credit for his courage.

So the Workers' group does not feel that the legal requirements have been satisfied, quite apart from the other considerations, and we feel that we must insist that the Constitution be observed; and that means that the most representative organisation should be asked to nominate both the delegate and the adviser. It is for these reasons that we are asking the Conference to support the minority report, and I am in particular asking the Workers' delegates to support the minority report, signed by Mr. Sánchez Madariaga.

Mr. GEYSER (Government delegate, Republic of South Africa)—I regret that I have not been afforded the opportunity of seeing a copy of the objections lodged with the Credentials Committee and of replying thereto, as on previous occasions.

My submission to the Conference, in keeping with the views expressed by Mr. Perera, is that the minority report deals mainly with matters which are completely irrelevant to the application of the provisions of the Constitution governing the appointment of delegates to the Conference. It also contains allegations which are without any substance whatsoever. I am referring to the statement in the report regarding the social situation in South Africa and the discrimination arising from the new legislation. I categorically deny these allegations. The new legislation introduced in
South Africa, and to which I presume the minority report refers, is directed against subversive elements of whatever creed, colour or race. The Congress is in no way connected with racial questions or bona fide trade union activities.

The issue before the Conference is purely and simply whether the Workers’ delegation from South Africa has in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution been nominated in agreement with the organisations which are most representative of working people. The Workers’ delegate and adviser to this Conference, Mr. Liebenberg, has in no way violated either the letter or the spirit of paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Constitution.

Mr. LIEBENBERG (Workers’ delegate, South Africa)—I would like to say first of all that I regret that by a ruling of the Chair you are called upon to pass judgment without having listened to the arguments. But I think there are a sufficient number of members in the hall to make a fair and just judgment of the present case.

Before dealing with the merits of the case, I would like to say that Mr. Collison was not correct when he stated that I had submitted a statement to or had consultations with the Credentials Committee. I saw the members of the Credentials Committee for the first time this morning. I was not consulted nor asked for an opinion on my own personal views on that matter which I will have to report back to the workers of South Africa.

The PRESIDENT—Mr. Carbonell Horruitiner, Workers’ delegate, Cuba, has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. CARBONELL HIRRUITINER (Workers’ delegate, Cuba)—I have raised a point of order because I consider that in the last few days both in this hall and in all the neighbouring passages in the Palais des Nations we have heard the opinions of an extraordinary number of delegates on whether the representatives of a country which has, as part of its Constitution, the policy of apartheid—the policy of racial segregation—have the right to come to this platform. This policy has been condemned by all the workers of the world, by all the civilised people of the world. The result has been that we can all note the absence from this hall of an extraordinarily large number of delegates, not of a group of countries but of a whole continent, who, with the support even of the United Nations, have condemned once more the policy of racial discrimination imposed on the South African people by its Government.

In addition, I consider that those who assassinate negroes every hour and every day should have no right to speak for a quarter of an hour in this gathering to justify the policy of discrimination in South Africa.

We think that the Workers’ group, in accordance with a group decision to oppose by every possible means any action taken within the legal structure of the I.L.O., should come to this rostrum to prevent a further insult of our brothers in the African Continent, in the form of the presence on this platform of a delegate of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, which is practising discrimination. I am speaking on behalf of the workers of Cuba. I come from a country where the policy of racial discrimination is not only condemned by the law but also was one of the reasons for our revolution. The policy of racial discrimination is now a thing of the past. In our country we have the most extensive freedom. Negroes in our country can attend the schools and the universities without its being . . . .
The PRESIDENT—A point of order must be a short one. You cannot continue in this way. All right, you may continue, if you have almost finished.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. CARBONELL HORRUITINER—I was saying that nowadays in my country our brother Negroes are admitted to the universities and this is regarded as being perfectly natural. It is not a matter for public agitation and it causes no national disorder, as occurs in other countries. In accordance with this state of affairs in this country and in accordance with my right as a delegate of the Cuban workers at this 47th Session of the Conference I propose to this gathering that a delegate of the Republic of South Africa should not be allowed to speak here.

The PRESIDENT—Mr. Mainwaring, have you a point of order? You have the floor.

Mr. MAINWARING (Government delegate, Canada)—Yes, Mr. President, thank you. I submit that the delegate of Cuba did not in any way raise a valid point of order and that to rise in the way he did is an insult to this Conference.

The PRESIDENT—Well, perhaps it was not a point of order, but still I think I ought to take it as a point of order. I understood it in that way—that the representative of the workers of South Africa who had the floor should not be allowed to speak. I cannot accept that and therefore I ask Mr. Liebenberg to continue his speech.

Mr. LIEBENBERG (Workers' delegate, Republic of South Africa)—After the events that have taken place during the past week some of you may find it queer to see a speaker from South Africa at the rostrum. I am not going to dwell on politics. I wish to deal exclusively with the merits of the report before us.

We have two reports, a majority report and a minority report. The majority report, according to my view, does not require any discussion. It is consistent with previous decisions, and both the Chairman and the Employers' representative on the Committee have said more than I would be able to say now, and I think I look upon that as now disposed of. I also see that they have a very logical approach to the matter, and I note the fact that they are retaining the Constitution as the basis upon which to arrive at decisions. I am, however, forced to examine the minority report and, with all due respect to the member who submitted it, I want to touch on one or two aspects.

It commences by saying that new facts now exist, but it completely omits to indicate which facts. We do not even know whether they are facts about the constitutional aspect or whether they are facts relating to the political aspect, and I am going to assume ultimately that the decision will be based on the constitutional aspect and not on the political aspect. But the minority report states that there are new facts, without stating what they are, and, in view of the omission, I think that statement that there are new facts, if they relate to constitutional matters, should be immediately disregarded. You should not put before an intelligent man a matter for decision without telling him what it is about.

Now I move to the rest of the minority report, which is entirely political in its approach, in my view, as I can read it. In the first place, it deals with the social situation, but "social situation" is a very wide term and one is not sure what is meant by it. However, if it means that the social position of the people of South Africa of all races is worse than it was last year, or the year before, or that human relations are worse now than last year or the year before, then I want to say that this is not a statement of fact. I want to say that the social conditions have improved, and there is ample proof of it. Those people in the know, and those who have visited South Africa, actually said so in the open; and, as far as human relations are concerned, they have never been better than they are at the present time.

The PRESIDENT—Mr. Gacio Fuerte, Employers' delegate, Cuba, has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. GACIO FUERTE (Employers' delegate, Cuba)—I asked to speak in the name of the employers of Cuba, revolutionary Cuba, which has already eliminated racial discrimination, in order to raise once more the question of whether we should permit a country which practises this policy to have one of its representatives speak from the rostrum of an international body like ours, and to suggest that it should not be allowed. I am raising this point of order again in the meeting....

The PRESIDENT—It has been raised and not accepted by the President and therefore you cannot repeat it.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. GACIO FUERTE—I wish to state on behalf of my delegation that we are raising the issue again.

The PRESIDENT—I ask Mr. Liebenberg to continue.

Mr. LIEBENBERG (Workers' delegate, Republic of South Africa)—I will be as brief as possible. I would like to move on to the other point raised in the minority report.

The next reference is to legislation. Here again the Conference is left in mid-air because we do not know whether this legislation refers to industrial legislation, or racial legislation, or any other legislation. Let me just assume for the moment that it refers to industrial legislation and means that the position has been worsened because of that. That is not a statement of fact. This year Parliament has enacted further labour legislation and certain legislation in connection with the employment of women, which is in advance of what the I.L.O. committees are considering at the present time. I want to ask: does the author of the minority report object to that? Does he consider it a worsening of the position?
If he is referring to other legislation such as racial legislation, then I want to say that the legislation since the last Conference was for the establishment of an independent State, the Transkei, with its own government, of 3 million people and it was accepted by both sides; in fact they are in process now of electing their parliament. Does the author of the minority report object to that? In the absence of precise information about what he is referring to, I ask the Conference to disregard that statement altogether.

Then, out of the blue, quite irrelevantly, the author of the minority report refers to a decision of the United Nations. That is an entirely political organisation, and it seems queer to bring a political decision to a technical organisation. But suppose there is some connection, let me remind the author of the minority report that since the adoption of that resolution a South African delegation has been present at the United Nations, and its credentials were not questioned. Was he bringing the matter up now in the I.L.O. and query it here before the United Nations has reached a decision about its attendance there?

An effort has been made to make a point of the fact that the South African Congress of Trade Unions has not been consulted, and far be it from me to comment broadly on that, but I do want to say that there are minority groups in every country, and in a free country such as mine those minority groups are at liberty to join the majority groups. Is it expected that a government should eventually consult each individual worker, or groups of five, or groups of ten, or groups of 1,000? In this respect the Constitution is very clear; it refers to the "most representative". So no good purpose can be served by Mr. Collison's trying to create a difference and drive a wedge between the South African Confederation of Labour and the Trade Union Council of South Africa in this connection. We have been working together on this question of the nomination of representatives at the I.L.O. for some years now, and this has worked satisfactorily.

Then the author of the minority report, just as an extra, says he would have liked the whole South African delegation to be excluded by the Credentials Committee. But surely the author of the minority report belongs to some nation and has had plenty of opportunity, as has his delegation, country or Government, to lodge an objection to the South African delegation. He has had enough time; he has not been imprisoned in this building. Why raise an irrelevant matter now? He is doing this because he thinks it is a good time to do so, that the atmosphere of the Conference is favourable and that such an attempt might now be successful. I think that is extremely unreasonable and shows a very poor standard of reasoning.

The question now arises as to who raised this objection. I said earlier on that there has been excellent co-operation on this question in South Africa notwithstanding our many problems. Who raised this objection? There is something I can explain very easily, and that is that we have exterminated communism in our country; we have taken it out by the roots, so I can well understand that the World Federation of Trade Unions will do everything in its power to make it difficult for a country which has made it impossible for communism to start, and I can well understand why the Cuban delegates want to hit the roof when they see a South African.

I have not come here to plead not to be excluded. On the contrary, I am making this contribution so as to have it on record that our side has also been put. I submit that constitutionally the Conference has no alternative but to uphold the delegation irrespective of what other feelings you may have. During the past few days you have indicated that you will stand by the rule of law irrespective of the difficulties confronting you. Here too, if you want to be consistent, you must do exactly the same.

There is a general feeling that action must be taken, that the Conference must now do something material about the position. That is what I gather from this minority report. It presents an opportunity to the Conference to do something concrete and to take some action. But is it the function of this Conference or the I.L.O. to take action? Has this body any executive powers? Was not the original intention that it should be an advisory body to the various member nations on social matters, and also to non-member nations? Is it the function of this Organisation to do anything active? It is only required to advise the nations, therefore action should be left to the international bodies which are constructed and have the machinery for action. Let us not undertake something unconstitutional just because we want to achieve something.

A lot has been said on the political side—this minority report is entirely political—but let me say that I want to give just one reply to all the speeches that have been made on this question of politics. I say that in the foreseeable future the responsible and initiative African leaders of my country will reply to all the critics of South Africa—in the foreseeable future—and I want to read to you a statement made by Mr. Edgar Dean four days ago in Cape Town. He is a coloured...

The PRESIDENT—May I remind you that we are discussing the Credentials Committee report and that you must keep to that subject.

Mr. LIEBENBERG—I am sorry, and I will confine myself to saying that Mr. Dean, who is a coloured leader and a very prominent one, was shocked by the behaviour of certain delegates to this Conference and expressed his disgust.

I think the choice before the Conference is a simple one. It is whether to decide this question constitutionally or to decide it politically. I believe the Conference will decide this constitutionally, because in every society, in every group of people, there are always those who can be relied upon to keep their balance even in a crisis. I appeal to the Conference to reach a decision which I can take back to my country and that we can take back to his country, and which can be used as a precedent in later years.
Mr. MAINWARING (Government delegate, Canada)—As Mr. Perera states, our decision on this must be based on constitutional principles and not on the atmosphere that may have happened to prevail in this hall. To this extent I support Mr. Perera's position. The Cuban delegates who intervened on so-called points of order want us to base our decision on other grounds. They urge us to deny the most elementary principles of freedom of speech, and want us to accept as evidence of the majority opinion in this Conference whatever rumours may be going on in the corridors. That is why I termed his intervention an insult to this Conference.

We intend to support the report of the Workers' member. Our vote is based on the fact that the Credentials Committee had, on two previous occasions, expressed the view that the Government of South Africa should consult the South African Congress of Trade Unions, and that even the majority report of this year's Credentials Committee expressed extreme regret that once again this has not been done. The Credentials Committee has had evidence before it and has expressed the opinion that the South African Congress of Trade Unions ought to be consulted. This opinion of the Credentials Committee must be given due weight.

We support the observation by the Workers' member where he says in paragraph 11: "In previous years, the Committee has asked the Government of South Africa to consult the Congress in connection with the nomination of the Workers' delegation. It should be noted that these requests have been completely ignored. This attitude of the Government cannot be accepted indefinitely."

In support of this line of argument we intend to vote for the minority report of the Workers' member. But I would like to say that this is not necessarily a precedent for the position we may take in some future year when further evidence may be before the Conference.

Mr. MAINWARING (Government delegate, Canada)—As Mr. Perera states, our decision on this must be based on constitutional principles and not on the atmosphere that may have happened to prevail in this hall. To this extent I support Mr. Perera's position. The Cuban delegates who intervened on so-called points of order want us to base our decision on other grounds. They urge us to deny the most elementary principles of freedom of speech, and want us to accept as evidence of the majority opinion in this Conference whatever rumours may be going on in the corridors. That is why I termed his intervention an insult to this Conference.

We intend to support the report of the Workers' member. Our vote is based on the fact that the Credentials Committee had, on two previous occasions, expressed the view that the Government of South Africa should consult the South African Congress of Trade Unions, and that even the majority report of this year's Credentials Committee expresses extreme regret that once again this has not been done. The Credentials Committee has had evidence before it and has expressed the opinion that the South African Congress of Trade Unions ought to be consulted. This opinion of the Credentials Committee must be given due weight.

We support the observation by the Workers' member where he says in paragraph 11: "In previous years, the Committee has asked the Government of South Africa to consult the Congress in connection with the nomination of the Workers' delegation. It should be noted that these requests have been completely ignored. This attitude of the Government cannot be accepted indefinitely."

In support of this line of argument we intend to vote for the minority report of the Workers' member. But I would like to say that this is not necessarily a precedent for the position we may take in some future year when further evidence may be before the Conference.

Mr. MAINWARING (Government delegate, Canada)—As Mr. Perera states, our decision on this must be based on constitutional principles and not on the atmosphere that may have happened to prevail in this hall. To this extent I support Mr. Perera's position. The Cuban delegates who intervened on so-called points of order want us to base our decision on other grounds. They urge us to deny the most elementary principles of freedom of speech, and want us to accept as evidence of the majority opinion in this Conference whatever rumours may be going on in the corridors. That is why I termed his intervention an insult to this Conference.

We intend to support the report of the Workers' member. Our vote is based on the fact that the Credentials Committee had, on two previous occasions, expressed the view that the Government of South Africa should consult the South African Congress of Trade Unions, and that even the majority report of this year's Credentials Committee expresses extreme regret that once again this has not been done. The Credentials Committee has had evidence before it and has expressed the opinion that the South African Congress of Trade Unions ought to be consulted. This opinion of the Credentials Committee must be given due weight.

We support the observation by the Workers' member where he says in paragraph 11: "In previous years, the Committee has asked the Government of South Africa to consult the Congress in connection with the nomination of the Workers' delegation. It should be noted that these requests have been completely ignored. This attitude of the Government cannot be accepted indefinitely."

In support of this line of argument we intend to vote for the minority report of the Workers' member. But I would like to say that this is not necessarily a precedent for the position we may take in some future year when further evidence may be before the Conference.
minority report is not legal or constitutional. It is claimed that I am not acting in conformity with the rules and proper procedures. I wish to reply that from the point of view of law the question is whether there are new developments or whether the facts before the Committee are the same as before. The other two members of the Committee say the situation is the same as it was and so the objection must be rejected.

I say that there are new facts; that the social situation in South Africa has become more serious. In particular, a resolution has been taken by the United Nations stating that South African policy remains one of discrimination, that not only have persecution and murder continued, not only is the indigenous population of South Africa still being oppressed, but that this policy is endangering the peace of the world.

I maintain quite legally that the Government of South Africa has not accepted the recommendations of the Credentials Committee on previous occasions, let us not spend a lifetime waiting for it to choose to accept these recommendations. Let the Conference not wait for ever until South Africa chooses to accept the invitation to leave the I.L.O. So I think that it is quite proper for me to ask the Conference to accept the minority vote.

The President—I have no further speakers on my list so we will proceed to take the vote, but first it will be announced in the committees.

Mr. Carbonell Horruitiner, is it a point of order you wish to raise?

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. CARBONELL HORMUITNER (Workers' delegate, Cuba)—No, it is on the report.

The President—Well, please stick to the report.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. CARBONELL HORMUITNER—I am not going to tire you now because I am very much in favour of doing what you, Mr. President, want me to do and I want to confine myself, as I always have done, to the issue under discussion.

Therefore, on behalf of the Cuban Workers' Union, I want to express my opinion concerning the minority report of the Credentials Committee concerning the rights of the so-called Workers' delegate of the Republic of South Africa.

But first, I should like to reply to the distinguished Government delegate of Canada. I would like to tell him that what I said from here before was not intended to be an insult to my fellow delegates in this Conference, for whom I have the greatest respect. Perhaps he misunderstood what I was saying or perhaps there were linguistic difficulties, although we have wonderful interpreters here. I was not intending to insult this Conference. In any case I think that if there was some insult the insult was made by the South African delegate when he insisted on speaking to this Conference.

We agree with the legal grounds stated by the author of the minority report of the Credentials Committee because it reproduces the opinion expressed on this subject not only outside this Conference but also expressed to the Credentials Committee by the World Federation of Trade Unions to which the Cuban Workers' Union has the great honour of being affiliated.

We believe that the legal grounds stated by the Workers' member of the Credentials Committee, who is the author of the minority report, are more than sufficient to induce all delegates in this Conference to reject the credentials of the so-called Workers' delegate of the Republic of South Africa, because in that country there is not the freedom which would enable the workers of South Africa to elect their delegates to attend this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. The policy of crime and oppression of the Republic of South Africa prevents the true exercise of genuine democracy, and it is an insult not only to all delegations at this 47th Session of the Conference, but, in particular, it was an insult for the representatives of the workers at this Conference that there should be representatives of people who, we are all deeply convinced, were not chosen by a truly democratic process.

I am expressing the views of the workers of Cuba and I am appealing to all delegates in this hall, particularly to the Workers' delegates, quite irrespective of the international federations to which they belong, to resolve their differences and to concentrate on what must be for all of us the fight to wherever necessary, against régimes which are not democratic, which do not allow the workers to elect their leaders, régimes which discriminate against workers on grounds of the colour of their skin, régimes which deny all trade union rights. I therefore ask all delegates to make a further contribution and a demonstration of that solidarity which many have referred to from here, solidarity with our brothers from the African Continent.

Let us vote here unanimously in favour of the minority report of the Credentials Committee. Let us expel from this hall those who do not represent the workers of South Africa.

The President—I do hope there are no further speakers. No further speakers?

We will now proceed to take the vote on the minority report submitted by Mr. Sánchez Madariaga, Workers' member of the Credentials Committee. The committees have been notified so that we can proceed immediately to take the vote, but before taking the vote I will have to read article 26, paragraph 7, of the Standing Orders:

"If the Credentials Committee or any member thereof submits a report advising that the Conference should refuse to admit any delegate or adviser, the President shall submit this proposal to the Conference for decision, and the Conference, if it deems that a delegate or adviser has not been nominated in conformity with the requirements of the Constitution, may, in accordance with paragraph 9 of article 3 thereof, refuse by two-thirds of the votes cast by delegates present to admit the delegate or adviser . . . ." 

Now I will ask you to listen. Delegates who are in favour of refusing to admit the delegate
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The PRESIDENT—The result of the record vote is as follows: 135 votes for, 3 against, with 57 abstentions. The Conference has accordingly refused to admit the Workers' delegation of the Republic of the South Africa to this Conference.

If there are no further comments, the Conference will take note of the third report of the Credentials Committee.

The report is noted.

(The Conference adjourned at 1 p.m.)

Record Vote on the Minority Report Submitted by Mr. Sánchez Madariaga, Workers' Member of the Credentials Committee

For (135)

Argentina:
- Mr. Villaveiran (G)
- Mr. Pico (G)
- Mr. Alonso (W)

Australia:
- Mr. Monk (W)

Austria:
- Mr. Hempel (G)
- Mr. Krenn (G)
- Mr. Altenburger (W)

Belgium:
- Mr. Servais (G)
- Mr. Troclet (G)
- Mr. De Bock (W)

Brazil:
- Mr. de Castro (G)
- Mr. Stafford da Silva (W)

Bulgaria:
- Mr. Michev (G)
- Mr. Tomov (G)
- Mrs. Tsaroulanova (E)
- Mr. Ivanov (W)

Byelorussia:
- Mr. Gurinovich (G)
- Mr. Chernushchenko (G)
- Mr. Kolosh (E)
- Mr. Obazhovitch (W)

Canada:
- Mr. Haythorne (G)
- Mr. Mainwaring (G)
- Mr. Morris (W)

Ceylon:
- Mr. Thondaman (W)

China:
- Mr. Liang (W)

Colombia:
- Mr. Arango (G)
- Mr. Espinosa (W)

Costa Rica:
- Mr. González Cubero (W)

Cuba:
- Mr. Ortega Suárez (G)
- Mr. Gacío Fuerte (E)
- Mr. Carbonell Horrutiner (W)

Cyprus:
- Mr. Sparsis (G)
- Mr. Shevket (G)
- Mr. Ziartides (W)

Czechoslovakia:
- Mr. Pithart (G)
- Mr. Klusák (G)
- Mr. Klecan (E)
- Mr. Pasek (W)

Denmark:
- Mr. Coln (G)
- Mr. Juul-Christensen (G)
- Mr. Nielsen (W)

Ecuador:
- Mr. Pallares Zaldumbide (G)
- Mr. Alvarado Garaicoa (E)
- Mr. Zúñiga Garzón (W)

Finland:
- Mr. Rinne (G)
- Mr. Kaunora (G)
- Mr. Kuukkanen (W)

France:
- Mr. Parodi (G)
- Mr. Hauck (G)
- Mr. Bouladeux (W)

Germany:
- Mr. Mönnig (G)
- Mr. Ernst (G)
- Mr. Beermann (W)

Greece:
- Mr. Lascaris (W)

Honduras:
- Mr. Núñez (G)
- Mr. Benítez Benítez (W)

India:
- Mr. Routroy (G)
- Mr. Mehta (G)

Iran:
- Mr. Azimi (G)
- Mr. Azam (G)

Ireland:
- Mr. Fitzpatrick (W)

Israel:
- Mr. Messer (G)
- Mr. Raday (G)
- Mr. Becker (W)

Italy:
- Mr. Ago (G)
- Mr. Purpura (G)
- Mr. Marazza (W)

Jamaica:
- Mr. McPherson (W)

Japan:
- Mr. Kato (G)
- Mr. Kato (W)

Malaya:
- Mr. Tambou (G)
- Mr. Wong (G)

Mexico:
- Mr. Santos Coy (G)
- Mr. Calderón Puig (G)
- Mr. Sánchez Madariaga (W)

Netherlands:
- Father Stokman (G)
- Mr. Beumer (G)
- Mr. van Tilburg (W)

New Zealand:
- Mr. Napier (W)

Norway:
- Mr. Bull (G)
- Mr. Utsaker (G)
- Mr. Hejdahl (W)

Pakistan:
- Mr. Rahman (G)
- Mr. Ashraf (G)
- Mr. Ahmad (W)

Peru:
- Mr. Aguilar Ladrón de Guevara (W)

Philippines:
- Mr. Ocampo (G)
- Mr. Joson (G)
- Mr. Reyes (E)
- Mr. Hernandez (W)

Poland:
- Mr. Chajn (G)
- Mr. Licki (G)
- Mr. Owczewski (E)
- Mr. Hanke (W)

Portugal:
- Mr. Lopes Ribeiro (W)

Rumania:
- Mr. Dumitresco (G)
- Mr. Ionascu (G)
- Mr. Gheorghiu (E)
- Mr. Rob (W)
Sweden:
Mr. Michanek (G)
Mr. Bengtsson (G)
Mr. Bolin (W)

Switzerland:
Mr. Môri (W)

Thailand:
Mr. Ashakul (G)
Mr. Udompong (G)

Turkey:
Mr. Ünal (G)
Mr. Onbulak (G)
Mr. Dölen (W)

U.S.S.R.:
Mr. Borisov (G)
Mr. Bordadin (G)
Mr. Poljakov (E)
Mr. Solovyo (W)

United States:
Mr. Weaver (G)
Mr. Delaney (G)
Mr. Faupl (W)

United Kingdom:
Mr. Collison (W)

Against (3)

Republic of South Africa:
Mr. Gersey (G)
Mr. de Villiers (G)
Mr. Liebenberg (W)

Abstentions (57)

Australia:
Mr. Bland (G)
Mr. Furlonger (G)
Mr. Forrier (E)

Austria:
Mr. Mautner-Markhof (E)

Belgium:
Mr. Verschueren (E)

Brazil:
Mr. Barboza-Carneiro (G)
Mr. Gonzalez Blanco (E)

Canada:
Mr. Robinson (E)

Ceylon:
Mr. Greve (E)

Chile:
Mr. Montt Balmaceda (E)

China:
Mr. Cheng (G)
Mr. Lee (G)
Mr. Chang (E)

Costa Rica:
Mr. Rodriguez Arce (G)

Cyprus:
Mr. Theocharides (E)

Denmark:
Mr. Lund (E)

Finland:
Mr. Hetemäki (E)

France:
Mr. Waline (E)

Federal Republic of Germany:
Mr. Faubel (E)

Greece:
Mr. Bardas (E)

Indonesia:
Mr. Bakti (E)

Ireland:
Mr. MacCarthy (G)
Mr. O'Leary (G)
Mr. Cuffe (E)

Israel:
Mr. Hausman (E)

Italy:
Mr. Campanella (E)

Jamaica:
Mr. Marshall (E)

Japan:
Mr. Tamura (G)
Mr. Aoki (G)
Mr. Mishiro (E)

Malaya:
Mr. Ubaidulla (E)

Mexico:
Mr. Ylanes Ramos (E)

Netherlands:
Mr. Fennema (E)

New Zealand:
Mr. Atkinson (G)
Mr. Woods (G)
Sir John Allum (E)

Norway:
Mr. Selvig (E)

Pakistan:
Mr. Wajid Ali (E)

Panama:
Mr. Aispurda (E)

Peru:
Mr. Aparicio Valdez (E)

Portugal:
Mr. de Motta Veiga (G)
Mr. Ribeiro da Cunha (G)
Mr. Morales de los Rios Leitão (E)

Republic of South Africa:
Mr. Hamilton (E)

Spain:
Mr. Gómez-Aeobo y Santos (G)
Mr. Aniel-Quiroga Redondo (G)
Mr. Galdo García (E)

Sweden:
Mr. Bergenström (E)

Turkey:
Mr. Alam (E)

United Kingdom:
Mr. Slater (G)
Mr. Ferguson (G)
Sir George Pollock (E)

United States:
Mr. Wagner (E)

Uruguay:
Mr. Végh-Garzón (E)
NINETEENTH SITTING

Friday, 21 June 1963, 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Dreyer

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

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue the discussion of the Director-General's Report.

Mr. ALONSO (Workers' delegate, Argentina)—The views of the workers of Argentina, organised in the General Confederation of Labour, can be expressed more firmly and with greater decision at this Conference than on previous occasions, because we represent three million workers who at an historic congress finally sealed their unity, closed a chapter of suspicion and conflict and established a powerful trade union organisation.

As Secretary-General of the Argentine C.G.T. I bring the greetings of the workers of one of the most southerly American countries to our brothers and comrades in our own and other continents and to all countries and peoples represented at this session.

Perhaps the Conference has been convened at the most difficult and critical moment in the history of the world. Owing to our strict agenda, we cannot examine all the questions which concern the peace and progress of mankind, nor can we take decisions aimed at putting an end to the arbitrary role of the powerful, the servitude of the weaker peoples and social injustice. However, the Conference can serve as a platform from which the nations and international organisations may be induced to devote their strength to ending the great drama which is going on around us.

The Director-General says that the I.L.O. is at a crossroads, and he deals successively with its structure, human resources, disarmament, responsibility of all for maintaining peace, labour relations, etc. These are certainly not new subjects for Mr. Morse but despite his writings and his efforts the arms race continues, while social justice, human rights and respect for the law have not been introduced. This Organisation came into existence in 1919, after a destructive war and a peace conference and treaty, and it still has almost the same structure and limitations as seemed appropriate at that distant time.

It might be argued that it is not a function of the I.L.O. to take decisions to end these struggles which separate men and weaken peoples. The reply is that our effort for understanding and comprehension between classes, for national reconstruction, for improved methods, will be useless, as will be our efforts to approach the great objective of all societies, human happiness and well-being, if we remain in danger of destruction and chaos because some people or groups seek to dominate the world.

Despite the efforts of the Director-General and his staff, despite the warnings spoken year after year, despite the demands of some and the cries of others, the I.L.O. has not managed to follow world events very closely, because its desperate effort to be up to date has been hampered by reactionary governments, insensitive employers, out-of-date procedures; indeed as it grows older its organisation has become like a perfect piece of Swiss clockwork which strikes the hour of justice for the humble rather late.

Although the I.L.O.'s tripartite structure appeared at its establishment to be an excellent thing and to augur a successful future, this was only the case in the immediate post-war period, until world capital and the monopolies had reorganised and re-established their position. They were then able to secure adoption of procedures which froze the Conference in its legislative work and the application of Conventions and Recommendations, and prevented it from dealing with matters considered not to be the concern of the Organisation although they very much concern ourselves, who would benefit by success and be destroyed by failure.

The peace of the world hangs on a thread. The anxiety expressed by Pope John XXIII on his deathbed reflected the bitter present and the spectre of chaos and destruction which stalks beside us. The armaments race on land and in space takes on alarming features even in countries such as our own which could do little or nothing to contribute to a world conflict. We are classified as underdeveloped and yet our budgets include enormous amounts for the armed forces, amounts out of all proportion to our population and economy, amounts which are simply deducted from what ought to be spent on progress and well-being.

Exploitation and injustice grow day by day. In the alchemistic kitchens of the world powers a broth is being brewed which soon will be fed by doses to the peoples of the world. First comes the psychological treatment through publicity, which prepares the way. It is
followed by action, *cordon sanitaire*, economic barriers, political manoeuvres, palace revolutions, conventions and agreements, which make rich countries poor, which make free peoples slaves, which destroy national prosperity and the self-determination of men and their countries.

Under the slogan of freedom and democracy the free peoples are exploited and ill-treated, governments are overthrown and defensive systems are eliminated if they do not serve those bastard interests of governments and other groups which grab wealth without worrying whether it was created in the sweat of another people who can do nothing against brute force and unscrupulous ambition.

In the southern, the Indian, part of America, most of our peoples are robbed of their raw materials, the fruit of their labour, the product of their land, the wealth of their minerals, in exchange for a mere pittance. When one such people seeks to break the circle of this high-level "Mafia" the world press, the radio and the other mass means of propaganda exhibit it to the world as a dictatorship, as infringing human rights, and this goes on until the popular government can be overthrown and replaced by something more docile, more servile.

The history of today is clear proof of what I am saying. My country might be taken as an example for purposes of comparative analysis. We have a Government which no one elected, the product of their land, the wealth of their minerals, in exchange for a mere pittance. When one such people seeks to break the circle of this high-level "Mafia" the world press, the radio and the other mass means of propaganda exhibit it to the world as a dictatorship, as infringing human rights, and this goes on until the popular government can be overthrown and replaced by something more docile, more servile.

The country which was once one of the world's granaries, one of its greatest perhaps, with a large and fertile territory, a hard-working and cultured people, an ideal climate, has passed in a few years from full employment to the unemployment of over 700,000 industrial and commercial workers and over 300,000 peasant families. It has passed from plenty to starvation, from work for all to work for few. Half the factories are closed and the rest stand on the brink of bankruptcy. Our currency is one of the lowest quoted on world exchanges. Our pensioners drag out their days in poverty after doing their duty by society and their country. The Constitution and all the safeguards it contains remain a dead letter, which serves only to tell students what rights and freedoms would exist in the country if it were governed in accordance with the will of the people.

The infant mortality rate from malnutrition, which has revived extinct diseases, is ravaging a people once described as among the best fed in the world. Our cost of living is the highest in the world. Our currency is one of the lowest quoted on world exchanges. Our unemployed constitute a dead letter, which serves only to tell students what rights and freedoms would exist in the country if it were governed in accordance with the will of the people.

As one example out of dozens of injustices I will tell you that no trade union officer can be a candidate for any post in the Government, Parliament or a municipal council, whereas lawyers and representatives of the big national and international companies which exploit our comrades can occupy any post up to that of President of the Republic.

If any second- or third-rate trade union officer should slip through the net he would be stopped by the so-called electoral tribunal which has been established under a measure prefabricated by the reactionaries.

But the world press and other means of propaganda pass by such facts in silence, or deny or distort them, and depict our people as backward or maladjusted. Nor do they mention that the cold storage companies established in our country with foreign capital apply work systems which violate not only freedom of association but also human rights and do so as a reprisal for a strike by which the workers sought fair wages and decent conditions of work. The petroleum companies in our country, also established with capital from abroad, act like foreign States in conquered territory and not only violate our laws and I.L.O. Conventions but have their own police, just as in the bad old days. Finally, our mercantile marine, once progressive and independent, is being strangled by economic groups from without and without the country, by boycotts and commercial trickery undertaken in conjunction with other fleets which are pirates and mercenaries since they fly flags which are not their own, thereby bringing to nought the efforts of Argentina to engage in free foreign trade.

All this occurs although there are national and international laws to defend us. It happens to us workers and to our nation. Nor is our position unique in this continent, for others suffer a like fate. Yet no one blushes, no one seeks to end this state of affairs. Instead they make fine speeches on freedom, democracy and human rights, but in fact their efforts and money are not spent on backing their words, which serve merely to hide their true aims and ambitions.

The I.L.O. can continue to vote its Conventions and Recommendations; we can speak from this platform praising and blaming, analysing and planning; but if we who truly represent our peoples and have access to no other international agency fail to transform the I.L.O. into a positive organisation which can intervene in everything which makes for peace, prosperity, development and justice and can prevent what threatens or endangers the stability of the world, we shall be mere spectators in the drama of today, while peace or war, progress or backwardness, will be determined by individuals and groups which do not listen to the voice of their own people, do not blindly accept the will of the people of the world.

There is fruitful land uncultivated in many parts, yet there is hunger; there are countries able to contribute by their effort to a freer and fairer future, and at the coming elections citizens will only be able to vote for candidates whom our Government, which is a military one, have screened again and again to eliminate the few free men that remain.
the exchange of means and resources, the abandonment of the policy of arming so that others may be subjugated or defrauded while the oppressors live in idleness and pleasure. I am not speaking as a destructive critic of the Report or as a demagogue; I merely intend to appeal to the sense of responsibility of the peoples and those who govern them so that as an act of faith we may decide to address all our efforts towards securing freedom and justice in the world; to abandon indifference and throw off the trammels of texts and Standing Orders; to take a direct part in the solution of the great problems that affect us so directly and deeply.

In accordance with its proclaimed objectives, the I.L.O. should be shaped so as to be useful to society and the nations. It should leave the old ruts which now prevent it from punishing acts of racial discrimination by a member State —acts which make that Member repugnant to the civilised world. In other cases also it should remove the restrictions which make the work of the Organisation sterile and frustrate the wishes of delegates.

Our objectives have been stated, and we Argentine workers will march resolutely towards them, and seek, with the Resolution, to give effect to justice, freedom and national sovereignty. The Argentine C.G.T. goes forward in faith and firmness. We know that many other American movements are beside us. The hour of the people is approaching. Nothing will prevent mankind from self-redemption and self-liberation. The I.L.O. should be the spokesman of this popular disquiet and determination. Let the I.L.O. take the lead. If it does not, we shall at least have had the satisfaction of speaking out humbly but courageously.

The PRESIDENT—I call on Mr. Vučo, Employers' delegate, Yugoslavia.

As he is not in the hall, I call on Mr. Gheorghiu, Employers' delegate, Rumania.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. GHEORGHIU (Employers' delegate, Rumania)—Our Conference is carrying on its work in conditions that are considered normal. In my opinion this is the result of shortcomings in the leadership and in the very Constitution of the I.L.O.

It is clear that if the authorities of the Organisation had persevered in attempting to implement the decisions of the 1961 Conference, they would have borne in mind the term of the resolution concerning the withdrawal of the Republic of South Africa from the I.L.O., and the present situation would not have arisen.

As the Report of the Director-General stresses, the Conference has reached a critical stage in its history. There is an obvious discrepancy between the social and economic situation in the world on the one hand and the programme, methods, procedure and structure of the Organisation on the other. There is only one possible way to overcome this crisis: a realistic awareness of the situation that has arisen in the world and the adoption of appropriate measures.

With regard to the contribution of the I.L.O. towards the maintenance of peace, the Report refers to the activity of a group of experts who prepared, under the aegis of the United Nations, a study concerning the social and economic consequences of disarmament. The Governing Body merely took note of the contents of the study.

All the Report does otherwise is to note the positive role of military expenditure in the organisation of production and the training of personnel. Is this a sufficient contribution to the cause of general disarmament, and consequently the strengthening of peace? Personally, I have grave doubts. The vital interests of peoples require that humanity should be rid of the folly of the arms race, so that it can devote itself to the development of production, economy, the eradication of existing social and economic inequalities, and the improved well-being of the workers.

Therefore, the Organisation must search constantly for ways of bringing together the representatives of the various countries, the various organisations and undertakings, in the interests of peace and international co-operation. The employers as well as the workers, as subjective factors in production, have the duty to adopt a constructive approach to problems of mutual interest. Experience has shown that many problems relating to the scientific organisation of production, to the organisation of labour, management training, social security, and the like, could well be the subject of exchanges of points of view and experience by means of seminars, exchanges of delegations of workers and technicians, by sending out missions to study the experiences of certain countries, by the dissemination of information, and so on.

Consequently, employers who are familiar with the concrete aspects involved, who are ready to discuss problems of production in their social context, should make greater use of this platform. For our part, we are ready to participate in any such activity that might be initiated by the Organisation.

We consider that the I.L.O., by virtue of its international character, should become a useful platform for fruitful exchanges of viewpoints and experience concerning the problems arising from the economic and social development of member States, irrespective of their social and economic systems.

We have tried to understand the logic of the structure and working methods of the I.L.O. My conclusion is that there are many constitutional provisions and practices which need modifying.

We have heard many observations during the discussions which coincide with our viewpoint. We read in the Report that nobody has impugned the tripartite principle. At present a number of delegates who go by the name of "free employers"—the majority of whom are, in fact, lawyers in the service of employers and not real employers—claim to be the sole representatives of employer circles throughout the world. Apart from being erroneous, this idea is highly dangerous.

The recent elections to the Governing Body, where the Employers' group has no representative from socialist countries and is composed to the extent of over 40 per cent. of West European and American representatives
from employers' organisations, clearly reflect the unrepresentative character of the Governing Body. That is why the tripartite principle will not be acknowledged unanimously until we solve the problem of unconditional representation of employers, wherever they may come from.

We are not here to fan the cold war. It seems to us that, as these factors are directly connected with production, it would be logical that our discussions here be directed toward finding ways and means of promoting the easing of tension in international relations, the consolidation of peace, and the eradication of colonialism and its consequences.

In this context, we think it is strange that the representatives of Western countries gathered here, as well as in the Governing Body, are completely ignoring a decision taken by the United Nations concerning the convening of a world conference on trade and development, matters of the greatest interest to our Organisation, in our opinion.

In the present situation, it seems normal that the I.L.O. should be asked by the young countries who are entering into the international arena, and hope to find understanding and support, to put an end to the underdevelopment which they have inherited from the colonialists. Without trying to take the place of the efforts made by these countries themselves, and respecting everything touching the independence and sovereignty of member States, the I.L.O. should devote greater attention to the training of national workers and technicians, indispensable elements in the consolidation of economic independence in these countries. Unfortunately, the Report does not provide for any special action in this field, and merely advocates giving unilateral assistance to these countries by sending out experts.

The majority of expert missions of the I.L.O. are not concerned with training national personnel with a view to material production, but are, rather, thinking of state administration and they make unjustified attempts to give this personnel a social education and infuse them with the unacceptable spirit of class harmony.

The I.L.O. should also fight the colonialist influences and racial discrimination, which persist.

These young countries do not need any theoretical teaching in human relations but they need national personnel, workers and technicians, who are capable of contributing towards the development of their countries. Only in this way can these countries liquidate their state of economic underdevelopment based on single-crop economies, the exportation of raw materials and the importation of manufactured goods.

The Organisation cannot continue to ignore the dire social consequences of technical progress, especially automation, for the workers of the advanced capitalist countries. Facts show that in these countries technical progress gives rise to problems which cannot be solved under the capitalist system without sacrificing the interests of the workers. Unemployment, difficulties connected with the regrading of workers, with the impossibility of fully utilising the labour force and output capacity—these are some aspects of the so-called world of free enterprise.

Experience has shown that technical progress and efforts to industrialise the socialist countries have resulted in a growth of the manpower requirement, as is evidenced by the differing consequences in the two big socio-economic systems, both of which are striving towards technical progress.

Undertakings in the Rumanian People's Republic have scored noteworthy results in solving problems connected with the industrialisation of our country and by technical progress.

Before the liberation, Rumania was underdeveloped from the industrial point of view. It was a base of raw materials and cereals for foreign monopolies. Our country knew what unemployment, illiteracy and famine were. After the setting up of the people's Government, the nationalisation of the principal means of production and the successful implementation of the annual and five-year plans, Rumania became a developed industrial and agrarian country. Rumania now attains in 55 days the same output of products as for the whole of 1938, which was considered the most successful year in capitalist Rumania.

In our country our industrialisation policy and the development of the main branches of the economy—power, iron and steel, industrial engineering, chemistry, petroleum, etc., based on modern techniques—is coupled with constant personnel training efforts. For example, in 1961 the number of workers was about twice the number in 1950. As compared with 9,000 engineers in 1938 our economy now can boast of 65,000 engineers, including many former workers who studied during the rule of the People's Republic, after nationalisation.

The economy of socialist Rumania is characterised by a harmonious and dynamic development, is constantly seeking to increase working ability and does not know the "pockets of depression" mentioned in the Director-General's Report.

Our achievements show at the same time the immense creative force of a people that has become the sole master of its wealth and resources.

There, in short, are some of the questions which we wish to draw to the attention of the Conference. The future of our Organisation depends on the way these new problems will be tackled.

Interpretation from French: Mr. SERVAIS (Government delegate, Belgium)—The Director-General of the International Labour Office has been very clear-sighted in asking the Conference to face up to the main current questions to which the International Labour Organisation must find an answer.

Because it has kept in touch with social developments in the world, the I.L.O. still has all the energy of youth but it must at every moment in its existence adjust in order to retain its exceptional vitality.

Faced with important problems—changes in the social policy of governments, the growing participation of nations which have recently
Last year I know that many delegates asked themselves whether the International Labour Organisation was well adapted to deal with the problems of the present age and those of the future. The Director-General has therefore been clear-sighted in deciding that the time had come to draw up a balance-sheet and to hold a general discussion on the programme and structure of the Organisation, to reach agreement on the choice of the main objectives, to decide on a clear order of priority and to adapt the methods and means of the International Labour Organisation to the way the world is going.

I am sure that the Conference is aware of the importance of the objectives involved and of its responsibilities, and that as above it wants to be successful it will reach an agreement which will give a new impetus to the activities of the I.L.O. That is my wish and I should like once more to assure the Director-General of the desire of the Belgian Government to continue to serve the cause of international social cooperation and to make its loyal contribution to his task.

In their search for the laws that govern economic life, economists have found that some of them hold in the long run and not in the short run. Among economic trends some are inevitable but are apparent only over relatively long periods. Politicians know how difficult it is to hold to a long-term policy. In most cases the adoption of long-term solutions is possible only if they are supported by motives which operate in the short run. This remark applies to the so-called industrialised countries and to countries in course of development, in spite of the fact that they all agree that it is unwise to allow oneself to be guided by short-term considerations. These considerations allow me to state that the I.L.O. should view the long-term perspective in formulating the main needs it intends to meet and in setting the best means of attaining them.

The programme outlined by the Director-General covers a ten-year period. Five major groups of problems are dealt with: the maintenance of peace and freedom; the priorities of the operational programme; the development of trade unions and labour relations in countries in course of development; the status and conditions of employment of the workers; the repercussions of automation and other forms of technological progress on the workers.

All these questions seem very different from one another. Allowance must be made for differing assessments of the various aspects of the state of affairs and a process of change according to the appropriate methodology. At the same time, however, experts must not work in total isolation from the outside world. The problems involved must be viewed in full awareness of their interdependence in many respects. For example, the mere fact that there are on this planet over-populated and under-populated countries should lead us to evolve new concepts of employment and underemployment. Peace, freedom, free labour-management relations, the advancement of labour in all countries are all imperative owing to the rapidity of progress; progress in all its forms—technological progress, which starts the whole process, and also economic progress and human progress. In the last resort these three forms of progress are chronologically and logically interdependent.

If it is true that we all seem to be increasingly conditioned by the acceleration of technical progress, it is also true that the best guarantee of prosperity for a country lies in a population with a high proportion of well-equipped technicians and a large and selective investment in human resources.

The I.L.O. is aware that technical progress can occur only in certain economic and human conditions primarily connected with standards of training. The Organisation certainly has first place in this particular field, and it can rely on the co-operation of my country in any action it may take.

The second part of the Director-General's Report considers to what extent the I.L.O.'s procedures and methods of working are adapted to existing needs and to what extent they should be altered or developed to allow for the requirements of a changing world. It is not possible to survey all these problems in a few minutes, but with regard to the role of the Conference my attention has been drawn to the importance of setting functions. While we must welcome the extent of the practical activities of the Organisation which were originally viewed as a supplement to its standard-setting functions, I do not think it is desirable that its operational activities should have priority over its standard-setting functions. The admitted value of operational activities lies, in the last resort, in the fact that in all countries of the world work and technical progress lead to the establishment and application of standards which are the essential regulator of social life.

I might add that I note with some misgivings that the Conference is increasingly adopting not Conventions but Recommendations. It is admittedly a result of the development of the Organisation that it has become very difficult to set standards at such a level that they can be accepted and applied by all States, but we must not lose sight of the fact that these Conventions are a stimulus for member States. Moreover, their ratification involves a solemn commitment to the International Labour Organisation, to the other States Members and, above all, to the cause of social progress.

In view of the various levels of development reached by States and in order to permit each State to assume undertakings it can live up to, would it not be a good thing to divide Conventions into two or three chapters, setting different standards? It would be possible to arrange for the ratification of these instruments chapter by chapter. Would not this be a way of enabling each State, as it developed, to play its full part in making the I.L.O. an effective agency?

The Conference should not confine itself to the adoption of Conventions and Recommendations. It should also be constantly striving to adapt these instruments to the new needs of a changing world and review them in order to allow a large number of ratifications. While the existing procedure is satisfactory in certain
cases, it is not in all; and therefore the Director-General’s suggestion to add to the existing standing committees a standing Revision Committee deserves consideration.

Such a procedure, if it were supplemented by a programme of systematic revision of Conventions designed to meet the need for a continual review of social policy according to circumstances, would enable the Organisation to carry out its task of pointing the way to progress.

The problem of the periodicity of the Conference is also raised in the Director-General’s Report. There can be no doubt that owing to the growing responsibilities of the Conference its annual workload can be quite a heavy one and calls for considerable effort, but it can also be asserted that, thanks to a strict and freely accepted discipline and close co-operation on the part of all its members, the Conference has always completed its work on time.

The arguments put forward in favour of an alteration in the periodicity of the Conference are admittedly relevant, but other reasons, very weighty to my mind, argue in favour of maintaining the annual periodicity of the Conference. Annual sessions facilitate a closer contact among delegates, both Government delegates and Employers’ and Workers’ representatives from different parts of the world, and representing different economic and political systems, and I regard these contacts as desirable for the purpose of supervision and to ensure a speedy adjustment of the Organisation’s activities to constantly changing needs.

The solution proposed, which would be to have full and restricted sessions of the Conference alternating every two years, would in a way be in accordance with the requirements I have just mentioned, whilst considerably reducing the burden of work for the Conference. It is obvious that the continuation of the practice of having annual sessions should enable the Conference to fulfil its various tasks. However, in order to enable the Conference to concentrate entirely on its essential tasks, it would be highly desirable to have a careful examination of the organisation of its proceedings. I myself should like this study to be marked by a joint effort to achieve mutual understanding. Small States, above all—and I think also young States—must be desirous of reaching such understanding.

To lead a full life man needs peace and progress and respect for the human personality. The same applies to communities. It seems to me that freedom, justice and equity, without any discrimination and under freely accepted order and discipline, is the surest way of ensuring human advancement, which is the basis of the ideal which we have chosen together for the I.L.O.

I hope that, true to its principles, the I.L.O. will play its part in this patient and difficult advance of civilisation. Civilisation is the sum of human activities and determines living conditions at any time. I am sure that the International Labour Organisation will play a leading part in the building of this new civilisation of labour. May we all co-operate generously with it. May we all show an understanding of the well-being of others and a common desire to contribute, each in our measure, to the development of mankind.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. PALLARES ZALDUMBIDE (Government delegate, Ecuador)—We have come together in this Conference at a time when the world is witnessing fundamental political and social changes. Our Secretary-General, Mr. Morse, is aware of the historic moment in which mankind is now living, and he begins his Report with a warning which contains a profound truth when he says that “the I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history, at one of those points where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action”. This statement of the Secretary-General also tells us what should be the new policy of the Organisation to cope with the constant change and with the requirements of nations and peoples who aspire to a more just and better world. Without ignoring the incalculable value of the practical achievements of the I.L.O. to date in promoting economic and social welfare of the workers, it is essential to search for wider horizons and to prepare new operational programmes, to give a vital impetus to this world Organisation, which is called upon more than any other to fulfil the noble mission of seeking solidarity and understanding among all men.

Therefore, rarely in the history of the I.L.O. have we delegates to the International Labour Conference had before us as important a document as this Report of the Director-General. This Report has been produced at a time when the I.L.O. is at a critical stage in its history, as was so well stated by Mr. Morse, when the world is seeking a new historical objective along a long and weary road.

Over the years that have elapsed since the Second World War there has been a series of events which have totally altered many aspects of traditional life, and new factors have emerged which are having a strong influence on social progress. In new terms Mr. Morse is asking us to discuss and think over new concepts, and we who help to make the I.L.O. what it is, through our co-operation, ask ourselves whether the I.L.O. is really ready to cope with the complex problems of the modern world. It is obvious that we have to give a reply to this pressing question. We must do more: we must reply by action, and our reply must be a practical one and must provide a genuine solution.

We do not mean by this that the I.L.O. is not in a position to cope with the new situations which are arising as a result of the new course of world events, nor that its eminently spiritual work, standard-setting and technical assistance has not helped to guide the nations through the difficult fields of social policy, but it is our duty to help to strengthen the Organisation, and to mention only a few aspects of its work which should perhaps be improved.

The International Labour Organisation has been built on a sound foundation, namely on the co-operation of governments, employers and workers, who compose it and give it strength. It is obvious that this particular structure enables the three factors to reach agreements on general lines—compromises on
social policy which take the form of the Conventions and Recommendations we adopt. But this discussion between these factors of production is perhaps not sufficiently continuous to produce greater understanding and better relations which would result in more effective national programmes of truly effective social policy. The Conventions and Recommendations, which are standard-setting instruments which should serve as examples for national legislation, are perhaps excessively general and in particular cases may prove to be obsolete. Unfortunately this is so and will continue to be so as long as (as Mr. Morse says) there is a division between North and South, between the industrialised countries enjoying relatively high levels of income and those countries, many of them only now emerging to independence from colonial status, in which incomes are very low and economies underdeveloped.

How can we define and draft a Convention or a Recommendation in reasonable terms applicable to all countries, even if this is done by stages, if in fact there is a tremendous abyss between the economic and social conditions prevailing in industrialised countries and those prevailing in underdeveloped countries?

This leads me to express very serious concern about underdevelopment, on which Mr. Morse has some very valuable things to say. We know that the I.L.O. has begun to operate programmes to promote development in various parts of the world. In our own countries, for example, we have for some years had the Andean Programme for the integration of the indigenous peoples.

We believe that programmes of this kind should be extended and intensified as the experts acquire experience and as resources allow this to be done. It is a fact that the funds available often do not allow us to carry out the programme which would be desirable, but in any case we hope that the Office will increase its efforts to ensure that such programmes to help countries in the course of development will have the priority which is required by the times in which we live.

My country, Ecuador, like all the countries of Latin America, is now concerned to make up for lost time and it wants to apply a plan of economic and social development which is designed, among other things, to raise the level of employment and the standard of living of the inhabitants. It is participating in the Alliance for Progress as representing a new regional effort to advance out of the state of underdevelopment. Accordingly, my country has undertaken a substantial reform of the taxation system and has already promulgated a new income-tax law which places an appropriate burden on large incomes and practically exempts persons with low incomes. Soon a fiscal code will come into force which seeks to unify taxation legislation and to replace indirect by direct taxation. A large incomes and a higher standard of living.

There is no doubt that human rights could be more effectively practised if our workers had higher incomes and a higher standard of living. In any case, whatever special treatment developing countries need, we are disposed to maintain freedom. We are disposed to maintain the freedom and essence of representative democracy because we believe that men should live, as affirmed in the Declaration of Philadelphia, "in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity".

I would like to state clearly that our country, Ecuador more than ever before feels itself to be a faithful Member of the I.L.O. faithful to its traditions and principles and as a faithful Member of the I.L.O. meets the requirements of modern insurance, which is already compulsory for industrial workers and public and private salaried employees.

Most peoples have more or less as their main preoccupation the securing of economic and social advancement, and perhaps the time has come for the I.L.O. to face with vigour and decision the new problems arising in this connection. One cannot wait for half a century to achieve the benefits which modern civilisation brings with it but which are enjoyed by very few, while the majority languish in care-worn poverty.

This will certainly be one of the most difficult tasks to be performed by the I.L.O., but it is a task by which it may undoubtedly make a very great contribution to the peace of the world because, in our opinion, the world is endangered not only by the manufacture and accumulation of nuclear bombs but, above all, by the persistence of poverty which creates popular discontent and collective disturbance.

The texts of Conventions and Recommendations may be attractive in a majority of cases but, unfortunately, they will be ineffective in countries in which extreme poverty does not permit ratification with a view to application.

This brings me to the question of freedom. We know that one of the objectives of the I.L.O. is to protect freedom, and our country, faithful to its traditions and principles and as a faithful Member of the I.L.O., maintains an atmosphere of absolute freedom in every respect and so we have given special attention to protecting freedom of association, which is guaranteed in our Constitution.

At the same time as we safeguard this freedom, until the trade unions are sufficiently strong to be able, by collective bargaining, to establish appropriate conditions of work, we have established labour legislation in accordance with the policy of protecting the worker and with the object of maintaining equilibrium between capital and labour.

There is no doubt that human rights could be more effectively practised if our workers had higher incomes and a higher standard of living. In any case, whatever special treatment developing countries need, we are disposed to maintain freedom. We are disposed to maintain the freedom and essence of representative democracy because we believe that men should live, as affirmed in the Declaration of Philadelphia, "in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity".

Ecuador has already promulgated a new income-tax law which places an appropriate burden on large incomes and practically exempts persons with low incomes. Soon a fiscal code will come into force which seeks to unify taxation legislation and to replace indirect by direct taxation. A substantial reform of the taxation system and the object of maintaining equilibrium between capital and labour.

Mr. DEVAN-NAIR (Workers' representative, Singapore)—In a world which continues to be
tormented by political, ideological, economic and racial dissensions, those who would success-
fully chart the courses of international bodies like the I.L.O. must be men who are capable of tran-
scending in themselves the divisions which rend humanity, so that they may effectively serve the cause of world peace, of international unity and of co-operation towards the world-
wide attainment of social justice and economic progress.

The Director-General's Report this year brings heartening evidence of the fact that the inspiration of this international organisation comes from men of high vision and humanity, imbued with a sense of practical idealism for the achievement of goals which we all profess in theory but do our damnest in practice to counter, obstruct or nullify.

Few of us can doubt, whatever may be our reservations or disagreements on matters of detail, that the Director-General's Report this year is inspired throughout by a vision of the possibilities of larger orbits of international co-operation and action for the amelioration of national and international socio-economic ills, injustices and inequalities.

It seems to me that it is basic and funda-
mental to the success of these international discussions to respect and to value the inter-
national character of the I.L.O. An international body becomes futile if it allows itself to suc
cumb to any narrow spirit of ideological exclusiveness, and to become a partisan instru-
ment in any particular interest. International unity and co-operation become im-
possible, and world peace also, if differences in philosophy concerning man and society are al-
lowed to act as a barrier to practical international action on labour and social matters.

All these considerations the Director-General has stressed in his admirable Report, and no-
thing that has transpired during this historic Conference weakens or invalidates these con-
siderations which are fundamental to the success of any truly international undertaking. However, in the light of developments, it becomes necessary to elaborate on these prin-
ciples and to assert that the success of any beneficial international action, which is the pri-
mary concern of international bodies, can easily be prejudiced if effective universal sanc-
tions, over and above mere condemnation in principle, are not applied against a nation like South Africa which offends against every known code of social ethics and moral values.

Surely it cannot be held that we become guilty of any narrow partisanship or ideological exclusiveness if we exclude from the sphere of international discussion and action a country like South Africa. Communism, socialism, capitalism and so forth are inherent social philosophies in spite of all their mutual antagonisms, but apartheid and rank racialism are not philosophies, any more than a murderer or rapist can be deemed to be a respectable member of a civilised community.

It is surely vital to the ideals of international co-operation that we should make this essential distinction if we are to keep our principles of international action alive and meaningful and protect them from degeneration into meaningless platitudes. I would humbly submit that it is in this light that we should all work towards

the solution of the dangers which threaten the existence of the United Nations and the I.L.O. The alternative to the effective functioning of international forums and agencies of action is too dreadful to contemplate.

In the limited time available I am able to touch on only a few aspects of the Director-
General's Report. Singapore is in vigorous pursuit of a policy of industrialisation and, as the Singapore Workers' representative, I have a special concern in this context with the distribution of incomes and its relation to general economic and social objectives.

I am glad to note that it is suggested that for the developing countries the I.L.O. should have as a main objective the bringing about of "a distribution of incomes which is socially just, taking account of the needs of the most vulnerable groups and of the need to achieve high levels of income-creating employment and an equitable sharing of the responsibilities and rewards of economic growth".

We accept the truism that there must be production before there can be distribution, and part of what is produced must be set aside for investment in physical assets and in human resources, with a view to increasing productive capacity. However, there are pressing reasons to work out a wages and incomes policy which would be in harmony not only with the necessities of economic and social planning but also with the demands of social justice.

In this connection, we are glad that the Director-General is of the view that the I.L.O. would not subscribe to the idea that wage policies should be unconditionally subordinated to the requirements of general economic and social development. I hope that governments and employers will endorse the view that it is hardly equitable or politically realistic to require sacrifices from the workers in the development effort, for example by moderating wage increases, unless proportionately greater and greater sacrifices are required from those who can most afford to make them.

We hope that this Conference will accept the Director-General's suggestion that the question of incomes policy in relation to economic development should be considered at an early session, with a view to reaching agreement on general principles, possibly in the form of an International Recommendation, which could be a guide both to national and to I.L.O. action.

Lastly, I come to the revision of I.L.O. Conventions, and the desirability of ensuring flexibility in their formulation and application. Flexibility in the matter of the formulation and application of Conventions is clearly necessary, if only to take objective account of the great variations which exist in respect of national conditions and circumstances. I.L.O. Conventions should be regarded in many cases as ideals to be sincerely striven for under widely varying national conditions, rather than as immediately attainable and endorsable national goals. This I would submit to be sheer common sense. Any self-righteous dogmatism in this regard would only retard the ultimate attainment of the universally cherished goals as enshrined in these Conventions.

What the I.L.O. should require is clear
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We are aware that flexibility in the matter of the application of Conventions can be stretched to absurd limits. There are, unfortunately, governments in the world which possess an India-rubber flexibility in the matter of the application of Conventions, so much so that they are able to wriggle out of all Conventions, obligations and decencies. We can have nothing in common with such governments.

In conclusion, may I reiterate my sincere congratulations to the Director-General for an enlightened and inspiring Report which is worthy of the most serious and respectful consideration by all who believe in the ideals of social justice and economic progress for the working masses of mankind.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. APARICIO VALDEZ (Employers' delegate, Peru)—The Director-General's Report has the double merit of quality and timeliness. Certainly a better moment could not have been chosen to study the possibility of adjusting the I.L.O. to a changing world made up mainly of young countries.

It is proper to consider that this Organisation should increase its efforts to provide technical assistance for all the countries that are striving to develop. It is said that there are many international agencies which can give this kind of assistance, but I doubt if any one of them is better qualified than the I.L.O. to do this job within its field of competence.

As an example I may quote the efforts now being made throughout Latin America to establish vocational training centres which will enable productivity to be increased at short notice by improving levels of skill. When these centres are in full operation a better utilisation of the labour force will certainly be possible. The I.L.O.'s co-operation in this field is a subject of satisfaction. It is most important to multiply these efforts, for that will contribute directly to the progress of our countries and a higher level of wages. Peruvian employers, who of course wish to promote the training of the workers, are associated with these efforts, for they contribute directly to the resources of such training centres in our country.

I am convinced of the importance of the International Institute for Labour Studies. I believe that the I.L.O. should continue to support it and should study the possibility of the Institute's holding courses in the future in other parts of the world. This would certainly be cheaper than inviting the students to Geneva as is done at present, and it would enable a greater number of pupils to be instructed.

There is a great desire in Peru to study and improve labour-management relations, and this matter has the attention of all sectors. Attempts are being made to place these relations on a solid basis of co-operation. Our employers are also supporting the Centre for Labour Studies recently established in Perú, which gives trade union training courses and will be one of the sources of guidance for the new currents of constructive trade unionism.

As far as they can, Peruvian employers con-
tinue to co-operate in the country's industrial development. They have succeeded, jointly with the highly skilled Peruvian fishermen, in making Perú's fishing industry one of the first in the world, although ten years ago it was unknown. The workers obtain a good return for their labour in this industry.

We think too that the prices of raw materials should not fall sharply, as this affects the eco-

omy of a country, harms all sectors and leads

unemployment.

Apart from co-operating directly in technical development and so helping to raise the standards of living of the working class the I.L.O. should, I believe, continue its standard-setting activity. However, the instruments should be Recommendations rather than strict Conventions. The I.L.O. is having increasingly to issue general standards covering workers in widely different regions and occupations, and difficulties are caused and a wider margin for error left if the provisions are too narrow. The I.L.O. should make Recommendations which will enable each country to adjust its legisla-

tion to particular possibilities and characteris-
The Conventions should be limited to basic matters which, as they are universal, should be applied to all countries irrespective of the region and way of life. As standards can hardly be perfectly applied in all latitudes because of the differing conditions, regard should be had to the natural changes which occur in course of time, and so some of the instruments should be revised—but of course only in the light of their essential objective.

We feel that everything should be done to enable the Industrial Committees of the I.L.O. to continue to operate as they have in the past. New industries arise as development occurs and science progresses, and so technicians and experts should study the conditions of work in those industries. If the I.L.O.'s economic situation does not permit the Committees to continue to operate on the present footing I would recommend that the number of participants representing each country be reduced.

Before concluding I should like to express the hope that all countries will find, through wholehearted co-operation, a constitutional solution for the difficulties which the I.L.O. is now going through, and will at the same time express their continued repudiation of every form of racial discrimination. This is demanded by the maturity and prestige of the I.L.O., the senior among the international organisations.

Mr. van TILBURG (Workers' delegate, Netherlands)—The Report of the Director-General to this session of the International Labour Conference is in my opinion perhaps one of the most important which we have ever had placed before us. It deals with the future role of the I.L.O. in a changing world. And the world has changed. We can see two major divisions in the world: first there is the sharp division between East and West, but there is also the division between North and South or, as the Director-General says in his introduction, between the industrialised countries enjoying relatively high levels of income and those other countries many of which are only now emerging into independence from colonial status and have underdeveloped economies.

I underline the fact that this division between North and South has evidenced a growing consciousness of mutual responsibility and of the necessity to achieve practical international co-operation. It is one of the most important tasks of the present generation to attack world poverty. Moreover, we have to face the so-called second industrial revolution; the major technological changes and the application of automation and atomic energy.

The question put before us is how and how far the structure of the I.L.O. and its programme need adaptation to these tremendous changes. I do not believe that any of us think there should be no changes. Moreover, we are used to finding each year a number of proposals for changing the Constitution or the Standing Orders of the I.L.O., all of which result from the concept that the structure of the I.L.O. is insufficiently adapted to the changes occurring in the world.

There is, for example, the rapid decolonisation process in Asia and especially in Africa—a development that we workers of the West welcome with joy—which leads to a constant influx of new members into the United Nations and as a consequence into the I.L.O. These new countries cannot complete the process of decolonisation without a corresponding development in the social and economic field. They need aid in many forms, including money of course, as gifts or loans, but especially technical assistance in many fields, including our own, the social field.

This indispensable help from the richer and developed countries could easily rouse thoughts of neo-colonialism. Therefore this aid has to be given mainly on a multilateral basis, which means, for example, that the specialised agencies and also the I.L.O. should play an important role.

For us, the workers of the Netherlands, this belief in the right of the new countries to every kind of assistance is based on the fundamental idea that there can be no justice and no respect for human dignity in a world where such large and ever growing differences of wealth exist, as they do in our world today. We trade unionists have always fought for social justice. This struggle is by no means finished on the national level, though relations have improved and we are proud of the results we have achieved up to now.

It is my firm conviction that international solidarity has to prevail over national troubles in the industrialised countries. This is a requirement of social justice and is necessary to promote world peace.

During the coming period the I.L.O. has to play a more important role, and I am in agreement with the Director-General's remarks in the Report about this question.

Above all we should realise, however, that there is a growing interdependence between all the countries in the world, and connected with this is the need for expansion of world trade. This is not possible if Western countries close their frontiers to the products of the newly industrialised countries. The slogan "trade not aid" is one-sided. It should be "trade and aid". Workers in the developed countries must realise that this means, to a certain extent, a new division of labour and changes in the employment structure in our countries. This could be difficult and perhaps painful.

With regard to this, I recall the Association Agreement between the six countries of the Common Market and a number of French-speaking African countries. I hope that the English-speaking African countries will also come into line with this in the framework of the negotiations based on the Trade Expansion Act of the United States.

I agree with the Director-General when he says that the I.L.O. has to provide fuller information on all these questions. Nevertheless, we must not forget that the I.L.O. must retain its proper responsibility of upholding basic human rights in the labour and social fields.

In this connection, I should like to say a few words about one of the basic characteristics of the I.L.O.: I mean freedom of association. In his Report the Director-General recognises the principle that freedom of association has a validity going beyond particular forms of social and economic organisation. In this field
the I.L.O. has a major responsibility. Member States have the same responsibility as soon as they participate in the I.L.O. However, I see it as a failure in the Report that you cannot find an answer to the question of how the I.L.O. will or can protect this freedom effectively and, in cases of violations of this freedom, can redress it. In my opinion the I.L.O. has to give a clear answer.

In his Report the Director-General also raises the question of the distribution of incomes and its relation to general economic and social objectives. You will understand that we in the Netherlands have read this part of the Report very carefully, because trade unions and employers' organisations have co-operated with the Government since 1945 to achieve a wage policy that takes account of the interdependence of such economic and social targets as full employment, stable economic expansion growth, price stability and equilibrium of the balance of payments.

The unions have given this collaboration in the real interest of the workers, and have played an important role with regard to this wage policy. This attitude has not always been met with understanding by our friends from other countries. On the international level there is a lot of misunderstanding and resistance. They have not always understood why we were prepared to accept a degree of governmental interference and achieved a degree of centralisation in the bargaining process that narrowed the scope for negotiations on the local level or even on the industrial level.

Therefore I welcome the suggestion of the Director-General that the I.L.O. should make a study of these important and difficult problems. However, a prerequisite for such a study should be a common acceptance of certain social and economic objectives and a common view on the role of trade unions with regard to the wage policy. This attitude has not always been met with understanding by our friends from other countries. On the international level there is a lot of misunderstanding and resistance. They have not always understood why we were prepared to accept a degree of governmental interference and achieved a degree of centralisation in the bargaining process that narrowed the scope for negotiations on the local level or even on the industrial level.

Finally, it should be understood that the instrument of the wage policy cannot be used and studied in isolation. Wage policy is only one of the instruments for reaching a just income distribution. Our experience in the Netherlands teaches us that we need close co-operation between the different instruments, among which taxation and monetary policy are very important.

To be frank, the statements of the Director-General with regard to trade unions and labour relations in the developing countries have astonished me. If I understand the Director-General correctly, he seems to hold the view that the I.L.O. should promote sound organisations and provide adequate training for their leadership. In my opinion this can never be an I.L.O. task. To assist the workers in the developing countries to build their own unions cannot be left to a tripartite body like the I.L.O. It should be the task of the workers themselves, if necessary with the help of the international trade union movement.

Now I shall tackle the problem of the structure of our Organisation. For lack of time I shall be very brief. One of the most important proposals is that concerning the credentials procedure. The Director-General proposes to entrust a number of functions of the Credentials Committee to an independent judicial body. In my view, this proposal is not acceptable. Article 3, paragraph 9, of the Constitution says very clearly: "The credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be subject to scrutiny by the Conference ..." I see no reason at all why the Conference should hand over this important competence to an independent body. This would mean that the Conference—which is a sovereign assembly and has to make its own decisions in respect of credentials—would show its incompetence to deal with its own responsibilities. Moreover, the tripartite structure of the I.L.O., which I consider to be essential, would be undermined by this procedure. Of course we can study ways of speeding up the credentials procedure, but this important competence must never be given up.

In this connection it seems to be necessary to say a few words with regard to the essential character of the I.L.O. and its tripartite structure, as I see it. The Report says in Chapter X that it is vital to "respect the principle that the I.L.O. is not merely a body for tripartite discussion but a body for tripartite decision".

I fully agree with this statement. But I do ask, whether, in other parts of the Report, the concept of tripartism is not overshadowed by the concept of universalism. (Whatever it may be, this concept cannot be found in the Constitution.) Universalism could be a valid and vital concept, when speaking of the character of the United Nations. Nevertheless the I.L.O. is a specialised agency of the United Nations now. However, the I.L.O. is based on acceptance of the concept of tripartism. Whatever happens, this unique character must be retained. You cannot interfere with this concept without damaging the character of the I.L.O. itself. There is no need either for a new political forum or for a technocratic institution. In this changing world we need this unique organisation where the governments, independent workers and employers of the whole world can consult together, and where decisions can be taken in a democratic way for the well-being of all peoples.

I have to limit myself. Without going into details, I support in general the suggestion of strengthening the regionalisation plan. Also I agree with the proposal to form a permanent committee during the Conference to revise the Conventions and Recommendations. Finally, concerning the question of Convention or Recommendation, it is in my view the role of the I.L.O. to make a systematic attempt to provide the best possible standards. I understand the need for flexibility in Conventions, but such flexibility should not lead to a weakening of this international instrument. I cannot agree with some arguments made from this rostrum, namely to introduce partial ratification.

I finish in expressing the hope that on the basis of the Report of the Director-General and this valuable general discussion together with the answer we get from the Director-General on the basis of this Report, the newly elected Governing Body will come for the next session of the Conference with clear proposals which
will improve the programme and strengthen the structure of the I.L.O.

Mr. HANKE (Workers' delegate, Poland)—In replying to the invitation of the Director-General, who has asked for a free and open discussion of problems mentioned in his Report, I should like to submit to the Conference the views of the Polish trade union movement in respect of matters which in our opinion are of particular significance for the future activities of the I.L.O. and the improvement of the lot of the working people.

It is not by accident that the programme and structure of the I.L.O. have been placed on the agenda of this session of the Conference. Both the programme and structure of the I.L.O. have to adapt themselves to present realities.

It is essential to introduce here and now changes which correspond to the needs of our times so as to rejuvenate our Organisation and enable it to meet problems which result from deep social, economic and political changes taking place all over the world. This process of change cannot be stopped. The traditional order, when confronted with the merciless forces of life, crumbles to pieces. New criteria and ideas are born out of the struggle. They greatly influence the relations between nations, so as to guide the nations in the common task of improving the living conditions of all people in ensuring peace, freedom and social justice.

The fact that the I.L.O. has obstinately held on to traditional concepts and the empty letter of outdated constitutional provisions, that it has closed its eyes to the realities of the present world, has led to a very serious crisis which has been manifesting itself in the course of the present session. When trying to assess objectively the activities of our Organisation, it becomes clear that the maintenance of such outdated provisions of the Constitution and the Standing Orders, as well as of traditional methods of work, is incompatible with the true interests of the I.L.O. and with its future tasks.

From this point of view the Report of the Director-General constitutes, no doubt, a step forward in seeking, in spite of many obstacles, the right solutions.

I should like, however, to say a few words concerning the second part of the Report. The proposals expressed in this part may, in fact, be considered only as half-measures aimed at improving the methods of work of the Conference, its organs and committees. These proposals do not touch upon changes that must be undertaken. We know from experience that even the best of all programmes cannot be implemented if the conditions for implementation are not first created and the structure and methods of work adopted.

The Director-General says that in its activities the I.L.O. follows three basic principles, namely freedom of work, freedom of association and the priority of social problems. These principles are generally agreed to, but they are not applied in practice. We are in full agreement with the Director-General that one of the basic tasks of the I.L.O. is to press for these principles to be adopted and implemented in all countries.

The I.L.O. may be successful in its tasks if in its practical and standard-setting work account is taken of urgent economic and social problems of the working masses.

However, the I.L.O. does not pay enough attention to the fact that the part played by the working class and its trade union organisations is continually increasing in all countries, including those where the interests of governments do not fully coincide with the interests of the working masses or the nation. The fact that the working masses are a decisive factor in the shaping of national policy and true engineers of social progress is insufficiently brought out in the Report.

The I.L.O. has been set up to serve the working man. It will be able to face and solve the complicated problems of the present time only if it maintains a closer contact with the working masses, takes greater account of the importance of trade unions, and is able to find speedy solutions to the burning economic, social and political needs.

The I.L.O. should in fact find its strongest supporter in a truly representative Workers' group of both the Conference and the Governing Body. On the other hand, the Workers' group should co-operate with the I.L.O. to the full, so that the activities of the I.L.O. would accord with the interests of the working masses. It is clear that the unity and strength of the Workers' group of the Conference determines the strength and direction of I.L.O. activities.

Unfortunately, the leadership of the Workers' group of the Conference has been, for the past 15 years, monopolised by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which is usurping the right of exclusive representation of the working masses of the world and which pretends to be infallible in solving the workers' problems.

The conservative wing of the Confederation's leadership and its policy are responsible for the weakness of the Workers' group and also, to a large extent, for many shortcomings of the I.L.O., including the reasons for the incidents which have taken place at the present session and the difficulties which have followed. It is essential that we deprive the Confederation of the monopoly to govern the Workers' group, so as to enable the Workers' group to regain its proper role and authority in the Conference and its strength as one of the main pillars of the I.L.O.

Therefore, for the good of the I.L.O., it is necessary, when revising the Constitution, to amend provisions concerning the election of Officers of the Workers' group so that all tendencies existing in the international workers' movement should be represented. The absence of proper representation is particularly striking in respect of the Officers of the Conference and the composition of the organs of the I.L.O., the Governing Body in particular.

The latest elections to the Governing Body are proof that the present anti-democratic system of election is contrary to the interests of the I.L.O. How else, if not by conscious discrimination, can the fact be explained that the Governing Body does not include the representative of the U.S.S.R. trade unions, which today number 66 million members?
How can we explain that the 12 Workers' members of the Governing Body do not include a single representative of unions affiliated to either the World Federation of Trade Unions or the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions or of unaffiliated unions? The Governing Body, as well as other organs of the I.L.O., are not sufficiently representative and thus unable to fulfil their task.

The proper solution of this problem is closely connected with another very important matter. The Report of the Director-General says that in the course of recent years an increasing number of countries have challenged some of the Conventions of the I.L.O. This has been so because some governments appoint Workers' delegates not according to the principle of the most representative organisation, but according to their own likes and dislikes. It is therefore difficult to find in the Workers' group of the Conference true reflection of the situation and conditions obtaining in the trade union movement of particular countries.

These practices are symptomatic of war waged against trade union rights by monopolies and by governments linked with them. If freedom of association and trade union rights are truly among the basic principles of the I.L.O., the Organisation should, first and foremost, urge the governments of States Members to send to the Conference Workers' delegates appointed according to the provisions of the I.L.O. Constitution. Were these provisions followed, the number of challenged credentials would be reduced, a truly representative character of the Workers' delegates to the Conference ensured and the prestige of the I.L.O. increased. It is also necessary for the Credentials Committee to revise, in full objectivity, the decisions which, a few years back, were taken in respect of some organisations, and to acknowledge that these organisations have the right fully to represent the interests of the workers.

The Director-General has devoted considerable attention to the standard-setting activities of the I.L.O. which, we think, should have an important place in the future programme of the I.L.O. No doubt revision of some Conventions may be timely because their provisions have been somewhat devalued in the light of social progress brought about in a number of countries through the hard struggle of the working masses, but none the less the question of ratification and of practical application of Conventions remains in the forefront.

We know from experience of the workers' movement that the application of adopted standards does not depend so much on the goodwill of governments as on the pressure and strength of the trade union movement. Therefore, in seeking a solution to the programme of the application of Conventions, the I.L.O. should appreciate that the activities of trade unions and social policies of governments are closely related and, in its action, rely to a greater extent on trade unions.

The activities of the I.L.O., its achievements and failures, depend on the extent to which the trade union movement in the countries concerned is able to engage the unions on particular questions, and their sharing in the responsibility for the Organisation.

There is no doubt that men who are deaf to reason and blinded with hatred of communism feel little, if any, responsibility for the I.L.O. These men have learned nothing from the events of the last few days. They consciously poison the atmosphere and render co-operation difficult, as may be judged from the stand taken by the Workers' delegate from the Federal Republic of Germany, who attacked the German Democratic Republic—the first democratic and peaceful German State, with which we maintain relations of friendship and cooperation.

We are fully convinced that among trade union members, regardless of their tendencies and opinions, the number of those who favour a policy of reason and of co-operation between nations is on the increase. We are also convinced that there are more and more trade union members who want a united world trade union movement, so as to ensure the victory of our just cause.

Today, as on previous occasions, we want to appeal to all trade union members to join forces in order to solve the problems with which we are all confronted. These are: peace, friendship between nations, liquidation of the last vestiges of colonialism and of its social and economic results, general disarmament, so that money spent on armaments may be used for the improvement of material and cultural standards of the working people and, finally, defence and respect of trade union rights and democratic freedoms.

The I.L.O. may be used to the advantage of union activities, because it provides us with an opportunity of exchanging opinions and experience and of trying to solve, through common efforts, important and often complex social problems.

The Polish trade unions have, in the course of recent years, acquired practical experience in respect of workers' participation in management, improvement in safety and hygiene, on collaboration with relevant authorities on workers' training, new methods of workers' education and culture, etc.

We believe that co-operation and uniformity of action of the whole Workers' group in the I.L.O., based on common interest of working men in all countries, regardless of their political and economic systems, is one of the basic conditions of improving the atmosphere within this Organisation, of guiding it in the right direction and of strengthening its ability to implement in practice the principles of the Declaration of Philadelphia and of the Constitution.

Interpretation from Persian: Mr. SEYFI (Workers' delegate, Iran)—I am happy to be able to participate in this great meeting of Workers' delegations from various nations. Before taking up the discussion of the Director-General's Report, I should like to draw your attention to the problem of racial segregation in the Republic of South Africa. On behalf of the Iranian trade unions and workers, I protest energetically against the way workers in this country are being treated.

I am a Workers' delegate from a country where, for 25 centuries or more, the various
religions and social and political ideas have always been respected. We sympathise with the suffering of the South African Workers and was join our voices with those of the other workers throughout the world in demanding that a solution be found as soon as possible to this shameful racial problem. It is fortunate that the I.L.O. is seeking ways and means of improving the social situation of the workers. In the Director-General's Report various extremely interesting problems of concern to the workers are brought up: the protection of freedom of association, vocational training, social security and many other matters.

In my country the I.L.O. publications on trade unionism and vocational training have rendered considerable service. It is easy to understand why the standard of living of the workers and peasants in Iran is very low. Iran is a vast country, possessing enormous natural resources which could help to raise the living standard of the people if they were to be utilised correctly for the welfare of society as a whole. However, for many years the important posts and the seats in Parliament have been occupied by a number of profiteers and impostors who have been sharing among themselves the natural income without worrying about improving the lot of the people and about social progress, and in this way they have prevented any social reform. Unable to assemble in such conditions, the unions were unable to organise themselves in order to improve the status of the workers. In consideration of what I have just said, the majority of the people, who are farmers and workers, were deprived of decent living conditions, since the fruit of their labours was appropriated by a handful of exploiters.

Over the past few years considerable progress has been made in all fields. New industrial centres have been set up; new dams and housing for the workers have been constructed; new labour and social security laws have been introduced. The trade unions have succeeded in regrouping the workers, and this implies considerable progress. The agrarian reform which has taken place, thanks to the sustained efforts of our democratic Shah, the leader of peace and freedom and the defender of his country's independence, has favourably influenced the lot of the working class. This deep influence has placed social life on a brilliant path, holding out high hopes for the future. The attempts made by the resistance of revolutionary circles, supported by the capitalists, to prevent agrarian reform and the participation of the workers in the profits of the undertakings, and other reforms, have failed. The reform was supported by some 6 million people and by the will of His Majesty the Shah. This agrarian reform has proceeded apace throughout the country.

We hope that in the near future, thanks to the signing of collective agreements between workers' and employers' organisations, the workers will participate more fully in the profits of the undertakings. Thanks to agrarian reform, which is having a beneficial effect on the rural workers, the living conditions of industrial workers are improving constantly and this prevents the exodus of the rural population to urban centres.

The trade unions in Iran have exerted a great influence on social security schemes and their operation. At the present time medical care is guaranteed to the worker and to the members of his family.

Our trade unions and workers' organisations are now endeavouring to set up a national federation in order to solve, as rapidly as possible, problems such as wage fixing on the national level and the building of workers' housing in the various provinces of the country. These efforts to develop social justice will make for higher incomes and increased well-being for the workers. I am convinced that the combined strength of our workers and peasants will foil any attempt to retard or prevent the victorious advance of our people.

I trust, and am convinced, that the discussions and the suggestions made by the distinguished delegates to this Conference, together with the decisions taken, will contribute towards improving the living and working conditions of work people throughout the world.

Mr. FENNEMA (Employers' delegate, Netherlands)—The crisis in this Organisation has not been overcome because of international events, but because the I.L.O. has not been approved. The crisis has been there for many years, although the Director-General has assured us, year after year, that the I.L.O. was strong and healthy; and even last Tuesday, in his remarkable address to the Conference, he told us that he believed that the I.L.O. had emerged strengthened from each test. I do not share that view.

Since the entry of communist dictatorships with tripartite delegations in 1954, the installation of a so-called Appeals Board, the strike of the staff during the Governing Body Session of March 1962, the undermining forces of this Organisation have become stronger and stronger. Some of you believe that it is the result of political factors and that if only these political factors were removed the I.L.O. would again become a harmonious tripartite organisation.

It is my view that the Government delegates bear a very heavy responsibility for the degradation of this Organisation precisely because of their political opportunism.

In asking ourselves today in which direction we are going it may be useful to look from where we come, at what the I.L.O.'s founders wished and meant it to be. They meant it to be an Organisation grouping free and equal states—de jure and de facto—under the protection of the United Nations and able to enforce the decisions of the competent organs. In my opinion that is what the I.L.O. is meant to be, irrespective of political limitations. The I.L.O. is free and autonomous, an international organisation, distinct from the United Nations. It is an international union of employers, workers and governments, just like the two former international unions.

The I.L.O. is an international union of employers, workers and governments. It is an international organisation of a tripartite nature. It is a union of labour, a union of governments and an international organisation of a tripartite nature.

We see in the I.L.O. the godson of the United Nations family, because the I.L.O. works under the protection of the United Nations, and the I.L.O. is a uniform which is not worn only by the United Nations and the states, but by employers and workers. The I.L.O. is the offspring of the United Nations, and I believe that the United Nations is the offspring of the I.L.O. We are conscious of this; we are conscious of the fact that the I.L.O. is an international organisation of a tripartite nature.
who would be nothing more than disguised Government representatives.

The problem would similarly arise if Soviet Russia were to become a Member of the I.L.O. It is, in fact, impossible for the Government of Moscow to delegate an Employer or Worker representative who would not be an official. The judicial solution, in either case, would consist of confining the representation of those States in which autonomous association no longer exists to two Government delegates only.

The Conference betrayed the tripartite structure of this Organisation when in 1959 the so-called Appeals Board was installed. On page 133 of the Director-General's Report the establishment of this Appeals Board is presented as a compromise proposal. It may be that the term "compromise" in this connection is a remnant of the original proposal, adopted by a majority of the Governing Body and presented to the Conference, in which the monstrous system of block-voting was introduced by which, under certain conditions in the Conference committees, minority negative votes could be counted as being positive votes. I would, in view of the fact that the system than by quoting Professor Ago, the Chairman of the Committee which invented this queer arithmetic, who explained the system in the Governing Body in March 1959 in the following terms: "... Section IV of the proposals, relating to voting in committees, was designed to meet a preoccupation of the Government members in particular. They had been anxious to ensure, alongside equality of treatment for all members of the Conference, the maintenance of the tripartite system which was the essence of the I.L.O. The intention was that in especially important and exceptional circumstances it should be possible to restore the balance of voting strength as between the different groups if it were endangered as a result of the composition of the committees, but only if the group so desired. The procedure would be entirely optional and for use in exceptional cases; if the group did not wish to make use of it, so much the better, but the Government members had felt that a safety valve of this kind was necessary in the Standing Orders. ..."

The Conference fortunately in the same year rejected this system of block-voting, but it is clear from Professor Ago's statement which I have just mentioned that by doing so it abolished the maintenance of the tripartite system, which was the essence of the I.L.O., and it prevented restoration of the balance of voting strength as between the different groups. In 1959 democracy in this Organisation was replaced by hypocrisy.

I have dwelt on this matter rather comprehensively because the Director-General is so pleased with this system of by-passing the Conference and leaving decisions to outside persons that, with regard to the credentials procedure, he is making similar proposals on pages 149 and 150 of his Report. A judicial body would be established which would make the final decision to determine whether there has been a violation of the Constitution, and the Credentials Committee and the Conference itself, the highest organ, could only accept this decision in silence. I am happy to note that this proposal has met with serious objections from speakers from all the three groups of the Conference.

The Director-General rightly points out that our credentials procedure is entirely different from the credentials procedure of any other international organisation. The basic aim of the credentials procedure in the I.L.O. has been and should be to protect and safeguard the tripartite structure of the Organisation. Nevertheless, it is my view that at present our credentials procedure is completely bankrupt, mainly as a result of the attitude of Government delegates, who pay lip-service to the principle of independence of Employers' and Workers' delegates, but in their decisions—and often in their instructions—are guided by political considerations. In 1945 the Conference at its 27th Session, in Paris, unanimously adopted the recommendation of its Credentials Committee to invalidate the credentials of the Workers' delegates of a Latin American State, because they were not appointed under those conditions of liberty which are presumed by the agreement referred to in paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Constitution. I think I was not the only one to feel surprised—to use no stronger expression—to hear the President of the 1945 Conference, last year, defend the credentials of the Cuban Government official who was nominated as Employers' delegate, without refuting the arguments brought forward by the Credentials Committee but only on the slogan that there be coexistence here between representatives of different and differing economic systems.

On behalf of the free Employers' group, with regard to the proposals of the Director-General concerning certain amendments in the credentials procedure, I have to state that we are opposed to any solution which will diminish the competence of the Conference and its Credentials Committee with regard to the investigation of, and decision on, the validity of the credentials.

We think that some improvement in procedure could be made if the provision of article 26, paragraph 1, that the credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be deposited at least 15 days before the opening date of the Conference, were to become compulsory with the proviso that the delegations whose credentials are received after the stated time limit could only attend the Conference as observers. Moreover, governments would have to indicate, together with the credentials, which organisations of workers and employers they had consulted and in agreement with which organisations they had made their nominations of the non-governmental delegates and advisers. At the same time, the government should also include in the letter of credentials the functions of these persons. If the Standing Orders of the Conference were amended in such a way we think it would enable the Credentials Committee to arrive at conclusions at an earlier date during the Conference.
I have acted...the Credentials Committee for many years, but I have never...of the relative strengths of competing...The Credentials Committee is not a court; it is only presenting...recommendations to the Conference. It is for those who challenge the credentials to prove that the government concerned has not followed the provisions of the Constitution.

I therefore support wholeheartedly the statement of Mr. Abid Ali, the Workers’ delegate of India, who said last Wednesday that the unkind remarks on the position of the Workers’ members of the Credentials Committee, though couched in fine words, must be rejected outright.

The last point I should like to raise concerns the I.L.O. and the family of United Nations organisations. As I have said before at preceding Conferences, the I.L.O. is in an absurd position to have to admit passively to its membership member States of the United Nations without the possibility of a two-thirds majority vote as required for non-Members of the United Nations. It seems to be evident that conditions for admission to the United Nations cannot be the same as conditions for admission to the tripartite International Labour Organisation, because our fundamental principles are not the same. But the situation is still more absurd because the United Nations Organisation has the powers in its Charter to expel a member State, but, in the case of such an expulsion from the United Nations, the I.L.O. has no power to take similar action.

We should therefore re-examine our relations with the United Nations in order to change our satellite position and become free masters in our own house.

In conclusion, may I join my Workers’ colleague from the Netherlands in expressing the wish that the newly elected Governing Body will examine most carefully all the suggestions which have come from this rostrum, in order to present to the Conference of 1964 more concrete proposals for overcoming the critical situation in which our Organisation finds itself today.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. ESPINOSA (Workers’ delegate, Colombia) — The Report which the Director-General has submitted to us contains, inter alia, a chapter of great importance dealing with trade unions. The author begins by stating once more the importance of trade unions in modern life and the important role which they play in national economic development. He then outlines a possible I.L.O. programme of assistance to the unions.

I would begin my comments by recognising the interest shown by Mr. Morse in the growth of the trade union movement, which is one of the main factors in national prosperity; but it is essential to recall that any campaign in favour of workers’ organisations must begin by guaranteeing freedom of association. If we workers are to be in a position to exercise our rights and play an active part in economic development programmes, we must be organised in free trade unions which are independent of governments, parties and employers. However, it seems that in various parts of the world the position in this respect is not sufficiently clear. The Report tells us that, out of 106 member States, only 63 have ratified Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, which deal with freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining.

One should also check whether all the countries which have ratified these Conventions have strictly complied with them. The anxiety of the workers has always been lest the number of Conventions should be increased in vain, since the supervisory machinery is not improved and developed. In this connection Mr. Morse said: “Perhaps some further improvements could be made in the procedures for dealing with allegations of violation of freedom of association: for example by providing on appropriate occasions for the Committee to follow up the written procedure by making inquiries on the spot; and, in that way, by devising a new procedure for ascertaining whether the Committee’s recommendations have, in fact, been carried out.”

I consider that the Conference must welcome the Director-General’s initiative since there are countries where, on the pretext of a false revolution, the right of the workers to be organised in free trade unions is infringed. There are countries where, owing to the political régime, the government is responsible for everything and the unions, if any, are controlled by the government and entirely in its service. We know that on more than one occasion the Committee on Freedom of Association has publicly denounced these facts, but, precisely owing to the lack of greater powers, the recommendations it has made have not been acted upon, and consequently the position in those countries has not altered at all.

I consider that, whilst we are making structural changes, the I.L.O. should be given extensive powers to carry out investigations concerning the violations of freedom of association Conventions, ensuring that they may be taken as far as necessary in order that all the member States comply strictly with those Conventions. We should like to take the opportunity of giving more importance to the I.L.O.’s relations with the free trade unions. Why do we not investigate the possibility of deciding on some activities, especially educational activities, by direct agreement between the I.L.O. and the free trade union confederations at world, continental or national level? There have been cases in which it has not been possible to implement programmes because of a sea of official papers which has been an insuperable obstacle.

Another part of the Report which deserves our closest attention is that relating to workers’ education. In this connection, the Director-General states: “I would like to ask the delegates to the International Labour Conference to consider carefully whether the I.L.O. should not have the opportunity of giving more direct assistance to trade unions in particular, and of overcoming the great difficulties in setting up sound organisations and providing adequate training for leadership.”
It is true that the training of workers' leaders is, above all, a matter for the unions themselves, but I think that the I.L.O.'s assistance is very useful when it is given through the free trade union confederations, which have for some time been carrying out their own programme of trade union training. This is true of the I.C.F.T.U., on a world scale, and of the O.R.I.T., on a continental scale. The workers' educational manuals published by the I.L.O. must become numerous and be distributed in all parts of the world. Being written in a legal language, Conventions and Recommendations rouse little enthusiasm among ordinary people. But if popular leaflets were published interpreting the meaning and scope of each instrument, the working class would be able to learn a great deal and would also appreciate the intentions and achievements of the I.L.O.

We are sure that economic development and the part which the trade unions can play in this increase in the educational level of the working class. I therefore think it of great importance that the I.L.O. should be given sufficient powers and funds to extend its programme of workers' education. How can one rouse the worker's interest in a higher standard of living? How can he be made to share in the decisions affecting his employment? How can he be induced to co-operate in the progress of industry and the development of the economy? How can he be made an increasingly useful member of society? How can he be preserved from the influence of demagogues? How can one make him share in the making of his own future without sacrificing his freedom? Unfortunately, the result of the lack of education in the working class, together with other factors which are equally important, has been that the standard of living of workers in countries in course of development is sometimes unworthy of human beings. Similarly, the part they can play in the determination of conditions of work may be very small and unimportant, so that it may be useless or worse if it is sought to obtain their co-operation in the development of industry and in economic development generally in spite of the possibility which such a policy would give them of increasing their incomes. The low educational standard of the working class makes the work of responsible trade unions extremely difficult. When human intelligence has not been nourished by education man is governed not by reason but by emotional impulses.

In this unsettling atmosphere it is demagogues, agitators and extremists of all kinds who are most successful in leading the masses. We know that it is not they who will solve social problems, since they rely on violence, hatred and lies. But this is how one destroys men's faith in the possibility of building their own future. This is how democracy loses its prestige and dictatorship is exalted. This is how a country's economy is ruined by the maintenance of an atmosphere of agitation and disquiet on a permanent basis. This is how the peoples lose their right to govern themselves and are handed over to foreign domination.

Therefore we must support the workers' education programmes which the I.L.O. has developed and in relation to which Mr. Morse is making such interesting proposals for improvement. Workers' education enables people to increase their incomes and makes them more useful members of society because it arouses a true awareness of their duties, rights and responsibilities and gives them confidence in themselves, converting the worker into a firm defender of peace.

Finally, allow me to make a further reference to free trade unions. In the Report, on which so many comments have been made, it is said that one of the objectives of the I.L.O. is to protect freedom. Very well; in a programme of economic development which is of interest to all countries it is essential to develop the free trade unions because they can increase productivity and promote progress. What we cannot accept is a programme of economic development without trade unions or with trade unions which are subject to the omnipotent power of the State. Economic development without free trade unions means slavery, oppression and a return to the civilisations that built the pyramids and the Circus Maximus.

Only with the participation of the free trade unions can economic development be of benefit to man and to society. The reverse is a violation of human dignity. It will lead to disregard of human rights and human potentialities. There is no alternative: either economic development is promoted with the co-operation of free trade unions in a democratic régime, or the genuine participation of the workers is superseded by government trade unions under a dictatorial system. Fortunately for the workers the I.L.O. always has been and will continue to be a true defender of human freedom and dignity.

*Interpretation from French: Mr. NGUYEN-Le-Giang (Government delegate, Viet-Nam)—* The choice of Mr. Johnson as President this year was an act of homage to the peoples of Africa and a welcome to the new delegations from that continent. I regret, however, that an unfortunate incident made it impossible for them to continue working in the Conference, but the unmistakable and unanimous condemnation by this assembly of the policy of apartheid has at least restored its prestige. We ourselves have suffered much from such racial discrimination under foreign domination and we fully share the sentiments of the African peoples.

The I.L.O. being the first international assembly that has unequivocally and repeatedly condemned racial discrimination, we think that a solution must be found within the legal framework of that organisation: if we choose our weapons badly we may do ourselves a disservice.

I would like to congratulate our new President, Mr. Dreyer. He has shown great strength of will and courage in assuming this difficult position: may his qualities lead the countries to a greater understanding to help tide the Conference over very difficult times.

The Report of the Director-General which is before the Conference this year is an important landmark in the long road travelled by the I.L.O. Now that the developing countries are
becoming increasingly numerous in the membership of our Organisation and are even becoming a majority, it does indeed seem opportune that the Organisation should revise its operational programmes and methods of work, adapting its structure to the needs of the times. In this connection the analysis contained in the Report and the various suggestions made therein seem to me to be most objective and relevant. I think we should congratulate the Director-General and his colleagues.

Since most of our gainfully employed population work in agriculture the present state of our economy obliges us to examine the programmes or measures proposed from the viewpoint of a developing country. It is from this angle that we should like to submit a few suggestions. We will make our observations in the order adopted in the Report—that is, first of all concerning the proposed operational programmes and then as regards the changes in the structure of the I.L.O.

On the first point, our country fully approves the programme priorities on which the Director-General invites the Conference to concentrate its activities during the next few years. I would just like to make a few remarks concerning certain aspects of these programmes.

As the Director-General has rightly pointed out, although the Conference has for some years given attention to the rural sector and agricultural workers its efforts in this field remain insufficient as compared with what has already been done in the industrial sector. Accordingly, we should like agricultural problems to be given more attention by the I.L.O. in the future.

The measures for raising the standard of living of farmers in the developing countries which are proposed on page 51 of the Report—that is, price stabilisation, agrarian reforms and credit policies—seem extremely realistic and would fully meet the needs of our countries. Considerable efforts have been made by our Government in this respect since we achieved independence. A bold agrarian reform has been successfully carried out. Agricultural credit has become a state institution which, as regards the size of loans granted, has now become the most important banking organism in the country. However, while our Government can maintain the stability of internal agricultural prices, it cannot take effective action as regards international prices. Our country exports only primary commodities and the price of these largely determine the income of our population and their social standard. In this connection it is regrettable to note that, as the studies made by the economic institutions of the United Nations show, international prices of primary commodities have fallen continuously in recent years while those of industrial products have followed an upward curve. This prompted the Workers’ representative of our delegation to submit a short time ago to the Asian Regional Conference in Melbourne a resolution requesting the I.L.O. to alert the highly industrialised countries to the necessity to re-examine their commercial policy to ensure that the gulf which separates those countries from the under-developed countries does not continue to widen.

I should also like to extend my warm thanks to the Minister from Colombia, and other speakers for dealing fully with the same problem a few days ago from this rostrum. Admittedly the I.L.O. is not entirely competent to deal with this subject, but since it is considering closer links with other specialised agencies of the United Nations, could it not study with the economic commissions of the supreme international institution measures to be adopted in order to ensure that variations in the prices of industrial products and raw materials follow the same direction?

Another suggestion I should like to make relates to the proposed development of the research and information functions of the International Labour Office. We can only applaud this suggestion. Ours is a country in the course of development, and we should like to learn of experiments which have been carried out elsewhere. The ability with which the Director-General’s assistants have this year discussed the many and extensive problems covered in the Report fully guarantees that the search for information will be useful and objective.

However, I think I must draw their attention to the fact that they should be careful when collecting information as a basis for the studies they will carry out. The criticisms made by certain States with regard to some of the figures in the general report submitted to the Asian Regional Conference in Melbourne should be borne in mind.

In this connection, we are very glad that the Director-General should have thought of giving the regional Field Offices of the I.L.O. an adequate staff. The regional staff of the I.L.O., who travel regularly in the countries in each region, will be in a better position to judge the accuracy of the information supplied.

I come now to certain changes which the Report suggests regarding the structure of the Organisation. With regard to the intervals at which the General Conference should meet, our country would like it to meet once every two years. On the other hand, regional conferences should meet more often.

The main task of the General Conference is to establish international standards. As was suggested by the Director-General, these standards would be better if they were more flexible in the future, if they included only fundamental principles and as few details as possible. Only in that way can they be easily adopted by a large number of Members at different stages of economic development.

For the same reason, we are not in favour of making the General Conference responsible for preparing more detailed recommendations to supplement existing standards. If they are to be easily applied in a large number of States, these recommendations should be more varied and realistic, in view of the different degrees of development of each region of the world. They could then well be drafted by regional conferences.

In other words, as regards international standards, the General Conference should be called upon to draw up fundamental principles only—that is, the essentials. The regional conferences should be instructed to prepare practical recommendations adapted to the particular conditions in the states of a particular region, or acceptable to a large majority of them. This
would lighten the burden of work of the Conference, which could then meet less often. We give our firm support to the Director-General's proposals for strengthening the field offices and convening technical regional meetings. Such meetings, which allow exchanges of experience among responsible people from countries at a similar stage of economic development, would be bound to provide valuable information, promote the progress of the economies concerned, and lead to a better organisation of local conditions of work.

The Panama and Secretary-General of the Conference, concerning the settlement of labour disputes achieved satisfactory results. Would it not be a good idea to have others dealing with vocational training methods, training of managers, and better organisation of labour relations?

The Report contemplates decentralisation of the services of the International Labour Office. There are also complaints about the cumbersome procedure of the Conference as a result of the growing number of member States. To avoid this, would it not be desirable also to decentralise the functions of the General Conference? In other words, we might have a better balanced distribution of tasks as between the General Conference and the regional conferences.

Apart from the above remarks, our country entirely supports the Director-General's conclusions, and particularly the proposed programmes of action which are aimed, above all, at safeguarding liberty and at contributing to the maintenance of peace. If only the I.L.O. could persuade certain States which favour war as a legitimate means of imposing their economic and social systems on other people that their attitude is quite contrary to its objectives, and most dangerous to the very existence of the world.

As the representative of Albania alluded to the aggression suffered by my country, I would like to remind him that the authors of this aggression were named with clear proof by the majority report of 2 June 1962 by the International Control Commission which was set up in my country by the 1954 Geneva Conference. This precisely in order to avoid once again becoming a victim of discriminatory policies, which would undoubtedly be imposed by new colonialists, that our people fight unitedly against that aggression. The people of Viet-Nam, while ardently desiring peace, are no less anxious for the reunification of their country. They do not wish to be represented by two Governments at the same international meeting.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. URRIOLA (Workers' delegate, Panama)—As a preamble, I should like to say that I am about the refer to two matters only: freedom of association and social security.

As the representative of the workers of Panama and Secretary-General of the Confederation of Workers of that country, I have the honour to greet the delegates of the member countries of the I.L.O. met here in the 47th General Conference.

I shall now give my views on points raised by the Director-General in his Report. This document certainly refers to matters of vital importance to us workers who are struggling for better conditions of work, the full application of protective legislation, and government support in this regard. I am bound to say that each year the Director-General's Report plays a significant part in our consideration of the labour problems which arise with increasing acuteness throughout the world at this crucial time of the awakening of the working class.

Our country has a developing economy and presents a striking picture. One-third of the population works to maintain the remaining two-thirds which is composed half of young people and half of old people, most of whom have no old-age pensions. This demographic and economic situation is the major obstacle to raising the general standard of living. If we add that the active population has a very low level of training it will be clear that we need to take urgent and appropriate action to escape from this dangerous situation.

Our Government will have to engage in practical training for the training of our manpower so that it can contribute to a higher level of productivity, which can then be the basis for economic and social development.

A matter which is most important to the republican and democratic life of a country, and also for the future effectiveness of the I.L.O., and rightly raised by the Director-General in his Report, is freedom of association and the right of all citizens of a free world to form organisations without any restriction so as to defend their interests as workers.

This right is clearly laid down in the laws of many countries, including Panama, and is the most delicate aspect of the labour problems which I wish to mention.

This right is recognised and established on paper only. But when this legitimate, sensible and necessary control is taken out of the hands of the workers their freedom is reduced or eliminated owing to pressure by the employers and the weakness of oligarchic governments which have always implemented just laws ineffectively.

Our country has ratified the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), which has been law since 1958. This wise and encouraging instrument supplements the constitutional principle and the relevant provisions of the Labour Code.

Nevertheless, although we have the Constitution and the law on our side and the principle of freedom of association is laid down, our democratic organisations are seriously affected by the blind reactionary impulses of many grasping employers.

I should not allude to these matters here and now if some of the employers' manoeuvres were not so tragic and if they did not occur as frequently as has been the case in the last few months.

It looks as though the awakening of the workers to freedom of association and the beginning of social and economic demands have incited the employers to seek a revival of the dominance they enjoyed in past years.

This delicate situation, which I know is occurring in other American countries also, is evidently a more dangerous obstacle than the loss of any other freedom, for when freedom of
association is infringed there are also attacks on freedom of expression, freedom to live at home in peace, freedom to be employed and so to earn a livelihood for oneself and for one's family.

Faced with this threat to a country's development, our governments should understand that the time has come to improve the conditions of the workers and that the only way to encourage real democracy is to provide for free and effective exercise of the workers' right to form their own associations.

We hope that, as the Director-General mentioned the basic Convention in this field, Convention No. 87, in the Appendix to his Report, the I.L.O. will continue to make surveys on the spot regarding the trade union situation in member countries and that the suggestion to have a survey of such a kind in Latin American countries such as Panama may be adopted. Perhaps, if this is done, there will be wider understanding of the indispensable character of really free association.

I would like to quote some objective facts on the situation in our country. For instance our seamen suffer constantly from the indifference and arrogance of incapable and irresponsible officials who are so ignorant and self-seeking that instead of serving their government they incur the hostility of the working class. They are responsible for the disputes between branches of the labour movement. The National Seamen's Union has submitted its complaints and demands backed by evidence, but unfortunately these have not been successful. There may be labour laws on the subject but they are certainly not applied.

Before the amendment of the law governing the mercantile marine and relating to ships flying the Panama flag, Panamanian nationals had a right to 25 per cent. of the jobs on board. Now the figure has been reduced to 10 per cent. and even this is not applied. This unfair and discriminatory action not only prejudices the right of Panamanian seamen to earn a living for themselves and their families; it also harms approximately 75,000 Asians, Italians and persons of other nationalities who are exploited and have no social security. Their wages range between 30 and 50 dollars a month. This situation is not likely to be improved by any government, and still less by shipping companies devoid of any social or human feelings.

Disrespect for freedom of association, the reactionary behaviour of the employers and the indifference of the Government—all these disturb the harmony and equilibrium between capital and labor. This increasing general reaction is a striking consequence of the higher level of education among Panamanian workers due to the seminars arranged by the U.I.T.A., O.R.T. and I.C.F.T.U., those bastions of free and democratic trade unionism. We workers entertain the hope that our Government will make an effort at substantial progressive reform of our labour laws so as to remove obstructions to effective freedom of association and collective bargaining, the foundations of equality in labour-management relations.

The workers of Panama hope for the cooperation of the I.L.O. so that our aspirations for justice, peace and happiness may be realised.

Mr. ZACHARIADIES (Employers' adviser, Cyprus)—The Director-General's Report this year breaks away from past practice. Rather than concerning itself with some important current problem in the social field, this year's Report sets the theme for a general discussion on the adequacy or otherwise of the programmes and structure of the I.L.O.

Cyprus employers have nothing but the highest praise for the valuable work which the I.L.O. has consistently undertaken since its inception some 44 years ago. It is only proper, however, that after such a long and impressive record of achievements through constantly changing world conditions for almost half a century, we should pause from time to time to examine whether its structure and programmes are sufficiently adaptable to the ever changing scenes of life.

After the readjustment to post-war world some 20 years ago, there is growing evidence of a need for a further readjustment in the role of this Organisation and we warmly congratulate the Director-General on stimulating, by this year's Report, discussion on whether the I.L.O.'s present structure and activities are such as to enable it to cope successfully with the changed world conditions of today. No doubt many formidable tasks lie ahead but the chief challenge is bound to come from the need—may I say the obligation—to assist an ever growing number of developing new countries which, emerging only now into independence, are, nevertheless, anxious to take up their place in the community of nations by side with other socially and economically developed countries. I have no doubt the challenge will be taken up with implicit faith in the I.L.O.'s ability to adjust itself expeditiously to its new role. In the words of the Director-General this can be achieved only through the concerted wills of the I.L.O.'s membership, "a common agreement on basic objectives and a clear sense of priorities ".

Turning now to specific points raised in the Director-General's Report, I wish to be allowed to express, very briefly, on some of them, the view of the employers of Cyprus—a developing country still confronted with the multiple and complex problems of its economic and social reconstruction.

As concerns manpower assessment and planning, we fully endorse the views regarding manpower surveys leading to proper training through an accurate assessment of the needs of a country. Having established these needs by such surveys, educational authorities should co-operate closely with government and industry in order to make the necessary adjustment to syllabuses and curricula and provide for the types of schools best suited to such needs. If no experts are available to advise, there should be no hesitation in asking for the I.L.O.'s assistance.

There should certainly be no delay in changing things needing change and no lack of courage to cut through generations of social prejudice and to re-orient—where necessary—educational aims. It would be a great pity—a great sin I should say—if through an unrealistic approach to educational and vocational needs we were to release to society every year thousands of young unskilled men
eager for jobs whilst the country's economy is desperately in need but lamentably short of technicians, skilled workers and industries. Side by side with the schools which will provide for the new entrants to the labour market there should be apprenticeship schemes to provide practical training at places of work. Employers should be bound to give the necessary training at their places of work according to approved syllabuses and should also allow paid time off for attendances at schools for theoretical teaching as well. Thanks to the untiring efforts of the Ministry of Labour, Cyprus will shortly enjoy the benefits of such a scheme. With regard to people already in employment, they too should receive appropriate training and the best way to do this would be through short accelerated training at productivity centres or technical institutes. Cyprus employers are most grateful—and here I should like to acknowledge publicly our debt to the I.L.O. for the invaluable help given to Cyprus for the establishment of a productivity centre. Thanks to this assistance, and to the fine cooperation of government, employers and employees in Cyprus in the form of a productivity council, the establishment of this centre has now become possible. This, we expect, will stimulate productivity in every sector of our economy by every possible means. Here again employers should see to it that as many of their employees as possible receive the benefit of such courses and that, upon the employee's return, any lessons or techniques learnt are put to good use for the benefit of all employees.

Still more important in any developing country is the training of supervisors. In some countries the role of the supervisor is not very well known and supervisory tradition and conscience are, as yet, almost non-existent. From experience in our country we now know that it is of equal importance to train also top management. Short courses for them are also necessary.

In regard to social and labour policies, even if we get the right type of training and can produce the right type of manpower, even if we have a sound economic planning, it is axiomatic that economic development cannot thrive unless in an atmosphere of peace in the field of industrial relations. This can be ensured by trade union recognition and proper and timely attention to the legitimate claims of employees as regards the standard of living and amenities of life to which they are entitled. However, these standards cannot be equalised in all countries simultaneously and care must be taken to weigh accurately the effects of any social measure on a country's economy. Rising costs of production and high labour costs may well push a country's product to uneconomic positions and damage its position in competitive world markets. Productivity would then be the answer and no effort should be spared to initiate and sustain a productivity drive. Until the results of any such drive are felt, however, labour should be careful in its demands. Trade unions of different political aspirations—especially in countries where many separate federal or administrative existencies one another in a period of reconstruction—Governments should likewise be careful in their efforts to promote social justice. It goes without saying that employers should realise that labour exploitation leads to unhealthy job situations and community. Businessmen should see to it that their undertakings are conducted on a sound basis and that the interests of employees are adequately safeguarded. Lean and enervating conditions of work will end prove the guillotine of private enterprise. We firmly believe that employers must introduce good personnel policies aiming at improving labour management relations and ensuring simple social justice. Had there been any resolutions this year, we would have tabled one on the need for programmes of basic personnel policy to improve conditions of life and work in industrial and other undertakings or services. In Cyprus we are aware of the understanding between employer and employee for the sake of smooth industrial relations. To summarise: we believe in good labour conditions, good labour management relations, minimum social measures particularly in the form of retirement and unemployment benefits but not high labour costs, which may well lead to unemployment. For this reason we advocate close consultation between governments, employers, and labour in all spheres of economic and social planning.

On the most important point of I.L.O. structure we have the following suggestions to make.

Whilst not disputing the role of the International Labour Conference, we firmly believe there should be no question of assigning to it additional responsibilities. Enough of its time is already frittered away on politics and publicity of social systems and any increase of its present administrative role may well lead to a chaos of political antagonism. We are firmly in favour of developing arrangements enabling the Conference to discharge its assigned responsibilities, but directing the work of the I.L.O. is the responsibility of the Governing Body, with its tripartite representative character, and this should be further strengthened by increased membership.

In regard to field offices, with increased I.L.O. membership it is doubtless becoming increasingly difficult for these offices to have frequent contacts with the countries coming under their jurisdiction. The eastern Mediterranean in particular seems to call for the establishment of a field office nearer to that region, which could perhaps also cater for North Africa. In that event, Cyprus, because of its geographical position, would seem a very good choice. It is further suggested that field offices might wish to be assisted by advantage employ at least one person from each country coming under it. Such persons, knowing as they should, full well, their country's problems and local conditions, should be of invaluable help to the I.L.O.

The preparation of Conventions and Recommendations has always constituted an important part of the work of the Conference which, through a Committee, can supervise their application. We are fully alive to the need for reviewing from time to time international labour standards established by such instruments in order to adapt them to the needs of a changing world. We welcome, therefore, the suggestion of creating machinery for the revision of existing instruments and also for taking off the I.L.O. statute book Conventions which have failed to fulfil their purpose. Whilst on the subject of Conventions, we are gratified to see from the Director-General's Report that some of them—particularly the ones dealing with certain fundamental human rights—"continue
must have a clearly delineated programme in order to solve the main social problems; secondly, that the obsolete and conservative methods of the I.L.O. must be adjusted to the spirit of our times—that is, they must be made considerably more democratic.

We, in common with the Minister of Labour of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Salama, the Yugoslav Minister, Mr. Dzunov, and many other delegates, are seriously concerned at the situation of the General Conference with regard to the other organs of the I.L.O. The delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. is concerned at the fact that the role of the Conference in deciding issues has been reduced to a minimum whereas the powers of the Governing Body are growing out of all proportion. This process has been brought about partly by the fact that in the Constitution of the I.L.O. there is no clear delineation of the powers of the Conference and the function of the Governing Body.

Let us take a look at the scope of activities of the General Conference. The future programme of the I.L.O. is not discussed or approved by the Conference. The delegates know nothing about this programme. The Conference does not determine or approve the items of its agenda, and if the Conference finds it necessary to study a given item a decision must be taken by a two-thirds majority. In this regard we are not proposing any radical change; we are not advancing anything new here; we are not proposing any radical de-

The present session of the International Labour Conference is not only unusual and critical for the life of the Organisation, as has been rightly pointed out, in view of the problems it is called upon to solve but is of great political significance, and has been echoed throughout the world in connection with the events that have occurred in the Conference over the past few days. The struggle of the African people against the diehard racialists of South Africa is assuming more real and effective proportions. In this legitimate struggle the African countries are not alone. That has been shown here, in the Conference. The Ukrainian people, who have experienced the horrors of fascism, fully support and share the aspirations of the African people to put an end to fascist lawlessness in South Africa. We have no doubt that this legitimate and noble aspiration of the African countries to safeguard the life and dignity of the brother nations will be crowned with success.

In the meetings at which the Report of the Director-General has been discussed nearly all speakers have referred to a greater or lesser extent to the structure, programmes and working methods of the Organisation. Many delegates are convinced—and we fully share this view—that in the 40-odd years since the I.L.O. was created much has changed, not only in the world at large but also in the I.L.O. itself, and that discussion by the Conference of the future of the Organisation is a vital necessity. Contemporary economic, political and social development of the world makes it urgently necessary to appraise critically the activities, structure and procedures of the I.L.O. This must be done not superficially, as certain delegates are inclined to think, but radically. A general outline of such measures is clearly set forth in the memorandum of the Soviet delegation, which, unfortunately, has not up to now been issued by the Secretariat of the Conference. From the numerous, and for the most part interesting and substantial, speeches which we have heard from this platform we may draw at least two conclusions: first, that the I.L.O. to receive ratification at an increasing rate”. What is more gratifying, however, is the Director-General’s statement that the I.L.O. “has as one of its major responsibilities to help member countries in practical ways to live up to or towards the effective application of standards set by these Conventions”. Cyprus is, unfortunately, precluded by its very Constitution from ratifying one of the finest Conventions ever drafted—the one concerning discrimination in respect of employment and occupation. A community of 18 per cent. of the population is entitled to 30 per cent. of all opportunities in employment. It would be interesting, therefore, to see in which way the I.L.O. can help Cyprus “work towards the effective application of the provisions of this Convention. The Conference will become the sole master of the Organisation and the Governing Body will become its executive organ. To this end it is necessary to state clearly in the Constitution that the Governing Body is the executive organ of the General Conference and is answerable to it in all its activities. Incidentally, we are not advancing anything new here; we are not proposing any radical de-
partures. In the constitutions of all international organisations the powers and functions of the executive organs are made perfectly clear. In view of the need to improve the activities of the I.L.O. as a whole and to enhance the authority and the role of the General Conference as the main and most representative organ of the International Labour Organisation, the Government delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. deems it necessary to include in the Constitution a new article determining the competence of the General Conference and the functions of the Governing Body. We propose the following article:

1. The Conference shall be competent—
   (1) to admit new Members;
   (2) to elect the Director-General;
   (3) to approve the agenda of regular sessions of the Conference;
   (4) to approve the programme of activities of the Organisation;
   (5) to amend the Constitution;
   (6) to determine the ten member States of chief industrial importance for the Governing Body;
   (7) to elect the Governing Body;
   (8) to approve the budget of the Organisation;
   (9) to adopt and revise Conventions and Recommendations;
   (10) to examine annual and special reports of the Governing Body and to frame instructions to the Governing Body for its future activities;
   (11) to decide on the location of the International Labour Office;
   (12) to approve recruitment regulations for the staff of the Office;
   (13) to approve regulations governing the powers, functions and procedure of regional institutions and Conferences;
   (14) to discuss any questions which it considers necessary.

2. The Governing Body shall have the following functions:
   (1) to act as the executive organ of the I.L.O.;
   (2) between sessions of the General Conference, to conduct the activities of the I.L.O. in accordance with instructions issued by the Conference;
   (3) in general, to conduct the work of the Office and of the various committees and commissions;
   (4) to prepare the working programme of the Organisation and to submit it at specified intervals for approval by the Conference;
   (5) to be answerable to the Conference for implementation of the programme adopted by the Conference;
   (6) to prepare for approval by the Conference the agenda for its regular sessions;
   (7) to prepare for approval by the Conference proposals concerning the budget of the Organisation;
   (8) to supervise expenditure of the funds of the Organisation;
   (9) to decide where the General Conference shall be convened;
   (10) to prepare for approval by the Conference regulations fixing the powers, functions and procedure of regional institutions and Conferences;
   (11) to decide the periodicity and form of reports by member States on ratified and unratified Conventions;
   (12) to determine the ten member States of chief industrial importance with a view to their selection for the Governing Body by the General Conference;
   (13) to report on its activities to the General Conference.

Naturally, in the light of the contents of this new article fixing the competence of the Conference and the functions of the Governing Body it would be necessary to make corresponding changes in the appropriate articles of the Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Conference.

I should like to dwell on one more important question. The discussion on the Director-General's Report has also dealt with the I.L.O.'s programme; but let me ask—who among you has ever seen a clearly outlined programme of the activities of our Organisation? In fact, it does not exist. This important matter of planning the activities of the I.L.O. has been handed over to the Governing Body, which determines all the activities of the Organisation and establishes priorities. There is an old Ukrainian folksong which says "I drink alone, I walk alone". I think that can be said of the Governing Body.

Not even the most insignificant work, let alone the activities of an international organisation such as the I.L.O., can be initiated without a programme, without determining what is to be done first and what is to be done next, whether there exist sufficient funds, time, knowledge and so on. The I.L.O. must have a clearly delineated programme of activities for, say, five or six years. Draft programmes would be prepared by the Director-General and, after examination by the Governing Body, he would transmit them for discussion and adoption to the Conference. The General Conference, having approved the programme, would refer it to the Governing Body for implementation within the framework of the budget approved by the Conference. The Governing Body would submit an annual progress report to the Conference.

The Ukrainian Government delegation, considering that the I.L.O. has not at present a clearly delineated long-term programme, proposes firstly that we introduce into the work of the I.L.O. the practice of regular adoption by the General Conference of the Organisation's programme of activities; secondly, that on the basis of existing experience in drawing up a review of the programme of the I.L.O. for 1959-64, the Office be instructed to prepare
and the Governing Body to examine and submit for discussion by the 48th International Labour Conference a draft programme for the I.L.O. for the next five years, 1964-68, in order that the Conference may discuss and approve such a programme.

Mr. ALEXANDER (Workers' delegate, Trinidad and Tobago)—I wish, with pleasure, to recall what I said a year ago, that my delegation looked forward with great hope to its participation at this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference as a fully fledged member nation, and I am very happy to say now that this is a reality.

Once again, the Director-General has, in his Report, provided the means for a thorough soul-searching exercise in the matters listed for discussion, and vivid among them is that of termination of employment. It cannot be denied that termination is very closely linked with unemployment, which is one of the most depressing elements of modern life in the world. The world has an unemployment problem, but coexistent with this there is the fact of record profits being earned by large and small enterprises. There is a section of all democratic societies enjoying high and luxurious standards of living, and there are millions who are forced to live in shacks, ill-fed, ill-clothed, diseased, depressed and illiterate. In many of the developing countries, there are thousands of men, women, boys and girls in the rural areas who, having left the primary schools, will not or cannot earn a living on the land. There are those in the urban areas who find themselves in a similar disquieting situation, and as a result, considerable pressure is put on the unemployed, who have to stretch their small income to assist their needy relatives and friends.

The attainment and maintenance of full employment are not the sole responsibility of government. Trade unions, too, have an obligation to pay the utmost attention to these problems and to make their voices heard in the determination of government policies. However, because the employment structure in most of the developing countries is a unique mixture of modern factors and archaic elements, there are no easy solutions to these problems. Obviously, we must accept economic expansion and changes in technology with all their effects on the workers' life. Our immediate concern will therefore be how to eliminate the archaic elements. The first task is to integrate what may be termed the departmental labour market. In most of the so-called under-developed countries, this set-up has resulted in the uneven distribution of labour supply and demand, which in turn has caused substantial disparity in wages and working conditions. If they are to be standardised, it is imperative to remove artificial partitions and bring about a unified industry-wide labour market. In my view the governments would then be able to make an effective contribution in this direction by the introduction of an equitable minimum wage system. The trade unions on their part will have to intensify their efforts to organise the large number of workers in small enterprises, and to establish industry-wide wage standards. They must also keep pressing their governments to ratify I.L.O. Conventions. Their combined efforts could raise wage standards, and at the same time, promote greater labour mobility, thus ensuring equal employment opportunities and better training facilities essential to more and more workers.

The second task is the action by trade unions for the solution of problems arising out of the modernisation of industry; in particular, technological unemployment and re-adaptation of displaced workers. The basic and relentless approach of trade unions will be to demand that their governments provide more facilities for vocational training and retraining. At the same time employers must also be approached on the question of ensuring that displaced workers are given ample opportunities to choose new jobs. One aspect of modernisation of industry is the introduction of labour-saving devices. Therefore trade unions must never relax their efforts to achieve a shorter working week with a view to maintaining a standardised level of employment in industries of this kind. The world has an unemployment problem, but coexistent with this there is the fact of record profits being earned by large and small enterprises.

The attainment and maintenance of full employment are not the sole responsibility of government. Trade unions, too, have an obligation to pay the utmost attention to these problems and to make their voices heard in the determination of government policies. However, because the employment structure in most of the developing countries is a unique mixture of modern factors and archaic elements, there are no easy solutions to these problems. Obviously, we must accept economic expansion and changes in technology with all their effects on the workers' life. Our immediate concern will therefore be how to eliminate the archaic elements. The first task is to integrate what may be termed the departmental labour market. In most of the so-called under-developed countries, this set-up has resulted in the uneven distribution of labour supply and demand, which in turn has caused substantial disparity in wages and working conditions. If they are to be standardised, it is imperative to remove artificial partitions and bring about a unified industry-wide labour market. In my view the governments would then be able to make an effective contribution in this direction by the introduction of an equitable minimum wage system. The trade unions on their part will have to intensify their efforts to organise the large number of workers in small enterprises, and to establish industry-wide wage standards. They must also keep pressing their governments to ratify I.L.O. Conventions. Their combined efforts could raise wage standards, and at the same time, promote greater labour mobility, thus ensuring equal employment opportunities and better training facilities essential to more and more workers.

The second task is the action by trade unions for the solution of problems arising out of the modernisation of industry; in particular, technological unemployment and re-adaptation of displaced workers. The basic and relentless approach of trade unions will be to demand that their governments provide more facilities for vocational training and retraining. At the same time employers must also be approached on the question of ensuring that displaced workers are given ample opportunities to choose new jobs. One aspect of modernisation of industry is the introduction of labour-saving devices. Therefore trade unions must never relax their efforts to achieve a shorter working week with a view to maintaining a standardised level of employment in industries of this kind. The world has an unemployment problem, but coexistent with this there is the fact of record profits being earned by large and small enterprises.

The attainment and maintenance of full employment are not the sole responsibility of government. Trade unions, too, have an obligation to pay the utmost attention to these problems and to make their voices heard in the determination of government policies. However, because the employment structure in most of the developing countries is a unique mixture of modern factors and archaic elements, there are no easy solutions to these problems. Obviously, we must accept economic expansion and changes in technology with all their effects on the workers' life. Our immediate concern will therefore be how to eliminate the archaic elements. The first task is to integrate what may be termed the departmental labour market. In most of the so-called under-developed countries, this set-up has resulted in the uneven distribution of labour supply and demand, which in turn has caused substantial disparity in wages and working conditions. If they are to be standardised, it is imperative to remove artificial partitions and bring about a unified industry-wide labour market. In my view the governments would then be able to make an effective contribution in this direction by the introduction of an equitable minimum wage system. The trade unions on their part will have to intensify their efforts to organise the large number of workers in small enterprises, and to establish industry-wide wage standards. They must also keep pressing their governments to ratify I.L.O. Conventions. Their combined efforts could raise wage standards, and at the same time, promote greater labour mobility, thus ensuring equal employment opportunities and better training facilities essential to more and more workers.

The second task is the action by trade unions for the solution of problems arising out of the modernisation of industry; in particular, technological unemployment and re-adaptation of displaced workers. The basic and relentless approach of trade unions will be to demand that their governments provide more facilities for vocational training and retraining. At the same time employers must also be approached on the question of ensuring that displaced workers are given ample opportunities to choose new jobs. One aspect of modernisation of industry is the introduction of labour-saving devices. Therefore trade unions must never relax their efforts to achieve a shorter working week with a view to maintaining a standardised level of employment in industries of this kind. The world has an unemployment problem, but coexistent with this there is the fact of record profits being earned by large and small enterprises.
The social responsibilities of the employers must be strongly emphasised. It is their duty to use an appreciable percentage of their profits in such a way as to contribute to a well-balanced economic growth leading to the realisation of a welfare state, instead of utilising most of their profits to their own interest. They should also be made to realise that stabilised employment is indispensable for national economic growth.

The resolution concerning employment policy adopted at the 1961 Session of the International Labour Conference has enabled us to envisage many improvements in the present state of affairs. While those improvements are primarily the responsibility of governments, trade unions also have their role to play both as watch-dogs of governments and as initiators of further reforms.

In conclusion, I wish to state that it is earnestly hoped that the international trade union movement in close consultation with the International Labour Organisation and governments will continue to give serious consideration and positive assistance towards the achievement of the aims and aspirations of impoverished mankind.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. AIZPURÚA (Employers' delegate, Panama)—It is almost impossible to single out any of the topical issues raised in the masterly Report of the Director-General of the International Labour Office, in spite of his invitation to comment on his outright and practical analysis. We shall therefore confine ourselves to the most basic of these issues, that is the most basic in view of the international situation, namely the problem of world peace.

As is very correctly stated in the Report, it is through the international organisations of the United Nations family that the nations of East and West, now unnecessarily separated, manage to co-operate in the economic and social fields in order to ensure human coexistence, to the reciprocal mutual benefit of communities throughout the world, which now, more than ever, need understanding, solidarity, fraternity, and honest work.

As a specialised agency, the I.L.O. has done its duty. Its programmes, its technical assistance, the perseverance of its experts have played a very constructive role in maintaining international unity in the task of economic development and the growth of employment and the advance of labour legislation at national level. It has kept its assistance and co-operation within the bounds of general needs and has totally excluded ideological considerations from this work. It must therefore be of interest to all member States and their peoples to use these specialised agencies if the nations in the vanguard of industrial development really want—and we have no right to doubt that they do so want—to contribute to the elimination of the differences between the blocs of nations which are now ideologically divided, for the benefit of developing countries. For this tremendous task, those, like ourselves, who come from small countries, need to be honest in our thinking, honourable in our actions and humane in our sentiments.

It is most significant, as well as advantageous, to note, as the Director-General points out in his Report, that "the United Nations General Assembly has, through a resolution moved jointly by the U.S.S.R. and the United States, requested member States to develop information, plans and policies for making necessary economic and social adjustments in the event of disarmament". That is general and complete disarmament. This idea is ceasing to be Utopian and is becoming a possible universal achievement because the world of today and of the future cannot exist without peace and progress.

Man began to live in isolation in pre-historic days. He was then obliged, in order to meet his needs, to become gregarious, and, despite human dissensions, his instinct for coexistence still persists whatever the age, whatever the situation of the world. The interdependence and communion between the nations make this not only necessary but absolutely mandatory.

Today the advances of science have reduced distances and have placed human beings in constant and almost instantaneous communication. They impose new forms of co-operation and closer links. These involve common aspirations and compel us to be interested in human development in the light of complete reciprocal interest and benefit. Mr. Morse says in his Report, quite rightly, that for a modern society there is now no maximum to resources or to possible production. This is logical because the frontiers of the world now lie somewhere out in space. We have an enormous economic potential and the nations need output for their subsistence and survival. It is no secret that labour, which dignifies the human being, cannot be entirely profitable, cannot meet the needs of society, unless it goes forward in an atmosphere of general tranquility and security. Therefore the parties to the employment relationship—the employers and the workers—encouraged by the government representatives, must stimulate the nations which march in the vanguard of atomic science to put an end to the state of mutual suspicion so that, on the basis of reciprocal good faith and mutual confidence, they may establish a state of peace in the world, in which law, reason and equity regulate human relationships and preserve collective survival.

Now that we are meeting together in the present Conference we have a propitious occasion to contribute, all of us equally, to the efforts of the I.L.O. so that they may lead to concrete achievements for the good of all our countries. We must support its plans and its operations and maintain the spirit of brotherhood which should inspire us all.

I may also take this opportunity of telling you without reservations that we cannot enable our peoples to participate in the benefits of the work done here under the auspices of the I.L.O. if we do not put aside all selfishness, if we do not recommend the inclusion of the Conventions and Recommendations in our legislation, if, once they are adopted, we do not apply them in our internal employment relationships. Today, tomorrow and every day, this achievement will signify an advance for our nations, the development of free enterprise, fair distribution of wealth and economic prosperity for all at the individual and at the general level.
This statement of principles which are common to us leads me to tell you that our country has labour legislation providing for social security and regulating labour relations. We have provision for maximum daily and weekly hours of work, and guarantees for individual and collective bargaining. We protect freedom of association; we provide for Sunday rest; we establish high rates of pay for work done on rest days. The worker is granted annual holidays with pay after 11 months of service, and as regards employment injuries there is compensation for physical and mental disabilities arising out of these, and this includes benefits for agricultural workers. There is also maternity protection, and in this connection it is laid down that no pregnant woman may be discharged during her confinement and that she must be paid her full wages for a prenatal period of six weeks and a postnatal period of eight weeks, in addition to which she is entitled to leave for any illness arising out of maternity.

There is other protection under our social legislation which I cannot refer to in this short speech, but it has led up to the establishment of trade union rights for the leaders of trade unions, and these trade unions are either being formed or already exist.

The delegation of Panama would also like to congratulate the President of the Conference on the honour which was paid to him when he was chosen to direct the discussions in this Conference, and we offer him our best wishes for the successful performance of his task.

The delegation of Panama would also like to greet the delegates of Jamaica and transmit to them its feelings of fraternal solidarity and its best wishes for the future of their nation which will be based, we hope, on the principles which were inscribed on the flag which led them to independence—that is, the principles of freedom.

The PRESIDENT—In agreement with the Vice-Presidents and in accordance with article 14, paragraph 10, of the Standing Orders, the President has decided to permit the representative of the International Confederation of Executive Staffs to make a statement. I call on Mr. Ferrerò, representative of the International Confederation of Executive Staffs.

Interpretation from French: Mr. FERRERO (Representative of the International Confederation of Executive Staffs)—On behalf of the International Confederation of Executive Staffs (engineers and technicians) I would like first of all to express our deep gratitude to the President and the Officers of the Conference for having allowed us to make a few remarks concerning the Report of the Director-General of the I.L.O., Mr. David A. Morse. We should also like to congratulate the Director-General on his excellent Report on the programmes and structure of the I.L.O.

Before taking up briefly the points of particular interest in this Report, I should like to recall the fact that the International Confederation of Executive Staffs, which is an integral part of the Workers' group, is a firm believer in the Declaration of Philadelphia of May 1944.

As regards the agenda of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference, our organisation is particularly interested in items IV, V, VI, and VII.

With reference to the programme and structure of the I.L.O., the Director-General's remarkable Report stresses first of all, and rightly, the three main principles of the I.L.O.—freedom to work, freedom of association and the importance of social objectives. Mr. Morse says: "It would be illusory to pretend that these three principles for which the I.L.O. stands are accepted and acted upon throughout the world today. They are accorded verbal recognition more widely than they are practised."

All the points raised in the Report of the Director-General interest us to varying degrees, but as time is limited the I.C.E.S. will confine its remarks to two problems submitted for the consideration of the Conference.

The first point to which we should like to refer briefly is that of automation. Of course, engineers and technicians are gratified by the prodigious development of science and technology. However, faced with this problem so pregnant with consequences for the future the I.C.E.S. would like to draw the attention of the Conference to the human aspect of this evolution. We think it is necessary for governments, employers and workers to get together in order to solve these problems on an over-all basis, not only from the technical point of view but also from the economic and social point of view, respecting human dignity.

We think, for example, that in order to avoid future risks of unemployment the development of automation and the reduction of working hours must go hand in hand, and that we must furthermore study carefully the regrading of workers deprived of employment because of technological progress. In this field the I.L.O. must act rapidly; otherwise it will lag behind.

My second point concerns freedom of association. We cannot overstress the value and the necessity for this principle now and for the future. This principle must be applied everywhere. Its application is too often prevented by a mode of management known as "paternalism". The paternalism of certain employers is inadmissible today because human dignity and proper labour-management relations are increasingly opposed to this out-of-date system of regulating labour problems unilaterally.

We are pleased to note in his excellent Report, Mr. Morse has underscored the need for the unions to co-operate with the employers and the State. This recognition of the union, only theoretical but effective, must find practical application for the unions of engineers, technicians and executive staffs as well as for the manual workers' organisations. Now that science and technology are making gigantic strides and that more knowledge and greater capacities are required of the engineers and technicians, now that their responsibilities are becoming even heavier, it is paradoxical and unfair that certain employers continue to prevent them from organising in order to defend their interests and to participate in labour
problems. For human dignity and good labour relations, reactionary paternalism is just as bad as pure state control.

We are entirely in agreement with the desirability of establishing precise standards, which must, however, be sufficiently flexible in application to have regard to the different positions existing in the developing countries and the developed countries. We insist that in future standards regard must be paid to the interests of supervisory staff, and I would like to refer to the passage of the Report stating: "There are also two major groups of workers in respect of whom there is a constant pressure for more satisfactory standards, namely non-manual workers and agricultural workers."

As for executive staffs, of course our Organisation is dealing as much as it can with their vocational and social training, and we are very glad indeed to greet the future establishment of the Turin Training Centre.

Another quotation which I would like to make is the following: "The position of non-manual and agricultural workers will also call for continuing consideration. The far-reaching changes in the composition of the labour force which have occurred in so many countries during the last generation have been reflected in a growing demand that the International Labour Organisation should give a larger measure of attention to the problems of non-manual workers." Of course, we must recognise that non-manual work has played a leading role in economic development, particularly in developing countries. It is therefore most necessary at present to take into consideration the moral and material well-being of engineers and technicians.

First of all the I.L.O. must show much more interest in this question, which is of prime importance at the present time. In practical terms much more rapid consideration should be given to the many problems that fall within the scope of the Non-Manual Workers Division of the International Labour Office.

Of course we thank the Director-General for the relative degree of importance which he has given to the Non-Manual Workers Division of the International Labour Office. We are happy to have established excellent relations with that Division whose competence and support are of very great value to us. We feel that the Division should be much further enlarged so that it may carry out the increasingly numerous and important tasks with which technicians, engineers and executive staff would like it to deal in order to cope with existing and future needs. We have been happy to note that the Director-General recognises that the I.L.O. should devote due attention to these particular problems.

If these good intentions are to lead to good practical results, the Non-Manual Workers Division of the International Labour Office must be greatly enlarged and a meeting should be held as soon as possible to consider these problems, which are becoming increasingly urgent as a result of industrial and technical development.

While it is a good thing—and very desirable—that manual workers and office workers should receive increasing support, it is also essential to support intellectual workers.

In developing countries at the present time development will be achieved not merely by the sweat of the workers' brows but also thanks to technical development with the active co-operation of technicians, engineers and executive staff. Any hesitation in improving the conditions of these intellectual workers would be bound to lead to stagnation, and the development of newly independent countries would be held up. This is a task for the I.L.O.

We therefore once more urge that the Non-Manual Workers Division of the International Labour Office should be greatly enlarged and that qualified staff should be added to the excellent experts already on the staff of the Division in order that they may extend the scope of their surveys and studies.

This would also allow useful specialised sections to be established within the Division. At a time when technicians, engineers and executive staff are playing an increasingly important role in world development, they ask the Conference to support their legitimate claims in the general interest.

The best way of dealing with the shortage of executive staff and of inducing the more capable among them to pursue their studies is to provide this category of intellectual workers with the status, conditions and remuneration to which they are entitled.

That is why in concluding my statement on behalf of the International Confederation of Executive Staffs I should like to express our hope that the greatest possible weight will be attached to the legitimate desires of engineers, technicians and executive staffs when standards or action are under consideration.

Mr. COLLISON (Workers' delegate, United Kingdom)—Before I make my speech, may I congratulate the President on his election to his high office in the emergency situation in which we found ourselves. I should also like to thank him very much for the most able and efficient way in which he has controlled this Conference. We are all deeply indebted to you, Sir.

The Report of the Director-General this year is of particular significance, and I should like to join those who have offered their congratulations to Mr. Morse for placing before the Conference to support their legitimate claims in the general interest.

The Nineteenth Sitting
I see them, which have been evident in some of the speeches we have heard so far. On the one hand, I will not confine myself to generalisations, which, however sincere as a compliment to the Director-General, will not greatly help him in his task of steering the Organisation and choosing priorities. On the other hand, I will try to refrain from introducing matters which are not relevant to what we are considering. In fact, I am sorry that so little notice has been taken by some delegates of the appeal by the Director-General to devote all our attention to the proper functions of the I.L.O., and leave political questions to a more appropriate international body.

The Director-General has called attention to three basic principles upon which the I.L.O. stands. These he expresses as freedom of labour, freedom of association, and the primacy of social objectives. I would hope that every delegate, adviser and observer at this Conference would heartily endorse these principles. For the workers, of course, they are of overwhelming importance. Where the worker has no freedom to choose his own job, to join the trade union of his own choice, or to participate in the handling of economic questions in order to ensure that the fruits of progress are fairly distributed, he cannot be regarded as a free man. Anything the I.L.O. can do to encourage respect for these principles will be widely supported in the ranks of the workers.

And yet I would agree with the Director-General when he points out that it is not enough to condemn the infringement of these principles. We must, as he says, look for the reasons why the workers' rights are not respected. It is my belief, and I would judge it to be the belief of the Workers' group of this Conference, that governments which set economic progress, important as it is, above human freedom are making a grave mistake. We have heard with regret statements from this rostrum —some indeed from persons of high political office who have rendered significant service to the trade union movement in former years—to run the risk of creating organisations which are not relevant to what we are considering.

The I.L.O. should not have the opportunity of giving more direct assistance to trade unions. I am sure that the Director-General is moved by the best of intentions. I believe he always is. He wants to see good industrial relations, based upon effective organisations of workers and employers. I am sure he would do nothing which in any way limited the freedom of action of the unions. Yet I must say that I do not believe that in normal circumstances the I.L.O. should engage in direct action in this field. There are other organisations better fitted for the task; organisations which belong to the workers only and are solely responsible to them. By all means let the I.L.O. use its influence to ensure that trade unions are honourably treated and the rights of members respected, but to go beyond this into the field of direct action is to run the risk of creating organisations which have an artificial, a synthetic character. What I think could be done is to ensure that the various facilities offered by the I.L.O. are freely available to those who want them. Advisory services, guidance on workers' education, seminars and study tours, these and many other means are at our disposal. Let us make full use of them. A trade union should be a spontaneous creation, arising out of the desires and sentiments of workers. The I.L.O.'s task is to help to create a healthy environment in which these unions can grow in strength and independence, and if this job is done well we should be satisfied with our efforts, without wanting to be, as my colleague from Pakistan has already said, "the father and mother of the unions".

The Director-General deals in his Report with the problem raised by the rapid growth of the Organisation in recent years. He considers, for example, the possibility of certain changes in the structure of the I.L.O., and under this heading examines the role of the Conference and of the Governing Body. I entirely agree that these are matters worthy of consideration, but I do not feel that the general debate in which we are now engaged will provide, or can provide, the careful analysis which, in my view, is required. While expressing an opinion on this matter I should say that the present debate should be only the beginning of an exhaustive process of self-examination. I would like to see the Governing Body—perhaps by appointing a special committee—devote the most serious and sustained efforts to a survey of the effectiveness of our Organisation. Such a survey, carried out in the light of the present debate, could provide answers to some of the questions arising from the Report before us. Are we flexible enough, or is the I.L.O. continuing its traditional functions without careful stocktaking? What is our total impact upon laws and practices? Are we doing all we can to ensure that technical assistance is wisely directed? Equally important, is the advice of our experts accepted by governments, and if not, what needs to be done about it? I do agree that it is easier to ask questions than to find answers, but I do urge that questions like this must be asked if the health of the I.L.O. is to be maintained.

I have not dealt with a number of important points raised in the Report and this is because of limitations of time, and because each dele-
gate must decide which issues appear to him to be most pressing. In conclusion, therefore, may I express the hope that the debate to which the Director-General's excellent Report has given rise will mark the beginning, as I believe it will, of a further phase of expansion of the work of the I.L.O.

In this Organisation we have a unique instrument for social progress. The success which attends its work depends first upon the good will shown to the I.L.O. by member governments, and secondly upon the keenness of the workers in pressing for the ratification and application of Conventions. I would venture to address an appeal to the governments and workers of the developing countries: give this Organisation your full confidence and your full support. Your entry into the I.L.O. is enthusiastically welcomed by the workers of the industrialised nations. We want to use the I.L.O. to help you to help yourselves, because we realise that the original tasks of the I.L.O.—to abolish the gravest abuses of labour and to enhance the status of the worker—are now largely effected. Our attention is now turning to other fields because of this. Our attention is now turning to the fields of productivity, of labour-management relations, of fair distribution of incomes and others outlined in the Report.

I am glad to have had this opportunity of reaffirming once more the belief of the workers of the United Kingdom that the I.L.O.'s mission is far, far from being ended: on the contrary we believe it is about to move into new fields, and in its efforts the I.L.O. can count upon our determined support.

Interpretation from Bulgarian: Mr. IVANOV (Workers' delegate, Bulgaria)—At the present session of the Conference we are studying very important questions whose solution could help the Organisation to free itself from hidebound traditions and remoteness from life.

The Director-General has pointed out that the I.L.O. has reached a critical juncture in its development, and a lot must be done to improve the structure, working methods and programme of the Organisation. There is no doubt that the time has come for the I.L.O. to review its activities in order to improve the living conditions of the workers. Everybody knows that in the world today we have the socialist States and that the shackles of colonialism are being sundered for good. As a result we have brighter perspectives for the utilisation of scientific and technical progress for the welfare of all mankind. Because of its competence, the I.L.O. has to deal with many questions. It has many tasks. However, now its tasks must be geared to changes that have taken place, including those concerned in particular with the question of the maintenance of peace, without which it is impossible to have any social and economic progress.

The appearance of greater unity and concern in the world for the maintenance of peace, against the threat of nuclear war, irrespective of the differences in the social and economic systems of States, clearly shows that this is the first duty of all peace-loving forces, all national and international organisations and trends fighting for the maintenance and strengthening of peace.

In the general struggle for peace, the trade unions of the People's Republic of Bulgaria are supporting the peace-loving policy of their Government. They consider it a sacred duty to devote all their efforts to the struggle for peace and friendship among the peoples. The guaranteed freedom of the Bulgarian trade unions makes it possible for them to help fight for peace and also for the development of the economic and cultural standards of all the country.

The trade unions take part in the management of undertakings, in drawing up production plans. They can, through legislation, undertake initiatives in all labour questions and in social security. They have functions at a governmental level for defending labour. They control the implementation of labour legislation and can lay down sanctions in case of infringement, and they can stop work at an undertaking if necessary. Without the agreement of the trade unions and the workers concerned, no collective or individual dismissals can take place, and no labour agreements can be rescinded.

This is how things really are as concerns the rights and freedoms of trade unions in my country. Consequently how ludicrous are those attempts that have been made from this platform to slander the unions in the socialist countries. We are ready to welcome any representative of the I.L.O. to our country in order to study the conditions under which our unions are working and developing.

The picture is quite different if we look at the rights and freedoms of trade unions in many capitalist countries. There the governments, through legislation and other methods, prevent the organisations from assembling and from fighting in favour of the working classes. We consider that the I.L.O. should intervene here. It cannot remain aloof from the position of the trade unions in many capitalist countries.

At its Fifth World Congress, the World Federation of Trade Unions adopted a programme to defend trade union rights and freedoms, which was approved by 129 million workers throughout the world, whose organisations are members of this largest trade union federation in the world. That is why the I.L.O. should take into account this programme of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

I have already said that if we wish to improve the working conditions and living conditions of millions of workers, this will not be possible unless we have peace in the world. In this context the I.L.O. has departed from the right path. Instead of following the real way to achieve a better life shown by the workers, the I.L.O. has particularly emphasised the principle of class harmony to which a very large part of the Director-General's Report is devoted. In these conditions we can logically ask the following question: why has the I.L.O. in the mass strikes in a number of capitalist countries, the demonstrations and manifestations of workers in defence of their vital interests—class co-operation with the monopolies or their fight against the policies directed against the workers?

That is the reality. Those are the facts:
in Bulgaria people say: "When facts speak, even the gods are silent." It is quite clear to us that the struggle of the exploited against the exploiters is strengthened as the wealth created by the peoples is concentrated in the hands of a financial oligarchy, and this phenomenon is closely linked with industrial and social relationships. Therefore we cannot accept the position taken by the Director-General in his Report that it is possible, by means of class co-operation, to improve the position of the workers to any large extent. Nevertheless, the I.L.O. is taking a position which prevents it from following its proper course on behalf of peace throughout the world.

What is happening is that aggressive monopolistic capital is being upheld, and a policy is being forced on the Organisation that is directed against the interests of the working class. What has happened over the last few days at our Conference provides further proof that our Organisation is aloof from reality and historical development. The Conference preferred not to have regard to the just demands of the representatives of a whole continent, supported by many other delegates, on behalf of essential human rights and dignity, in favour of the representatives of a country which is treading elementary human rights and freedoms under foot.

The Constitution and other rules of the I.L.O. should reflect present-day questions, and in particular make it possible to maintain peace and fight against the hateful colonial system. These ideals should be basic to the activities of the Organisation.

The time has come to consider problems connected with the economic and social consequences of disarmament. These are not new questions. They were put before the Conference in 1960 by the delegates of the national organisations affiliated to the W.F.T.U., and in 1955 they were brought forward by other delegates. The solution of these problems is urgent, in the light of the resolution regarding disarmament adopted by the United Nations on the proposal of the Soviet Union and the United States.

The Bulgarian trade unions accepted the Director-General's suggestion not to introduce resolutions on subjects outside the agenda of this session of the Conference, hoping that this constructive proposal would be met. However, we regret to find that in the Report proposals are made to restrict the procedure for introducing resolutions on questions not on the agenda, and these proposals would not at all facilitate our work in this connection. This tendency is particularly obvious in the proposal contained in the Note from the Governing Body concerning Standing Orders Questions dated 5 June, in which other restricting proposals are made on the submission of resolutions under article 17 of the Standing Orders of the Conference. These facts speak for the existence of unjustified discrimination, which is inconsistent with the elementary democratic principles on the basis of which our Organisation should act. We do not accept this, and we think that we should eliminate the remnants of discrimination within the I.L.O.

For some years now the Governing Body and other organs of the I.L.O. have contained no representatives of W.F.T.U. trade union organisations, although the W.F.T.U. includes over 120 million persons in its ranks. This is a cause of the unrepresentative character of the organs in question, particularly the Workers' group of the Governing Body. The present members of that group are all representatives of the I.C.F.T.U., the I.F.C.T.U. and other bodies. This position in the Workers' group cannot and should not continue. There is no doubt that representation on the Governing Body and other organs of the I.L.O. of the working class corresponding to the real position in the world would only increase the authority of its decisions and make them more effective.

Another abnormal position that obtains now is that certain capitalist countries are sending to the International Labour Conference delegates who do not belong to the most representative trade unions in their countries. It is necessary for the International Labour Office to see that the governments in question send to the Conference delegates from the most representative unions.

As a result of standards existing up to now which regulate the organisational structure of the I.L.O., the principle of proper geographical representation in the membership of the organs of the I.L.O. and in the recruitment of the staff of the Office is not possible. It is necessary also to make changes in the Constitution and the Standing Orders of the I.L.O. to ensure fair representation in elections to and of membership of these organs, in the filling of posts and the appointment of I.L.O. experts.

We do not understand easily the functions of the Conference and the Governing Body. As things stand now, the Governing Body studies and decides on questions which as a rule should be in the competence of the Conference. It is necessary also to determine the functions of the Conference and the Governing Body in the Constitution of our Organisation. The Conference should adopt the I.L.O. programme, determine the agenda items for its sessions and elect the Director-General of the International Labour Office. The Governing Body should report to the Conference on its activities over the past period.

In conclusion I should like to repeat from this platform that we need peace and peace again if we are to fulfill the aspirations of mankind—welfare, social progress and a high level of culture.

(The Conference adjourned at 7.30 p.m.)

1 See Appendix III, p. 478.
NINTH REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE: SUBMISSION, DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—The first point at this morning's sitting is the ninth report of the Selection Committee. I ask the Chairman of the Selection Committee, Mr. Weaver, to be so kind as to come to the rostrum and submit the report.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—I have the honour to present the ninth report of the Selection Committee, which has already been circulated. It contains proposals regarding deferment of the election of the members of the African Advisory Committee to the next session of the Conference and matters thereto related.

I ask the Conference to adopt this report.

The PRESIDENT—Mr. Gurinovich, Government delegate, Byelorussia, has the floor.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. GURINOVICEH (Government delegate, Byelorussia)—As you will recall, Mr. President, I suggested a couple of days ago that the plenary meeting of the International Labour Conference should be interrupted in order to allow the Selection Committee to look at the proposal, moved by a number of socialist countries, which was submitted by the Government delegate of the Soviet Union, Comrade Borisov, concerning the postponement of the present session and its resumption in November of this year.

Now we have received the ninth report of the Selection Committee and we see that nothing has been said about what the Selection Committee has been doing or whether it has been doing anything about this matter, and if it has been doing anything, what it has decided.

I feel that the Selection Committee or you yourself, Mr. President, should indicate to the plenary exactly what action was taken on the proposal in question.

The PRESIDENT—to the question that has just been raised I can only answer that personally I do not know what has happened. The proposal was referred to the Selection Committee, but I do not know the decision of the Selection Committee and I would ask if Mr. Weaver would have any answer to make.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—Mr. President, the motion referred to in the question asked by the delegate was disposed of at the Selection Committee at its sitting the night before last. Mr. Borisov moved his proposal as a substitute for the items on the agenda of the Selection Committee. It was debated thoroughly and most extensively, and the Selection Committee by an overwhelming vote—if memory serves me correctly, 33 to 2—rejected the amendment proposed by Mr. Borisov. This item therefore, Mr. Chairman, was disposed of accordingly.

The PRESIDENT—Are there any further remarks to the ninth report of the Selection Committee? If not I will take it that this report is adopted by the Conference. It is adopted.

(The report is adopted.)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GUARDING OF MACHINERY: SUBMISSION, DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—we will now turn to the next item of our agenda, which is the report of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery. I would ask the Chairman of this Committee, Mr. Drachmann, and the Reporter, Mr. Azimi, to come to the platform.

I call on Mr. Azimi to be so kind as to submit the report to the Conference.

Interpretation from French: Mr. AZIMI (Government delegate, Iran; Reporter of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery)—I have the honour to submit to this Conference the report of the Committee on the Guarding of Machinery, which relates to the fourth item on the Conference's agenda.

The subject of machines lacking adequate safety devices or guards is one that has concerned the I.L.O. since 1925. With the expansion of industry and the progress of technology the number of machines in use increased enormously throughout the world, and the

1 See Appendix I, p. 465.

1 See Appendix VI, p. 566.
question of unguarded machinery is consequently of greater concern both to governments, employers and workers.

In May 1960 the Governing Body of the I.L.O. decided to include this important item on the agenda of the 46th Session of the Conference. As existing legislation deals mostly with the sale and use of unguarded machinery, we must also think of the substantial danger which arises from the export of such machinery to developing countries, where skilled workers are relatively few in number and where accidents due to such machinery are unfortunately too frequent.

The proposed Conclusions with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a supplementary Recommendation, were adopted following a first discussion on 27 June 1962 at the 46th Session of the International Labour Conference. The Governing Body of the I.L.O. was asked to include this item, for a second discussion, on the agenda of this session. The Committee on the Guarding of Machinery took as a basis for its discussion Report IV (2) prepared by the Office in the light of comments from governments of member States of the Conclusions adopted by the Conference at its preceding session.

Without wishing to go into detail on the report of the Committee, I would like to inform this Conference that in the first place the Committee held a general exchange of views on the main aspects of the problem. Then it proceeded to a detailed point by point consideration of the proposed text of the Convention and the proposed text of the Recommendation, as presented by the Office, as well as the 122 amendments submitted by members of the Committee.

In all, 14 meetings were held, each in an atmosphere of understanding and co-operation. The task of the Committee was greatly facilitated by the fact that many of its members participated last year in the work of the Committee and thus were well informed of the problems and what had been done on the subject before. Thanks to the spirit of cooperation and compromise shown by the Employer and Worker groups in the Committee, our Committee succeeded in adopting unanimously a proposed Convention supplemented by a proposed Recommendation, both of them dealing with the guarding of machinery. The text of the Committee's report and the text of the two proposed instruments which I have just mentioned have been published.

In conclusion I wish to thank the Chairman and the two Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, who directed the work of the Committee in an excellent manner. I also wish to thank the Representative of the Secretary-General on the Committee and the members of the Secretariat for the assistance they gave us and which we very much appreciated.

The PRESIDENT — The general discussion on the report is now open.

Mr. O'HAGAN (Workers' adviser, United Kingdom; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery) — In coming to this rostrum to support the report on the guarding of machinery now before the Conference, may I say that it reflects the best of the experience and knowledge of the whole Committee who, in my opinion, worked in a spirit of mutual endeavour to produce a document that could be accepted by this Conference and could be ratified by member States.

In this age of mechanisation and developing technique, it would have been easier to have taken up definite positions according to one's status, but fortunately the whole concept and the examination of this problem was one of ensuring that, as far as we could, we would be guided by the principle of safe working conditions. The work of the Committee was made more difficult by the fact that we had to cater not only for industrialised countries but also for developing countries.

I trust and I feel that we have taken care of these factors.

I may say that we all realised the importance of the developing countries and their needs, and while our African friends were with us we did on all sides of the Committee try to ensure that the points they put forward were adequately covered. In fact, we sincerely hope that if the Conference adopts the documents the developing countries will use and appreciate the work of the I.L.O. for the benefit of all workers and will realise that this work must go on in the technical committees in spite of any other difficulties.

In conclusion I should like to thank the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Drachmann, for his skilful handling of the work of the Committee. On behalf of the Workers' group I would also like to thank the Government and Employer members for their willing co-operation, which has resulted in a document that the Conference is asked to agree. I support the document.

Mr. MILLER (Employers' adviser, United Kingdom; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery) — It is my privilege to summarise here the views of the Employers' group on the proposed Convention and Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery. I am sure that all delegates here, from Government, Workers' and Employers' groups, are unanimous in agreeing that the field of accident prevention presents the I.L.O. with an opportunity to prepare an international instrument that could play a great part in reducing the appalling suffering throughout the world resulting from loss of life and limb—an opportunity to reduce the physical and emotional suffering resulting from industrial accidents.

I think we would all agree also that legislation alone cannot prevent all accidents, and as employers we are proud of the part we have played in many countries of the world in promoting by every possible means, including education, the reduction of such accidents. In many countries accident statistics themselves pay a tribute to the progress made and the effectiveness of what has been and is being done, and as employers we are unanimous in pledging the continuation of these endeavours, and indeed an intensification of them, to the greatest practicable extent. We feel that in this field, whatever progress has been made, one can never be satisfied: indeed we accept
that the basic responsibility for the safety of our workpeople rests with us.

At the outset last year the Employers were united, of course, in their desire to make real international progress in this field and to secure an instrument ratifiable by as many countries as possible. At the end of last year's discussion, however, we felt that the instruments—largely on grounds of inflexibility—did not fulfil that criterion and therefore we reserved our position by abstaining, in the hope of securing a more realistic instrument this year. I think we can say, therefore, that all groups were united in a common and highly desirable aim and that we reassembled this year in that spirit.

Coming to this year, I should like first to pay tribute to the excellent spirit of co-operation (which has already been referred to) and understanding that has existed among all groups this year. We feel strongly that if all technical committees at this Conference worked in this spirit everybody's task here would be very much easier. As a result of this spirit we feel that, despite our basic objection to Conventions—which we made clear at the outset last year and this year—we have now a Convention which is flexible enough for us to support, and we support it gladly and with enthusiasm as a contribution to world safety.

We feel also that in view of the large international trade in machinery the "sale and hire" part of this Convention is a particularly suitable subject for a Convention. The Committee has today submitted to us and to the Government members for their understanding and co-operation. The text of the Convention lacks clauses dealing with a whole series of problems of great interest to the workpeople throughout the world, because their application will truly protect those workers not only from traumatic accidents inherent in their work but also against all types of occupational disease. However, it is only proper to note that these two instruments are the result of a compromise and in particular that the text of the Convention lacks clauses dealing with a whole series of problems of great interest to the workers. Despite these obvious gaps the Workers' group accepts these instruments, because it is conscious of the fact that this Convention will be the first instrument in the history of the I.L.O. dealing with the guarding of machinery.

Considering the fact that the mass use of machinery throughout the world is more than a century old and that the I.L.O. has been in existence for more than 40 years, we find that there has been a serious delay in this field, a backwardness which is all the more grave when we consider that the majority of workers employed in industry, agriculture and transport are in direct contact with machinery and that many other countries have convention programmes of mechanisation and automation. From that point of view these two instruments could have a decisive influence on the legislation of all countries as regards the prohibition of the sale and hire or purchase of unguarded machinery in general, especially in those countries which find themselves obliged to import all their machinery.

I should like now to ask a question. Is it sufficient just to ratify these instruments, or should we envisage still further measures on the legal or organisational plane to deal with matters which are not specifically covered either by the Convention or by the Recommendation? In my view we should ensure that the legislation of countries which ratify the Convention concerning the guarding of machinery should regulate the problems mentioned in Article 6, paragraph 2, which states that "machinery shall be so guarded as to ensure that national regulations and standards of occupational safety and hygiene are not infringed". In other words, the national legislation must establish the basic standards of hygiene conditions for work on machines: that is, the maximum permissible concentration of toxic industrial substances in the air, the permissible degree of dust, the lighting, heating, and the permissible levels of noise and vibration, etc. While such standards do not exist in a country which is ratifying this Convention, then the provisions of Article 6, paragraph 2, will only be a dead letter.

It would be desirable for the I.L.O. to take practical measures to seek to combat occupational disease in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Conference. Furthermore, another condition no less important is necessary in certain countries if the Convention and the Recommendation on the Guarding of Machinery are to be effectively applied. In industrialised countries, particularly in those where the working classes by organising themselves into trade unions and fighting hard have obtained the right to social assistance in the case of occupational accidents or diseases, both the employers and the governments are economically interested in keeping down the number of labour accidents and occupational diseases and consequently, in prohibiting the sale, hire or use of unguarded machinery. For many years these countries have had labour inspection services entrusted with the control of safety standards at work, and they have in addition set up an effective system of penalties to be imposed upon an employer if in his undertaking there are many labour accidents and deaths and cases of occupational disease among the workers.

However, the situation of the workers is infinitely more difficult in a country where such legislation on the material responsibility of the employer with regard to labour accidents and occupational disease does not exist; assuming, of course, that these are caused by the fault or carelessness of the employer. Such employers in countries like these, in order to
make as much profit as possible, buy the least expensive machinery, sometimes worn out and lacking guards.

In this connection there is a thesis I can quote which is confirmed by experience: a private employer will not provide guards for his machinery except to the extent that it is economically convenient for him. That is why the question of guarding machinery assumes different angles in the industrialised countries and in the underdeveloped countries or in places still under colonial domination.

For these reasons we consider that ratification of the instruments to be adopted today should lead and encourage all governments to envisage concrete measures to regulate legally on the national plane, economic and criminal responsibility with regard to labour accidents and occupational disease.

The fullest respect for the safety and hygiene conditions of workers on machines can be guaranteed by the existence of the following provisions in those countries in which ratify the instruments we are dealing with. In the first place, standards for labour hygiene in undertakings; secondly, standards for the social protection of workers in the case of labour accidents and occupational disease.

After these few comments I should like to say that the Committee has done a useful job for the workers and that is why the Polish delegation to this 47th International Labour Conference will vote without reservation in favour of the Convention and the Recommendation on the Guarding of Machinery.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. BORDADIN (Government delegate, U.S.S.R.)—At the present session of the International Labour Conference we are having our second discussion on the prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery. The Committee has drawn up a proposed Convention and Recommendation concerning the Guarding of Machinery. These instruments are undoubtedly useful for the workers and their application will certainly help to reduce the number of accidents. This is particularly important if we take into account the high level of industrial accidents which occur in a large number of countries, in particular as a result of the inadequate guarding of machinery. In this connection it is easy to understand the efforts of the Workers' group of the Committee to draft a document containing the fewest number of exceptions, and capable of the widest possible application both with regard to the industries concerned and the type of machinery.

The Employers' representatives have tried to reduce the scope of the instruments and to water them down. It should be pointed out that as a result of the work done by the Committee this year the draft instruments have been somewhat improved. For example, one improvement is that in order to ensure proper application of the Convention a provision has been included in it with a view to providing for inspection and supervision of the way the instrument is implemented.

Another aspect is that these draft international instruments which have now been placed before the Conference do not contain many exceptions in respect of their scope.

I am pleased to note that Article 16 has been deleted from the initial draft Convention, since it made it possible for member States to exclude from ratification Part II or Part III, which are among the most important sections of this international instrument. This would simply have made the whole instrument meaningless.

One of the weaknesses of the instrument in our view is that the period of exemption concerning the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery has been increased from two to three years. A two-year period appears quite sufficient for providing the machinery with adequate guards.

To sum up, the Committee has prepared very useful and valuable instruments for the protection of the safety and health of workers.

However, this year, when these documents were completed, there was no participation by the representatives of a large number of African countries, as a result of the circumstances of which you are all aware that arose during the Conference. In fact, one-third of the delegations, representing the whole of the African Continent, were compelled to leave the Conference and could not take part in its work just because of one racist country, the so-called Republic of South Africa.

In this way, the Conference forfeited its truly representative character. To take decisions when a whole continent is unrepresented, over one-third of all the member States, cannot be considered proper.

Nevertheless, since these documents do meet the interests of the workers and can help to improve conditions of work and reduce the number of industrial accidents and since, last year, the representatives of the African countries did participate actively in framing the texts now before you, the delegation of the Soviet Union will vote in favour of their adoption.

The President—Is there any other speaker? If that is not the case, I declare the general discussion closed and we will now proceed in accordance with Order.

The first point is the adoption of the report itself. Are there any objections to that? If not, I will take it that the report is adopted.

(The report is adopted.)

Proposed Convention concerning the Guarding of Machinery, Submitted by the Committee on Guarding of Machinery: Adoption

The President—We now turn to the proposed Convention on the Guarding of Machinery. We will take it Article by Article. Are there any comments on the Preamble? If not, I declare it adopted.

(The Preamble is adopted.)

(Articles I to XV are adopted seriatim.)

The President—We now have to take a decision on the whole text of the proposed Convention. If there are no objections, I will take it as adopted unanimously by the Conference.

(The proposed Convention as a whole is adopted.)
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The PRESIDENT—The text of the Convention now adopted will, in accordance with article 40, paragraph 6, of the Standing Orders, be referred to the Conference Drafting Committee. At a later time, a record vote will be taken on the adoption of the text which will be before the Conference after having passed the Drafting Committee of the Conference.

**Proposed Recommendation concerning the Guarding of Machinery, Submitted by the Committee on Guarding of Machinery**

The PRESIDENT—We now turn to the proposed Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery. We will take this Paragraph by Paragraph.

First, the Preamble. Is it adopted?

(The Preamble is adopted.)

(Paragraphs 1 to 19 are adopted seriatim.)

The PRESIDENT—We now have to take a decision on the complete text of the proposed Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery. If there is no objection, I will take it that this proposed Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery is adopted unanimously by the Conference.

(The proposed Recommendation is adopted.)

The PRESIDENT—This text of the proposed Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery, in accordance with paragraph 6 of article 40 of the Standing Orders, will be referred to the Conference Drafting Committee.

It now only rests for me to express on behalf of the Conference our very warm thanks to the Chairman and the Reporter of the Committee and to all its members for the very fine work they have done, thus making it possible for the Conference to deal with these texts of the proposed Convention and Recommendation in so short a time and without any objection. This is an example of how it is possible in this Conference to achieve co-ordination not only between the three groups but also among the representatives of the different nations present here. I repeat on behalf of the Conference our very sincere thanks to the Chairman, the Reporter and all the other members of this Committee.

**Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.)**

The PRESIDENT—We will now turn to the third item on our agenda for today, the continuation of the discussion of the Director-General's Report.

Mr. HARAGUCHI (Workers' delegate, Japan)—The Director-General says in his Report that the I.L.O. is now confronted by the broad question of the adequacy of I.L.O. programmes and the adjustment of the Organisation to the changing world. This is the seventh year that I have had the privilege of attending the International Labour Conference, and on the basis of my experience in those seven years I feel the time has now come to reconsider the structure and activities of the I.L.O. as proposed by the Director-General. But this new aim of the I.L.O. cannot be achieved without the positive understanding and collaboration of the governments, employers and workers of all the member States. The most important factor for the success of any new structure, new activities, new programmes, is the enthusiasm and constructive effort of each government, employer and worker to promote support for these in their respective countries.

The division between East and West, the division between North and South, is another serious problem faced by the I.L.O. We must find out how to narrow the gap, how to build a bridge between the two separate parts of the world. The real solution for this problem will never be achieved if we try to approach it by identifying ourselves with one specific part of the world.

During these seven years since I first attended the International Labour Conference I have been most concerned with the problem of freedom of association. Seven years ago I first appealed to the Conference to urge the Japanese Government to ratify the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87). Since then the infringement of freedom of association and the question of the ratification of Convention No. 87 have been discussed continually by the Conference and the Governing Body. The ratification of Convention No. 87 has been one of the most important issues in the Japanese trade union movement, and through this issue the existence and merits of the I.L.O. have been fully recognised and acknowledged among all Japanese workers.

During the seven long years while we have been trying to achieve ratification we have been greatly encouraged by the I.L.O. Recommendations; at the same time, we clearly understand that the final responsibility rests upon us, the workers of Japan, to bring this about. At the present session of Parliament, which has been extended, negotiation for ratification is in progress. Through our valuable experiences, we have fully appreciated and relied upon the role played by the I.L.O., especially the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations of the Conference and the Committee on Freedom of Association of the Governing Body. On the other hand, we realise that the I.L.O. alone does not solve all the problems, and we recognise the limit of I.L.O. actions. Above all, we realise that the main efforts should be made by the workers themselves. Nevertheless, we Japanese workers want an even stronger I.L.O. Is this possible? Are we right in wishing for that? I expect an answer from the Director-General, and I believe his reply will be a favourable one.

In recent years, the gap between developed countries and developing countries has been considered one of the most serious problems of the I.L.O. It is quite understandable that many of the efforts of the I.L.O. should be directed to technical assistance for the develop-
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I.L.O., to our friends of the International Workers' group of the Governing Body of the International Trade Secretariats, for their confidence in the fundamental principles and Conventions to the I.L.O., especially the standard-setting and controlling activities. I am one of those who share this fear. Have the developed and industrialised countries which co-operate actively with the I.L.O. technical assistance programmes already ratified the I.L.O. basic Conventions and Recommendations, and have they applied them in practice? Freedom of association, the right to organise, the right to negotiate collectively—are all these guarantees? Is discrimination eliminated? Is forced labour abolished? Is the minimum wage system well established? Are the Conventions on hours of work and on social security respected? How do we construe the ever increasing complaints submitted to the Committee on Freedom of Association? How do we interpret the thousands of observations made by the experts with which we are dealing at the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations? I would like to stress the fact that even in some developed countries the fundamental Conventions and Recommendations of the I.L.O. are not commonly accepted or applied in a proper manner. It would be regrettable if, when the technical assistance programme is established and carried out, no special consideration were given to link it to respect for the fundamental standards of the I.L.O. In my opinion, it would be dangerous for the I.L.O. to emphasise too much the importance of technical assistance and leave aside the basic principles of the I.L.O. I do stress the need to link the I.L.O. fundamental principles and Conventions to the technical assistance activities. When setting up technical assistance programmes and when carrying them out, we should ensure that the I.L.O. principles are fully taken into account in the giving countries as well as in the receiving countries. Otherwise there will be no significance in the I.L.O. technical assistance.

Now I conclude my speech, but I cannot leave this rostrum without telling the Conference about a great event I anticipate in Japan. The 47th Session of the International Labour Conference will become a historic conference for the Japanese trade union movements. As I said at the beginning of my speech, the present session of our Parliament is extended until 6 July, and the ratification of Convention No. 87 on freedom of association is on the agenda. Very serious discussions are now taking place within the special committee set up for Parliament. The I.L.O. has raised many important problems. This initiative is a very wise one and, at the same time, very bold and meaningful. I congratulate the Director-General on his initiative, and particularly on the frankness with which he deals with the many important subjects and numerous problems which bear on the whole future activity of the I.L.O.

A discussion of all the questions brought up in the Report is beyond the power of one single person and I would just like to underscore a few points which seem to me most important. On each of these I would like just to highlight the most salient aspects.

I agree with the Director-General when he says: "The I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history, at one of those points where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action." In other words, what the I.L.O. has done in certain fields, in spite of relative efficiency, will not be sufficient for the future.

Since 1948 the I.L.O. has entered into a new phase of its existence. Technical assistance now goes hand in hand with the regular activities of the I.L.O. and since 1948, in the form of technical co-operation or operational activities, this assistance has found a more important place in the structure and activities of our Organisation.

I would like to describe the resources of the I.L.O. in this field and the basis on which this technical assistance is built up.

We have three branches of technical assistance: firstly, the I.L.O.'s technical assistance financed within the regular budget of the I.L.O.; then the technical assistance coming from the United Nations that is part of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance funded by the Special Fund of the United Nations; and thirdly, the Special Fund of the United Nations, which appoints the I.L.O. to carry out certain projects under its competence.

Then we have (a) the programme of workers' education; (b) the management development programme; (c) rural development programme; (d) European personnel and social services exchange programme.

The Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance includes the organisation of manpower (including vocational training); productivity and management development; co-operation, small-scale industries and handicrafts; social security; and working conditions and labour administration.

The Special Fund of the United Nations finances certain long-term projects.

The budget for technical assistance has increased yearly. The figures for 1963 are: under item 16, U.S. $1,250,000; for expanded technical assistance, U.S. $5 million; for the Special Fund, U.S. $7 million.

Apart from the principles and criteria in force before 1961, the Conference at its 45th Ses-
sion adopted a certain number of resolutions on technical assistance, bearing on present technical assistance, which completes the procedure already in force in 1961.

There are a number of criteria which are submitted for the Technical Assistance Programme of the I.L.O. under item 16 of the regular budget of the I.L.O.

There is a fairly complicated and long procedure in order to get projects adopted and implemented.

Finally, we have the problem of co-ordination. We have co-ordination at headquarters; co-ordination on the regional level; and co-ordination at the local level. The procedure of co-ordination for United Nations funds is fixed by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and the Economic and Social Council.

These are the funds of the I.L.O. in the field of operational programmes. These funds amount to US $13,280,000. If this figure is ridiculous this is not the fault of the I.L.O., but it cannot do much with these credits.

Two immediate problems arise: firstly, what means can be envisaged to increase these funds? This question cannot be solved at the level of the I.L.O. and must be considered by the United Nations, because with the means that I.L.O. and the organisations of the United Nations have at present, they will never manage to close the gap between the advanced countries and the developing countries, and this gap is widening from day to day. Secondly, what are the principles on which we must base operational programmes and what procedures must be envisaged for utilising these funds and choosing the projects and executing them so that they will give the maximum yield?

In the field of I.L.O.'s technical assistance under the regular budget we now have five criteria for the operational programmes of the I.L.O.: project requested by a newly independent State; project falling within the I.L.O. which does not enjoy any high priority under Expanded Technical Assistance or Special Fund; project from a developed country; project of preparation for or preparation mission; project coming from intergovernmental regional organisations.

These criteria have been effective, but as you see, they are used just to fill up gaps that exist because other more important technical assistance funds cannot cope with them, such as the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund.

At first sight this principle can be defended but if the I.L.O. changed its criteria and tried to orientate its technical assistance in the developing countries, while remaining in those fields which come under its competence, and if, with the small resources that it has, it assumed the role of co-ordinator, it could become much more effective for countries which are seeking their way but do not know how to proceed.

I would like to speak about the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund. The procedures to be followed to launch a programme under the E.P.T.A. and the Special Fund are complicated and slow. These procedural labyrinths and this slowness are largely instrumental in rendering technical assistance ineffective. Sometimes a project is admitted only years after the country makes the request and very often the project is no longer useful.

I now come to a very essential problem: co-ordination. This is a crucial aspect of technical assistance and one where we meet many difficulties.

The Economic and Social Council has looked at the problem seriously. A special committee of representatives of eight member States was appointed under resolution 851 (XXXII) of ECOSOC. The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination dealt with this problem and set up a detailed system of co-ordination on the local and regional level and at headquarters. But I cannot say that the machinery is perfect. This having been said, I would like to draw your attention to two important points.

First of all, the I.L.O. is considered on an equal footing with the other specialised agencies of the United Nations. This is not correct, because the I.L.O., by virtue of the importance of its functions, its competence and its structure, should have pride of place among these specialised agencies.

Once the share of I.L.O. in technical assistance is defined our Organisation should have complete say in the matter.

Secondly, the operational programmes of the United Nations and the specialised agencies are increasing from year to year. These agencies reach out to fields which did not exist in the past, but the personnel availabilities, even specialised personnel, cannot keep pace with this activity.

It happens in the developing countries that we find high officials of the United Nations who have all the qualities of a good diplomat but are not knowledgeable about the technical assistance they are in charge of. So how can we expect complete co-ordination from such personnel?

It may be interesting to recall that the 45th Session of the International Labour Conference adopted a resolution on technical assistance which refers to "the desirability of strengthening the co-ordinating role of the Resident Technical Assistance Representatives of the United Nations Technical Assistance Board as the channel of contact with governments concerning technical assistance and the need, in selecting these Representatives, for ensuring in co-operation with other organisations represented on the Technical Assistance Board their competence and impartiality".

Now, resolution 851 (XXXII) of ECOSOC does not give satisfaction to our resolution. This is a very serious fact which the Director-General of our Organisation should take into consideration.

Among the questions which, at the present stage of the United Nations Development Decade, have been particularly brought into prominence, there are three which deserve special mention: the encouragement of industrialisation in the developing countries; the broad economic and social aspects of rural development; intensification of the application of science and technology in economic development.

These problems, to a large extent, fall within the competence of the I.L.O. It is necessary for the I.L.O. to obtain from the United
Nations the place that is due to it in carrying out these programmes.

I fully agree with the Director-General that the important initiatives taken in the I.L.O. and its agencies in social and economic matters should be carefully drawn up and discussed with the representatives of the I.L.O.

I also agree with the Director-General that it is necessary, in consultations undertaken with the I.L.O., that the advice of the three elements of the I.L.O. be obtained in advance, that is, that there should be tripartite delegations taking part in the discussions.

There are other problems dealt with in the report of a regional nature. The Director-General speaks of the north-south, east-west divisions. This is a problem which really exists, in spite of the technical assistance efforts and bilateral and multilateral aid. The gap between the developed countries and the underdeveloped countries is constantly increasing, and I do not think it can yet be closed or reduced. In spite of all the Director-General's efforts since 1954, the east-west division still exists.

Does the Director-General envisage and hope for a disappearance of these divisions by magic? I do not doubt the optimism and courage of the Director-General, but I think this would be an illusion.

The I.L.O. must envisage other solutions different from those already foreseen, rather than speak of universality and other theoretical principles.

I do not think the I.L.O. alone has the task of closing the gap. The I.L.O. must simply find the means to accomplish its task and duties in spite of disagreements.

In my opinion the only way is to decentralise I.L.O. activities according to region. The I.L.O. must realise that the fundamental problems in the various regions and different blocs are not the same. The more our aspirations are homogeneous the easier it will be to meet the various needs.

We must also bear in mind that the International Labour Conference has become a conference of 432 delegates accompanied by three times more advisers. As such, it has become immense and too unwieldy to do useful work. Our work should therefore be done at a regional level and the Conference could meet every three years to take stock of the situation.

The region must also be delineated as a group of neighbouring countries having, as far as possible, the same social and economic conditions. This is a very important question which has to be resolved in consultation with all countries desiring to belong to a given region.

The structure of the I.L.O. must correspond to its new tasks. A large number of I.L.O. officials, in these conditions, will be transferred to the field offices and the regional and local offices. Headquarters will remain in Geneva, where the regions will be well represented.

Furthermore, the new economic tasks of the I.L.O. call for a strengthening of the economic divisions, just as the operational activities induce the I.L.O. to reinforce its technical staff in order to be able to cope with the problems connected with the introduction of modern techniques and to remove certain anomalies.

I am astonished that although the I.L.O. has been considered by the United Nations and above all by the Special Fund, as having competence in regard to productivity—which is of the greatest importance for the developing countries—and management development is part and parcel of productivity, the I.L.O. only has a Management Development Service instead of a proper Productivity Division which would comprise management development and other productivity problems.

Such are the few remarks I wanted to make on the Director-General's Report; and once again I would like to express my gratitude to the Director-General for having set up such a remarkable Report and I would like to reiterate my confidence in the future of our International Labour Organisation.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. ZÚÑIGA GARZÓN (Workers' delegate, Ecuador)—The 47th Session of the International Labour Conference is an important meeting of the peoples of the world under the auspices of the most representative of the international agencies. Its object is to analyse the requirements of today and plan the fulfilment of our dearest hopes.

It is our duty to stress the courage, goodwill and intelligence of the Director-General's Report. After a masterly synthesis, he seeks a positive lasting solution for the fundamental problems of our time.

I should merely like to tell you against this background of the position of our country which is closely linked to world ideological developments. The Conference is meeting at a time at which the economic and political crisis in our country is growing more acute. The people's poverty deepens day by day. The cost of living is steadily rising because of the complete failure to control speculation. In the cities and rural areas unemployment is increasing, so much so that 500,000 unemployed are officially admitted out of a total peasant population of only 4 million. The peasants are left to their fate, they live an increasingly miserable life, victims of feudalism, of low prices for their products, of oppression and violence by the landowners who employ them. The poor quarters of our cities continue to be unprotected and without any proper services. Whole provinces are abandoned and plunged into increasing backwardness.

While the people of Ecuador live in this wretched poverty a handful of great landowners, capitalists and bankers grow rich and insatiably exploit the masses. It is not only the national oligarchy but also, indeed mainly, imperialists, who plunder and impoverish our country. In fact Ecuador is still being colonised. All our natural wealth is surrendered to foreign monopolies—our petroleum, our fish, even our bananas. The exploitation of Ecuador by imperialist firms through manipulation of cocoa and coffee prices involves our country in a loss of not less than $25 million a year. The profits of these foreign companies amount to 1,500,000 suces a year for bananas alone. With this amount of money we Ecuadorians could solve some of our more urgent problems—illiteracy, tuberculosis, parasitic diseases—and undertake electrification and irrigation without
having to contract debts with the imperialists.

In fact Ecuador is more heavily in debt than ever. The amount owed by the country to imperialist bankers prevents any progress because, with interest and refund of capital, hundreds of millions of sucres a year flow out of the country. Nor does this borrowing benefit our nation, for the lenders get hold of the money again in the form of high salaries for their self-styled technicians and by channeling purchases through the monopolistic firms themselves.

At the same time the interference of the imperialists in our national life is growing worse. They intervene in education, destroys the basis of our nationality; in agriculture by guiding production only towards what suits them. And they poison the morale of our armed forces with anti-democratic ideas.

On the other hand, imperialism continues its war policy throughout the world, and seeks to hold up the peoples in their march towards final liberation. It redoubles its oppressive policy in alliance with the oligarchies and the big landowners of Latin America and elsewhere. It intensifies its aggression against the Cuban revolution because that people's example is a stimulus to all those who fight for their own liberation. Therefore they seek to invade Cuba and redouble the blockade of that glorious island of freedom. Their attacks have been defeated by the solidarity of the socialist countries, with the Soviet Union at their head, and by the solidarity of all the peoples of the world.

It is increasingly evident to the workers and the peoples that a war policy is a permanent threat of destruction for humanity, for that is what would happen in a nuclear war. It also means further poverty, because enormous sums are spent on armaments which if used for peace would serve to solve urgent human problems, particularly those of backward countries like our own.

Such a war policy means the subjection of our countries to the war plans of imperialism and the creation of military forces which are used to restrain the peoples in their struggle for freedom. Our country is also a victim of this policy. The oligarchs, traitors to national sovereignty and to the life of the people, have signed military pacts and arranged for the construction of imperialist bases on our soil. These could well be used for atomic missiles and so in case of war expose us to total disaster.

The workers and people of Ecuador have reacted energetically to this situation, to their own poverty and hunger and to the loss of national sovereignty. Our trade union organisation has been built up by hard fighting, both in the cities and in the rural areas. The workers are mobilised in defence of their right to work, to better living conditions, to respect for their other rights. They are using all forms of struggle for this purpose—demonstrations, strikes and active resistance to aggression by the employers and by the public forces which are at their service.

The action by large groups of workers which is now going on throughout the country, the great demonstrations on 1 May in all our cities under the banner of the Confederation of Labour of Ecuador, a W.F.T.U. affiliate, are proof that the confidence and fighting spirit of the workers have increased.

As a result of these struggles it is increasingly clear to our people that our national problems cannot be solved under a régime dominated by the oligarchs and imperialists, who are truly responsible for the poverty of the masses. They merely defend their own interests and privileges and throw the whole burden of the crisis on the shoulders of the people.

It is increasingly evident that a solution can only be found in a thorough radical revolutionary transformation of our national life, under a popular government headed by the working class in close alliance with the peasant and all popular democratic and patriotic forces. Accordingly, the masses of the people are growing more combative and one can now believe that this radical transformation will come to pass.

In the face of this advance by the workers, this increase in their confidence and fighting spirit, the oligarchy, landowners and imperialists have reacted with a violent campaign against the working class and the peasants. This has taken the form of imprisonment of trade union officers and of active members, the use of the army to defend the employers' interests and the establishment of a real state of siege in rural areas. This anti-labour campaign is reinforced by a violent wave of lies by certain organs of publicity, etc., which seek to distort the truth about our class action, and by an increase in the diversionist activity of imperialist agents who seek to introduce their disgusting policies among the ranks of our workers.

While using force and oppression, imprisoning and murdering, they seek to deceive our people about the so-called "Alliance for Progress", which is nothing but a false promise—a farce with which imperialism seeks to hold up the revolutionary process that is growing in our popular masses, particularly among the workers and peasants of Latin America. We are struggling to break the chains which bind our countries to imperialism and feudalism. The "Alliance for Progress" is supposed to aim at overcoming the backwardness and economic and social stagnation in which the Latin American countries have been living, but in fact it has and has the object of exerting pressure on the Latin American governments to break off diplomatic, commercial and other relations with Cuba, the first socialist country of the Americas, so as to crush that great popular revolution, a shining example which inspires us all.

In these circumstances it is for the workers of Ecuador to lead the popular masses in their struggle for the revolutionary transformation of our country, for that is the only escape from our present crisis.

This struggle implies a constant, energetic, determined fight for the immediate demands of all groups of workers as part of the over-all battle of our people for the following objectives: higher wages, establishment of a sliding scale of wages with automatic adjustment to the cost of living; improvement and extension of social insurance benefits; fairer employment stability; conclusion of collective agreements; cheaper, decent housing constructed by the State, the local
authorities, the welfare funds and the employers; reduction of rents and of light and water rates; increase in paid holidays for workers on unhealthy jobs; reduction of taxes on the poor and particularly of the wage tax, so that the rich people, the landowners, bankers and foreign companies may pay instead; action to eliminate unemployment; reduction of prices of main consumer goods; an agrarian reform to break up the big estates and distribute land and water free of charge to those who work the land; full rights for the Indians; respect for popular rights and their extension, particularly trade union rights such as the right to organise and to strike; nationalisation of the undertakings which now have our wealth at their disposal; action against the surrender of our national wealth, such as petroleum, fish, minerals, bananas, to imperialist undertakings; industrialisation of our country; establishment of diplomatic and commercial relations with the socialist countries; re-establishment of relations with Cuba; defence of the principles of non-intervention and self-determination; solidarity with all peoples fighting for their independence and sovereignty.

In this spirit, while we offer our solidarity to the I.L.O. for more complete success in its mission, we hope that its objectives, structure and methods will be increasingly improved and its arms will be opened to receive the new, wise and creative wisdom of peoples such as the People's Republic of China and the German Democratic Republic, and that it will reject delegations which infringe the profoundest traditions and ideology of the Organisation as in the case of the Republic of South Africa. That country has trampled on human rights, respect for which is the basis for peaceful coexistence, the only basis on which the I.L.O. is built and from which its whole action should stem.

To close, I should like to inform the Director-General and other I.L.O. authorities of our irrevocable solidarity and unshakeable support for the views expressed by Louis Saillant in the name of the W.F.T.U., the most representative international trade union organisation.

The President—As Mr. Bouladoux has had to absent himself I give the floor to his adviser, Mr. Farine.

Interpretation from French: Mr. FARINE (Workers' adviser, France)—Mr. Bouladoux has had to absent himself and has asked me to act as his deputy and present his statement from this rostrum.

In the first place, I would like to congratulate the Director-General for having succeeded in bringing into sharp focus the essential principles on which the I.L.O. is built and from which its whole action should stem.

But I wonder whether in spite of the efforts made by the Director-General to show its perennial validity, the practical exigencies are really accepted and understood by all. I do not think I am wrong when I say that, for some, the political systems or economic structures are more important than the requirements arising from these principles.

I would not hesitate to say that even if we must reconsider some of our customs and traditions we must search patiently and diligently for ways of reconciling these apparent or real antagonisms.

In order to do so, it is necessary to put first the ideal of the I.L.O. itself: peace, freedom, and justice in all aspects and with all their social implications, because these principles are such that men of good will can rally round them.

Time does not allow me to accord to the first part of the Report the place it merits. I hope I will have other opportunities to revert to it. Nevertheless, I am glad to state my broad agreement with the priorities outlined by the Director-General, namely the search for maximum efficiency of manpower, while respecting the rights of man.

As regards the chapter on incomes, I shall confine myself to saying that of course the possibilities of increasing incomes must be found, but with respect for social justice. Social policy must be integrated into all economic policy. This is a prerequisite for a sound income policy and it seems to me essential in this respect that the subsistence minimum for individuals and families should be sought for, granted and protected by social security. In other words, I feel that the International Labour Code needs to be completed in this respect.

In any case, it is no longer possible to allow the free play of economic laws, and no doubt only planning will ensure economic effectiveness while safeguarding social justice. But we should not be blind to the dangers which rigid planning can bring as regards the rights and freedoms of persons and activities. The I.L.O. has an essential part to play in establishing basic standards capable of enforcing these principles which, of course, it is desirable to remember but even more important to translate into practice.

I should now like to take up the important question of operational activities, not only because it seems to me that in this field the part of the I.L.O. is important, but also because it involves certain risks. We are all in favour of developing these activities, but not to the point where they might take the place of the basic purpose of the Organisation, namely standard-setting. Conventions in this regard are undoubtedly superior to Recommendations. Care should be taken not to encroach on the prerogatives of the component elements of the I.L.O. and particularly the trade union movement. I should mention, in this regard, workers' holidays. Work is being done, but where great precautions must be taken in order to avoid such encroachment and also to avoid this work being diverted to serve government interests.

There must be no reversal of I.L.O. policy; the agreement of trade union organisation is in all cases the first condition to be fulfilled.

It would be equally dangerous, at the opposite end of the scale, if there were to be a lack of initiative in certain fields. The I.L.O. should not accept that the United Nations subsidiary organisations should consider as their private hunting grounds certain activities
which obviously have social and economic implications.

Among these problems on which the I.L.O. should assert its competence and on which it should co-operate in solving I shall mention only the following: disarmament, which, as all the figures quoted have shown, is a major factor in determining the living standards of peoples and, in another area, the stabilisation of commodity prices without which, for some time to come, the economic balance of a large number of countries will remain precarious.

What these are strictly political or economic problems, and yet no one can deny their deep social implications and the fact that they impinge on the proper field of the I.L.O. So far as disarmament is concerned, can it not be said that if social justice is an indispensable element for the maintenance of peace, the maintenance of peace in turn is equally indispensable to social progress?

As regards stabilisation of commodity prices, it will suffice to point out that a mere variation of 10 per cent. in the prices of those products would totally cancel out the effort of co-operation in favour of developing countries. The figures published by the I.L.O. show that the over-all drop since 1958 is well above that percentage. This sufficiently shows that the I.L.O. cannot afford to disregard this question.

Finally, to conclude on this important question of operational activities, which I repeat should not overlook the tripartite character of the Organisation, they should in no case help member States which violate the fundamental principles of the I.L.O. We are sometimes told that it is precisely that co-operation which will enable those countries to adopt and apply the main Conventions. But nothing is less certain and, in any case, that would mean giving a bounty to the least deserving among the member States.

The respect of the tripartite principle, to which I have referred several times, since it is the most original feature of the I.L.O., raises some delicate problems. Some Employers’ delegates have pointed out that fact. As for ourselves, while we reaffirm our loyalty to this principle, I would like to say to the Employers that what seems to me essential in this function is not the financial structure of the undertaking but the true responsibility of the head of the undertaking in the economic and social field. Does the head of a nationalised undertaking have the freedom to discuss working conditions with his staff, taking into account social justice and the sound operation of the enterprise within the framework of the national economy, whether planned or not? If so, it means that he must, under any economic system, be accounted a real employer and as such entitled to participate fully in the work of the I.L.O. To deny this would be to assert that the principle of tripartism is incompatible with that of universality because it would amount to granting the traditional capitalist system a monopoly which is no longer in keeping with the world of today.

However, it is clear that tripartism is possible if all partners are placed on an equal footing, with mutual respect for the independence of government, employers and workers. This independence is bound up with freedom of association, which must be asserted and, if necessary, redefined.

I shall merely consider the question from the point of view of the workers’ organisations. Those who speak of freedom of association have appeared, for some time, to have in mind rather different situations. Freedom of association for the workers means, first of all, the right to form associations of their choice and, secondly, for those associations to be able to represent their members. Finally, it means respect for their independence by employers, by the State and by any external organisation or formation of the trade unions concerned.

Two major obstacles oppose this concept of freedom of association which nevertheless, it seems to me, flows from the principles of the I.L.O. The first obstacle is the artificial search for trade union unity. The unity of the trade union movement is a good thing and a natural tendency in the world of labour, but the conditions which it requires are very difficult to fulfil at the same time. The more the trade union movement extends to fields beyond its traditional occupational functions, and the more difficult it becomes for these conditions to be achieved, the more necessary is that unity. Unity, at any rate, must be the result of the freely expressed will of the workers. It cannot be achieved by government fiat or imposition of the will of a majority group. If this happens, then freedom of association is affected and hence the tripartism is affected.

The problem is serious, but it is not insurmountable. It can be tackled in a number of ways, which are subject to improvement, even though the suggestions in the Report do not fully satisfy me: the procedure for complaints of violations of freedom of association, the credentials procedure, the Conference machinery for examining the application of Conventions and Recommendations, all of these constitute the arsenal which should make it possible for the I.L.O. to ensure respect for freedom of association in member States, and, indeed, this machinery is often used successfully. Why, then, do we still today witness so many flagrant and persistent violations of freedom of association? Simply because the I.L.O. can take no effective sanctions and because it often hesitates for diplomatic reasons to take the necessary measures towards deliberate and persistent offenders.

This, I agree, is a delicate point, for there is no doubt that freedom of association, and indeed respect of all the Conventions which constitute the very basis of the I.L.O., will be respected only if offending member States can be sanctioned, and if the sanction in extreme cases can extend to the temporary or definitive expulsion of their delegates. This could be achieved through a modification of the Constitution, both the need and urgency of which has been brought to light by recent serious events.

For lack of time I can only touch on another serious problem which arises, and which I consider to be an important one: the regionalisation of the I.L.O. activities. Others have made excellent comments about this point. If, in its operational work, the I.L.O. should come as close as possible to the peoples on whose behalf it works. I think, with all due precau-
tions, an attempt should be made to adapt the standard-setting work to the conditions of the various regions. The danger of course, as I said earlier, resides in the fact that certain regional adaptations may lead to social retrogression. I think this can be avoided if the adjustment of standards takes place within the framework of the general Conventions adopted by the I.L.O. Conference. Perhaps we might in the future consider having less detailed Conventions, laying down basic minimum standards without enumerating all those problems on which legislative action should be taken, with a view to ensuring respect for the basic standards while at the same time ensuring the necessary social progress. Within such a framework, would it not be possible for regional conferences to meet more often and to adopt particular Conventions or instruments supplementing existing Conventions and laying down detailed and progressive clauses for their application?

There can be no doubt that this is a bold undertaking and one which will not tolerate improvised action; but neither can it be doubted that the standard-setting role of the I.L.O. will gradually lose all interest and substance if the same texts operate to regulate problems concerning all countries whatever their degree of development.

Finally, I may add that, if the Organisation is not in a position to enable ratification of certain regional Conventions, among them some for Europe, or of certain groups of European countries, then European institutions will take the place of the I.L.O. and the European workers will gradually lose interest in the I.L.O. if the latter fails to respond to their preoccupations.

In closing, I should like to touch upon one last problem, that of resolutions, which is making increasing inroads on the time of the Conference. This may be deplored, but the reason is another—we have had the Conference who have not direct access to the Governing Body to express their opinions and make suggestions concerning the functioning and operation of the I.L.O.

The Conference, we are told again and again, is the supreme organ. Ought it not to be able to use its authority not only for suggesting but also for sanctioning? This is why I think we should maintain the possibility of depositing resolutions, even if we require a certain number of signatures for their introduction. It is a way of enlightening the Governing Body on the needs of the Conference and also suggesting ways and means of assisting the work of the I.L.O.

One point which I think has received insufficient attention is the role of the Conference with respect to the practical effect given to various resolutions. A suitable machinery should be set up to fill this gap. It seems that the usual practice is to inform the Conference, for example through an appendix to the Report such as that submitted this year, but without enabling it really to discuss and judge and possibly to sanction. Only if the Conference had this possibility would it do full justice to its responsibilities.

I am sorry that I have had to deal so rapidly and so superficially with the Director-General's remarkable Report. I have done so with the conviction that I was co-operating to the best of my ability to helping the I.L.O. to make the necessary adjustment, in its irrereplaceable work, to a changing world.

Mr. PERERA (Employers' adviser, Malaya) I trust I shall be excused if I start by referring to matters which do not come strictly within the Director-General's Report. The other day the Workers' delegate from my country made two statements in regard to conditions in our country on which I think the record has to be put straight. He referred to what he alleged was the lack of freedom of association in Malaya, pointing out in this connection that the relevant Convention had not been ratified and also referring to the legislation now in force. What he failed to say was the report of the Mission from the I.L.O. which looked into this makes it quite clear that although the Convention has not been ratified freedom of association does in fact exist in Malaya. He also failed to point out that the legislation to which he referred had been carefully examined, first by a committee and then by the National Joint Labour Advisory Council itself, the committee and the Council being composed of equal numbers of representatives of employers and workers; and that it was only upon their unanimous recommendation that the Government went through with the legislation.

He also referred to the Internal Security Act and suggested that this was being used to stifle trade union activities. The Government of the country which I have the honour to represent has made it quite clear that the Internal Security Act has nothing to do with trade unionism.

I had occasion last year to refer to the attempts made by international communism to capture Malaya by violence and terrorism. That has been successfully resisted. There are still people in the country who attempt to subvert both democratic principles and democratic institutions for the purpose of subjugating the country as they had attempted to do earlier by violence and terrorism, and the Internal Security Act is required purely for that purpose.

I will now move to the Director-General's Report. A number of speakers from this rostrum have referred to the present situation as being, to use a metaphor, one which indicates that the I.L.O. is at a cross-roads. I am not so sure that the metaphor is correct, because my own impression, and that I think of many others, over the past few years has been that we have been wandering down a rather ill-defined and meandering lane without any clear indication of where we were going. I would prefer to say that today, as a result of the Director-General's Report—a very thought-provoking, frank and bold document—we are stocktaking, making a reappraisal. I would even go so far as to say that this has to some extent the characteristics of an examination of conscience—an examination which I am afraid is going to be difficult and even painful.

The Director-General starts his Introduction by referring to the fundamental principle of tripartism in the I.L.O. I would like to join
Mr. Verschueren, the Employers' delegate of Belgium, in deploring the fact that except for that one reference no mention whatsoever is made of what so many of us have felt over the years to be the fundamental basis of this Organisation. The Director-General, referring to the fact that tripartism, or the tripartite structure of the Organisation, was reassessed immediately after the last war, said that events have since proved this judgment to be well founded. I would ask you if this is a correct statement. Do we have tripartism in this Organisation any longer?

The report of the Credentials Committee shows that five countries attending this Conference have only Government delegates—or at least, four have Government delegates and one has only a Workers' delegate, who therefore does not have a vote. I would ask you to consider how many delegations here are truly tripartite, because tripartism means not merely that there should be people who call themselves Employers' and Workers' representatives but that those representatives should be independent. The Declaration of Philadelphia refers to Workers' and Employers' representatives enjoying equal status with Government representatives. To my mind, equality of status is incompatible with dependence, and I would say that over the years we have compromised this principle of tripartism which we still pretend to believe is the foundation, the very base, of this Organisation.

Reference is made to other fundamental principles. Are those being followed? What action have we taken in regard to the basic freedoms which we say are at the base of this Organisation? We are in fact faced with one serious issue. We have on the one hand tripartism, with which must necessarily go the full autonomy of the groups—another principle which was compromised a few years ago—the basic freedoms: freedom of labour, freedom of association, the primacy of social needs; we have on the other hand what has been called the principle of universality. The previous speaker suggested that these were not incompatible. Is that so? Can we have the principle of universality, which requires us to have as delegates to this Conference representatives of nations which do not believe in tripartism, which do not believe in or observe the basic freedoms, or are we going to stick to those freedoms, are we going to stick to those principles? I feel that this is the major issue which the Organisation has to face today: whether we are going to have the principle of universality, which means that everybody has got to be here whether we like it or not, whether they follow those basic principles or not; or whether, on the other hand, we are going to restrict this body to those who do believe in those principles. That, to my mind, is the major decision which this Organisation must take, and take now.

Where principles are concerned compromise is impossible, and I feel that for many years we have deceived ourselves by having on the one hand these basic principles and on the other hand, tacitly or implicitly, compromise. Of all forms of deception, self-deception is the most dangerous.

I am not offering a solution at this stage because I feel that this is an issue which the Organisation has got to face fairly and squarely—and, I might add, honestly. If we believe in the principle of universality then these fundamental principles can never be principles; at the best they can be objects or aims. If, on the other hand, we believe in tripartism, then we must have true tripartism, with independent, free representatives of Employers and Workers; we must have group autonomy, and in referring to this may I express my sincere admiration of Mr. Abid Ali for the courageous statement he made on this point in regard to what has come to be known as the Appeals Board procedure.

We have spoken from this rostrum on more than one occasion of the rule of law. Have we followed that? May I ask those who are here and those who are not here—quite a number do not seem to be here—to ask themselves whether over the years, in taking the various decisions we have had to take, particularly on the question of credentials, we have followed the rule of law or the rule of political expediency. So much for the general aspect of this matter. The Director-General expressed the hope that discussions would not be merely polemic. I do not think I have been polemic, because unless we face the fundamental issues all other matters concerning the organisation and structure of this Organisation are useless. If we continue to fool ourselves—that is what we are doing when we compromise principles—then no adjustment to procedures, no adjustment to structures, no adjustment to organisations, will take the I.L.O. back to where it was intended to be in 1919.

To come to particular points, I should like to refer very shortly to the matter of Conventions, and in doing so I would commend to the serious consideration of this Conference, the Governing Body and the Office, the very important and lucid statements thereon made both by my Minister and by Mr. Greve, the Employers' delegate of Ceylon.

I have a feeling that the instruments of the I.L.O. are progressively becoming pieces of paper, that the object is not to get a workable instrument but to produce an imposing document, which can then be forgotten until it is time to produce another. A statement was made here that at least these Conventions will give an objective. That is not how I understand the standard-setting functions of this Organisation. If we are setting universal standards, then we must face realities. We must set standards which are practical. Otherwise, why have the complicated machinery that we use to produce Conventions if they are merely to be objectives to be aimed at by countries as and when they can?

There is another serious aspect of this, an aspect which has again been referred to by previous speakers: the application of these Conventions. We get more and more voluminous reports, both from the Committee of Experts and the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, which show clearly that many of those that have accepted responsibilities and obligations under these Conventions are not carrying them out. What have we done about them? What do we intend to do about them?
I would like now to move on to the matter of credentials and to say that, while I agree with the Director-General that the credentials procedures are unsatisfactory, I regret to have to say that his analysis of the reasons why they are unsatisfactory is entirely incorrect. May I say here that the slur which has been cast in the Report particularly on the Workers’ member of this Credentials Committee, if intended, can only be considered to be an insult not merely to the Workers’ member but to the Chairman and Employers’ member of the Credentials Committee as well. There is a slur on their impartiality. There was a suggestion that the Workers’ member might be moved by international ties. I would ask you to remember what happened yesterday when Mr. Sánchez Madariaga, despite his international ties, submitted the minority report. I may say that I still do not agree with him, and I do not agree with the Conference either, but nevertheless it was not international ties which made Mr. Sánchez Madariaga submit that report. The trouble is that we have failed to keep to the Standing Orders. Article 26 says “The credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be deposited with the International Labour Office at least 15 days before the day fixed for the opening of the session of the Conference”. This year some credentials were deposited 13 days after the Conference was opened. I suppose this is what is called the Standing Orders. Article 26 says “The credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be deposited with the International Labour Office at least 15 days before the day fixed for the opening of the session of the Conference”. I would suggest the Standing Orders be amended to make it imperative and obligatory on governments, when submitting these credentials, to give full particulars of the persons nominated, of the organisations consulted, whether there was agreement with those organisations, and if not what agreement was reached, and in addition such information as is available on the membership strength of those organisations.

I will not deal with the question of the credentials of Government delegates, because here we have to consider the position of the I.L.O. vis-à-vis the United Nations. We come back again to the theory of universality. While I hope earnestly and sincerely that the discussions that we are having at this Conference will maintain the integrity and increase the prestige of this Organisation, I believe—again sincerely and firmly—that we cannot achieve that unless we face fundamental facts and decide exactly what we stand for.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. KOLOSHIN (Employers’ delegate, Byelorussia)—In the discussion on the Report of the Director-General of the I.L.O. at the present session of the Conference, many of those who have preceded me at this rostrum have referred to the first sentence in the Introduction to the Report where it says, “The I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history”. Other points raised in the Report have been referred to, in particular the need for having a clear understanding of the priority of I.L.O. tasks and the adaptation of its methods and resources to the changing world conditions. If I take it upon myself to refer to these points once again, I do it simply to stress the depth of the crisis that the I.L.O. has reached. It has been unable, at this turning point in its history, to cope with its tasks and uphold the principles set forth in the Constitution and in the Declaration of Philadelphia. The fact that our Conference is denied the opportunity to swing outwards to embrace the representatives of African and other countries—who have left as a token of protest against the presence in the Conference of the racialists of South Africa, where the policy of apartheid, that bestial fascist form of hatred towards mankind, has been elevated to the rank of a national policy—indicates more eloquently than any words could do that the I.L.O. is not using its opportunity to swing outwards to a new and larger orbit of action. As an engineer I can assure you that, when there is such an attraction towards a new and larger orbit, you will not get there by clinging to hide-bound traditions at the same time. Those who wish to halt the course of history must be made to realise that our epoch is an epoch of constant renewal of all forms of human existence. We see a great desire to master the forces of nature, a great struggle to attain a more progressive social structure. One of the main characteristics of this epoch is the awakening of formerly backward and oppressed peoples. With volcanic might the aspirations of the peoples towards freedom, independence and democracy have burst through the confines of imperialist suppression. Just as a great earthquake can change a whole landscape overnight, the national liberation movement before our very eyes has changed the political landscape of whole continents. Colonialism is doomed. History has passed the death sentence upon it, and this sentence is already being carried out. It is time to understand that this destruction of the colonial system is a result of the will of the peoples. It is an objective law of our age.

The newly independent countries, treading the road of economic and social development, are forced to overcome the heavy heritage left by colonial rule in their countries. I shall quote examples to show clearly what the colonisers have brought to the people they have kept under their yoke for centuries. This has been brought about by those represented by the so-called “free” Employers of the highly developed countries.

At the United Nations Conference held in February this year on the application of science and technology for the benefit of the less developed areas, the well-known Indian scholar, Professor Takker, who was chairing the Conference, quoted figures to show that 57 per cent. of the world population, that is, the populations of all the underdeveloped countries, possess less than 10 per cent. of total world income. The income per head of population of the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America amounts to only $50 to $100 a year. If we read the world press we see that at the present time
in the developing regions of the world every hour almost 500 people die of hunger, that is over 10,000 people per day. Approximately half of the population in the economically weak countries can neither read or write and not more than 10 per cent, of children from the age of 14 to 18 go to a secondary school, and the number of people receiving specialised technical or higher education is ludicrous.

There, Messrs. "free" Employers, you have the results of your civilising mission in the past. But you are no better even now. When adopting the budget of the I.L.O. for 1964, you wanted technical assistance to the developing countries to amount to less than $1,400,000, although you yourselves pay not a cent to the budget of the Organisation, and to go by the figures of the United Nations every year you pump out of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America more than $20,000 million.

We consider that one of the main issues before the world today and before the I.L.O. in particular is the liquidation of the consequences of colonialism, and not the consequences of technological congresses, as suggested in the Director-General's Report. In order to solve this highly important problem the Director-General and the Governing Body of the I.L.O. must, with the broad participation of the developing countries and of countries with different social and economic systems, draw up without delay a generally acceptable programme for the eradication of the consequences of colonialism and should submit this for study by the General Conference.

At the Conference sessions and in I.L.O. bodies the question has often been raised concerning the need for the I.L.O. to raise its voice actively and loudly in the general struggle for peace, for general and complete disarmament, and for it to study the economic and social consequences of disarmament.

We are deeply convinced that the time is ripe for the I.L.O. to act. Deeds, not words, are expected from it by the peoples who now have to bear the brunt of the arms race. In one hour enormous sums are swallowed up by the folly of the arms drive, which may surpass three or fourfold the annual budget of some African countries.

There are surprising procedures being maintained in our Organisation. You are aware that more than a third of mankind is developing its economy by building up socialism and communism, the most just form of society on earth. The socialist countries produce more than 37 per cent, of total world industrial output. The state sector of the economy is developing in the majority of countries that have attained their independence, and the highly developed countries also have their state sector of the economy. And how is the I.L.O. reflecting this trend? It is most enlightening in this context to consider the recent elections to the Governing Body of the I.L.O. Not one single representative from the socialist sector of the economy was elected. I consider that this flagrant injustice must be rectified. In defending my position I could adduce many arguments, but short I shall limit myself merely to quoting from a statement by the distinguished representative of France, Mr. Hauck, at the 29th Session of the Inter-
national Labour Conference. Mr. Hauck said: "...we proved that in the world of today new forms of economy are developing on all sides every day; that it is no longer possible to consider that private enterprise is the only type of enterprise existing throughout the world; and that private employers have no longer the monopoly of representation of employers throughout the world because, besides private employers, there are public employers. ... The International Labour Office must pay attention to these problems, for the world is developing in that direction, and if we do not take account of the things that are happening and change in the world of today, our Organisation will have no more life in it and will not have any real contact with the problems which it is its duty to study and solve."

I should like to touch on one more question.

The representative of the European Economic Community attempted in his statement to the Conference to give the impression that this monopolistic organisation can only help, through its programmes, the economic progress of the developing countries. In point of fact, however, this is an endeavour of the monopolies of "free employers" in the western countries to find new ways and means of manipulating the economic positions of African countries, to hamper the industrialisation of these countries and to exploit them as suppliers of raw materials. Do not run away with the idea that this is only the opinion of the delegates from the socialist countries. Let us hear what the Africans themselves have to say about this, these Africans who are deprived of the possibility of speaking from this platform.

The report of the Economic Conference held in Cairo in the summer of 1962 states that membership of a number of African countries in the West European Common Market will perpetuate the existing structure of their economic and trade ties with this bloc and will lead to the establishment of economic discrimination directed against the whole of Africa. The Ghanaian Times, when analysing trade relations between African countries and the Common Market, wrote in December last year, in a leader entitled "The European Common Market: A Trojan Horse", that the deceptive façade behind which the propagandists of the Common Market are hiding their faces from the Africans is already collapsing, and that behind this façade one can discern the bare teeth of a hungry tiger.

These are the facts which show what is behind the phrases used by the western representatives who talk about their desire to help the economic progress of the developing countries.

The international situation prevailing during this 47th International Labour Conference and the situation now obtaining in our Organisation itself and in its various bodies, the events which we have witnessed at the present Conference—all this points to the urgent need to overcome conservatism, to eliminate the state of "Diktat", and to bring the I.L.O. Constitution and Standing Orders into line with the realities of our time.

Mr. ZIARTIDES (Workers' delegate, Cyprus)
—The Report of the Director-General sub-
mitted to this 47th I.L.O. Conference is an important Report. It deals with the future programme and structure of the Organisation. It opens the discussion of a new practical programme and of the adjustments and changes in organisation and in methods of work required for the successful implementation of the programme.

In his Report the Director-General has stressed that the I.L.O., being a member of the United Nations family of organisations, is fully committed to the objective of preserving and strengthening the foundations of world peace. I would like to state that the workers whom I represent, in fact all the workers of Cyprus, will always support all the efforts of the I.L.O. and of all international bodies and organisations aiming at strengthening the foundations of world peace and achieving general and complete disarmament. We believe that for all sane and civilised people no other problem is of greater importance than the problem of safeguarding, strengthening and consolidating peace. As it is repeatedly said, the problem of peace is equivalent to that of the survival of humanity.

My organisation and the World Federation of Trade Unions, to which we are affiliated, during various occasions and in their programmes have declared that as long as the threat of war is hanging over our planet the efforts and the struggles of the working class for a better life will encounter more and greater difficulties. In conditions of world peace it will be easier to advance on the road of social and political progress. This is why we in Cyprus are in agreement with that part of the Report which says that "the effectiveness with which the I.L.O. can pursue its work on labour and social questions is conditioned in a large measure by the climate of world politics. Where this climate is good, new initiatives can be taken and resources for action can be increased." We believe that what is true for the I.L.O. is true for national organisations and national efforts.

The I.L.O. could contribute much to the efforts for disarmament and peace; it could contribute by undertaking to inform and enlighten the workers and the people of all countries on the economic and social consequences of the huge world expenditure on arms. This expenditure is estimated by the Report of the Director-General and by the Consultative Group of the United Nations at roughly 120 billion dollars annually. The I.L.O. could help the workers and the people of the world to imagine and understand the results if those huge amounts today spent on arms could be allocated for the economic and social development of the depressed areas of the world. Last year the Report of the Director-General dealt with the problems of the aged working people. Three years ago it dealt with the problems of youth. None of the social problems, in fact no social problem, can be successfully solved as long as the forces which are hostile to peace succeed in their sinister policies.

In Chapter I of his Report the Director-General states that "even when social objectives are accorded a certain primacy in public policy, it is clearly impossible to give satisfac-

Chapter IV of the Report deals with trade unions and labour relations. I shall discuss only one point of those raised in the chapter.

Should greater stress be laid on collective bargaining between employers and trade unions or should greater initiative be given to the State in determining wages and working conditions? Should the right of the trade unions and the workers to strike be recognised, respected and protected or should the State be given the right to arbitrate disputes which cannot be settled by collective bargaining? On behalf of the workers which I represent I must state that we are not in favour of state intervention in determining wage levels and working conditions. Wage-fixing and conditions of work must be determined by free collective bargaining and collective agreements.

The State should only intervene in matters which belong to the sphere of social policy and social legislation or for fixing of minimum wages and other minimum standards of conditions of work, in cases in which the workers are unorganised or the trade unions are, for various reasons, in a weak bargaining position.

We also state that in any machinery devised for the purpose of negotiating labour disputes the right to strike must be recognised and protected and that there should be no justification for government intervention in legitimate strikes of the workers. I am raising this point only as a question of principle, and not because there is any such intervention in the right of Cypriot workers to strike.

Dealing with the first part of the Report of the Director-General, i.e. the future practical programme of the I.L.O., I must say that there are points in this part which are of the greatest importance to Cyprus and, I think, to all developing countries. Vocational training, social security, occupational safety and health, labour legislation, research and statistics—all these are fields in which the I.L.O. should expand its activities and increase the assistance given to the developing countries.

Coming now to the question of structure and to the adjustments in organisation which are urgently required, we must say that much courage, realism and responsibility are required to find what exactly is needed to make this Organisation and its bodies enjoy the continued and increased confidence of the Members. The realisation of the lofty aims of the I.L.O. can be achieved only with the confidence of operation and trust in all its Members. We believe that any attempt to defer the examination and settlement of the problems of organisation
would harm the I.L.O. and damage its prestige among the working people of the world.

In discussing this question of the adjustment made in the representation of the workers in the Governing Body, we must not forget that the trade union movement is not united. This is a regrettable situation, but it is a fact. There are three major trade union trends in the world today. Are all these trends fairly represented in the I.L.O. organs? I am afraid not. The World Federation of Trade Unions and the organisations affiliated to it, with over 100 million workers in their ranks, never were represented in the Workers' group of the Governing Body.

I know the argument that the majority of the group is entitled to elect by a democratic process its representatives in the Governing Body. But I believe that a proportional representation cannot be described as not being a democratic process—indeed I think it is more democratic than the existing one.

The intensification of the regional activities of the I.L.O. and how to strengthen the Organisation's action in the different regions is dealt with in the Report of the Director-General. First in importance among the regional activities of the I.L.O. are the regional conferences. My organisation, and, I think, all the organisations affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions, attach considerable importance to the I.L.O. regional conferences. We will support every effort to give these conferences more authority and we will work to enlist the interest of the workers of our country. Regarding the question of authority, we consider that regional conferences should be given more authority than the regional consultative committees. I would not agree that regional conferences should be empowered to adopt regional Conventions or other regional instruments; but I think that it would be right to give them a certain amount of say in the fixing of the agenda of the International Labour Conference.

It is stated in the Report that 14 regional conferences have been held since 1936, seven in Latin America, five in Asia, one in Africa, one in Europe. A regional conference for the Middle East planned for 1951 was postponed. As a Workers' delegate coming from that region, I would like to state that a Middle East regional conference would prove useful and necessary. We know there have been and there are political difficulties, but we think that no political difficulty will justify any more the postponement of the Middle East regional conference.

I have one more remark to make about this question of regional conferences. We could not understand why only one European regional conference was held. We do not believe that regional conferences are useful and necessary only for developing regions. Industrialised regions have their own peculiar problems which require discussion. Take Europe today. The economic and political developments of the last four or five years are affecting the standard of living of the workers. They are affecting social policies in Europe. Very rightly the Report of the Director-General states that the I.L.O. cannot afford to ignore these developments. We believe that an All-European Regional conference, fully representative of the whole continent, would help the I.L.O. in studying the problems created by the new situation in Europe. The I.L.O. is a member of the United Nations family of organisations and I think that it should follow the example of the United Nations, regularly convening All-European regional conferences. I am not suggesting that I.L.O. conferences of narrower European regions should not be convened. But these narrower conferences should not take the place of the All-European regional conference.

I now want to say a few words on the I.L.O. field offices. No doubt they are very useful and they can offer increasing help to the countries of their regions. Our aim should be to improve their research activities, their studies in labour conditions, wages, labour legislation, and to strengthen them so as to become a real help to regional conferences and the developing countries concerned. As regards the Istanbul Field Office, we in Cyprus feel that it is overburdened and that it would be advisable perhaps to set up a Middle East Field Office in one of the capitals of that region.

Interpretation from French: Mr. SOMOSKÖI (Workers' delegate, Hungary)—The events of recent days have justified the claim that in its working methods, structure and programme the I.L.O. must adjust itself to the changes which have taken place throughout the world. Anyone who thinks that the energetic action taken by the new African States is a passing phenomenon is mistaken and is triumphing too soon. The Hungarian Workers' delegation is solidly with the African representatives and absolutely condemns the fascist apartheid policy of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

We are persuaded that the I.L.O. can only carry out its task if it moves forward in pace with life, if its activity and programmes reflect the efforts made to achieve the objectives which express the aspirations of workers throughout the world. If any one were to make statistics about the whole of the earth certainly they would find that the problem of war and peace is one which most concerns the minds of men and women. We are certain that if this question was put to the vote the great majority of the masses would vote for peace,
for real security, for a life free from the fear of war. Nothing can better serve the interests of the workers in East and West than the defence of peace, the execution of a policy of peaceful coexistence, and general and complete disarmament. I agree with the Director-General that the I.L.O. must by every means participate in the maintenance and reinforcement of peace in the world.

Only peaceful conditions of life can provide a solid basis for the protection of the general and daily interests of the workers. This is why all the unions which really desire to serve the interests of the workers must with all their forces fight against any aggressive militarist policies and continually unmask those—whether they be leaders of monopolies or of trade unions—who seek to make the workers believe that disarmament may cause a reduction in employment and that armament policies ensure their well-being.

According to the advocates of the armament policy, disarmament would cause insoluble difficulties. Is that true? Would hundreds of millions of workers be out of work and their families without resources? No, this is not the case. An increase in military budgets cannot regulate economic life. The working class of no capitalist country has been saved from permanent unemployment as a result of militarisation of economic life. If a disarmament policy were adopted several hundreds of millions of dollars each year could be devoted to peaceful objectives. If this sum were spent on increasing food production, every inhabitant of the earth could have 50 per cent. more food than is now consumed per head, and free of charge. For the price of a battleship a city of 100,000 inhabitants could be built. Many people sleep on the bare earth because they have no home. I could go on enumerating such instances indefinitely.

How many simple human wishes could be realised by using the millions spent on armaments? These examples show that it is not sufficient to state (as does the Report of the Director-General) that disarmament would not involve insoluble economic difficulties. It is the duty of the Organisation to work out projects for the use of resources which would be released through disarmament, and to contribute by this work to fruitful co-operation between the member States in order to reach the social objectives of the Organisation. To this end it would be useful to establish, like the United Nations, a permanent working committee which would study from the Organisation's point of view the consequences of general and complete disarmament, and would prepare proposals on questions affecting the whole of mankind.

The Report of the Director-General deals also with the influence on the workers of generalised technological progress and automation in developed countries. The report makes a proper appreciation of the general trend of present scientific and technical progress and the developing automation of production. It is true that automation greatly increases the power of man over nature, rapidly increases productivity of social labour, and creates technical conditions appropriate to the material well-being and cultural level of humanity. But it is on the social system that the economic and moral influence of automation on the workers depends. Where the increase of productivity due to automation does not bring an increase of production and where the excess created by this automation is pocketed by capitalists, automation only means unemployment, poverty and insecurity for the worker. In the socialist society, increased production means greater material well-being for the worker, so that the wages spent on consumer goods increase constantly and this leads to a continued increase in production. Therefore, in socialist countries the trade unions support technological advancements in production, because by so doing they serve the interests of the workers. In the capitalist countries progressive and combative unions are not against automation, provided that such automation contributes to the interest of workers and does not increase exploitation.

The example of socialist countries does prove that the effect of automation on the situation of the working class need not be negative if appropriate practical action is taken. It requires that technological progress shall increase the income of a small social class, and that its results, mostly due to labour, shall be felt in the increase in real wages, material and cultural advances, improvement in workers' housing, and the development of public services. It is also essential that the programme of action adopted by the Fifth World Trade Union Congress should be accepted, thus ensuring at the place of work recognition and implementation of the rights of the trade unions. Technical development is necessary to ease the strain of work and to liquidate unemployment. According to the example of the socialist countries, the I.L.O. should plan and promote the reduction of hours of work without a reduction of wages, and with an increase in employment. During the I.L.O. Conference we often asked the question of human rights is on the agenda, but we await the time when more is done and with fuller effect, especially for the most elementary rights of the workers, and better wages for millions of workers become realities. Technical development provides a possibility of giving solid support to the aged worker. We propose that the pensionable age shall be 60 in general, but 55 in occupations where particular energy is required as, for instance, in the mines. The Organisation must continue more intensified activity to develop the science of labour protection and the prevention of accidents, in order to avoid the harmful effects of increasing mechanisation and the introduction of automation.

In the light of the above, I agree with that part of the Report according to which the next Conference should discuss changes in agreements concerning wages policy.

The Director-General's Report goes into detail on the work of the Resolutions Committee which raises a serious problem and has done for some years owing to the increase in the number of resolutions and resulting difficulties. All proposals which tend to reduce the work of the Resolutions Committee, or limit the possibility of putting forward resolutions tend to restrict the important right of trade unions to propose resolutions to the Conference. There-
fore, I think all the proposals on this question contained in the Director-General's Report are acceptable. I think it would be a good thing to examine how we could eliminate the obstacles and artificial difficulties raised by certain persons to prevent the efficient working of the Resolutions Committee.

In order that the I.L.O. may achieve the objectives set out in the Constitution and that its work may correspond to the task assigned to it, there must be changes in its methods of work, its structure, and its system of representation, and it should in general be made more democratic. These changes must reflect and correspond to the social changes going on in the world.

We are opposed to any modification in the methods of work of the Organisation which would diminish the scope and the competence of the Conference, which is the supreme organ of the Organisation. The Report considers the Conference as a parliament of world-level problems. This is right, and therefore changes must be made in order to strengthen its character; we demand that changes be made in important respects concerning organised workers, and we have been attempting for years to bring this about.

One important point is that, under the Constitution, the most important representative unions of each country should represent the workers of that country at the Conference. We must ensure that the W.F.T.U., which has more than 120 million members, shall be represented both directly and through its member organisations in the Workers' group of the Governing Body. An end must be put to the discrimination which has been going on for 14 years under which this group is considered to be the eternal property of certain international trade union organisations. The present composition of the Governing Body does not allow for reality, for the real situation of the international trade union movement, and thus it is an infringement of the universal character of the Organisation.

(The Conference adjourned at 1 p.m.)
TWENTY-FIRST SITTING

Saturday, 22 June 1963, 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Robinson

Report of the Director-General: Discussion (cont.)

The President (Mr. Robinson)—We will now continue discussion of the Director-General's Report.

Interpretation from French: Mr. Lascaris (Workers' delegate, Greece)—The Conference has before it this year very clearly and essentially the important problem of the programme and activities of the I.L.O.; in other words, the problem of the very survival of this world social parliament is before it. This great problem having been raised, we must explain our views and reply to many questions brought up by the Report. We must do this in an extremely short time, although we all know that it is impossible to allow us longer in the circumstances.

This brings us to a general remark—namely, that the procedure followed for the discussion and consequently for action on the Director-General's Report seems neither advantageous nor constructive. It is regrettable to find that so much precious time is wasted on monologues spoken from this platform—speeches which are not only often foreign to the question under discussion but are also frequently delivered in an almost empty hall, as is the case at this particular time. It seems to me, therefore, that a different procedure should be considered for the future. Before each Conference our views on the subjects dealt with in the Director-General's Report might be set out in writing. These could be published and subsequently a special committee could be set up which would, on the basis of the views expressed, submit to the Conference a report which would then be discussed later by the Governing Body. This procedure would make it possible to save precious time, avoid discussions outside the agenda and perhaps shorten the Conference itself.

I do not see any other possibility at this moment than to disregard some parts of the Report and make a few general remarks.

The whole problem which Mr. Morse brings before the Conference is whether in fact the structure and activities of the I.L.O. still meet the requirements of a developing world. This question is brought up by the Director-General in the light of the great events of our time, when a leading place is occupied by economic development, technological change and the universal movement to abolish colonialism wherever it exists and in whatever form. We declare quite sincerely that the definition of the problem in the various chapters of the Report does correspond to the views of the Greek trade union movement as regards the I.L.O.'s mission and its ideological direction as an independent social force in the service of freedom, democracy and peace.

Having said this, we note with the same sincerity that events are moving forward at a rate which sometimes exceeds the I.L.O.'s possibility of adjustment. In these circumstances the function of the I.L.O. may one day be regarded as being exceeded by the needs of the moment. The consequences of this danger are clear. However, no one will deny the efforts made by the I.L.O. administration during the past ten years, particularly with a view to the best possible adjustment not only of operational programmes but also of the general spirit of the Organisation. No one will deny the effects of the international political atmosphere on the I.L.O. mission, to which Mr. Morse refers. However, I do not want to accept in advance the view expressed regarding the defence strategy of the I.L.O., because this practice might endanger the advanced position still occupied by the I.L.O. and which it must maintain in the struggle of the nations for the high ideal which the I.L.O. is required by its Constitution to serve. On the contrary, we emphasise that no political or diplomatic factor could justify any delay on the part of the I.L.O. in accomplishing its task, which is primarily to safeguard the fundamental rights of the working man. This international institution, the I.L.O., has so much strength behind it that it should not retreat before these factors; on the contrary, its mission requires it to remain the torch guiding the people in their struggle for social justice and economic democracy. This objective can only be achieved by a policy similar to that which inspired its foundation.

The revolutions of the fifties, which have been spoken about from this platform—the national revolutions, economic revolutions and technological revolutions—are now at a status quo. These revolutions put an end to colonialism once and for all, demonstrated the inefficacy of the old economic régimes and doctrines and served as counter-revolutions to the régimes and situations set by the first industrial
revolutions. It is from this triple revolution that the modern world has arisen with its problems, dangers and achievements.

Our Organisation must accept the spirit of these changes and be impregnated with them. It must conscientiously face the problems of the new world and seek to understand them. Its duty, above all, is to point out and to annihilate, in so far as it is competent, the dangers arising from these changes.

In our view, the greatest of these dangers is the substitution of economic subjection for national sovereignty. Where the state is the principal agent regarding the development of a neo-colonial spirit is true, the fact remains that the speed of development increasingly gives rise to economic giants on the one hand and dwarfs on the other. This evolution calls up the spectre of economic subjection not only of peoples which have just become independent, but also of nations which have been free for centuries.

The present decade has been called the Development Decade. Let us hope that the results will not disappoint the hopes placed in this development by the peoples of the world. I am not going to speak at great length on the effect which a division of humanity into sovereign and subject peoples would have on the fate of the I.L.O. However, it is understandable that programmes of economic development worked out and executed in the absence of the essential elements—production factors and trade union organisations—may lead to suspicion by the beneficiaries as regards both the intentions and the results of these schemes. Hitherto there has been a tendency to consider economic development as an objective in itself and not as a means of achieving social well-being. We would be glad to see the I.L.O., impregnated with this social spirit, apply it within its competence, striving to institute a régime of equality in the relations between industrialised countries and developing regions, and associate the trade union organisations in the various stages of planning and implementing development programmes.

Chapter IV has also had our particular attention. It concerns trade unions and labour relations. In this connection, I want first of all to express our satisfaction regarding the manner in which the role and importance of the trade unions are stressed in this discussion of contemporary problems, and regarding the emphasis placed on the necessity of taking certain action of a more positive character to ensure practical application of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98 regarding freedom of association.

We consider that severe sanctions should be contemplated against member countries which, having ratified these Conventions, refuse to apply them or in any way infringe their spirit or their content. Such sanctions might involve, for instance, refusal to give technical assistance to countries which did not respect their commitments in this way.

As for direct assistance to trade union organisations in the developing countries, we are in favour of this because we think that this aid in no way interferes with the laudable effort to give workers the enjoyment of their fundamental rights. There should also be training of trade unionists to enable them to carry out their tasks properly. This is the best way of achieving this objective, on condition that the organisations remain absolutely independent, direct or indirect, governmental or otherwise.

In these circumstances, I am sure that such assistance based on the training of trade unionists, the establishment of trade union institutes, and the instruction of trade union leaders on economic, social and technological subjects among others, would be gladly accepted by the unions of developing countries as a proof of their positive interest without any reservations. On the contrary, we could not accept the idea expressed in the Report regarding the competence of experts from the I.L.O. in trade union matters, since interference such as that proposed is contrary to the independent existence and action of the trade union movement.

I now come to Chapters VI and VIII of the Report, which deal with I.L.O. standard-setting work in the light of experience obtained and technological development. My first remark relates to the need for accelerated rhythm in the legislative mechanism of the I.L.O. in order to establish a wide, flexible framework of international provisions adjusted to the requirements of the developing world. My second remark deals with the need for taking appropriate action to ensure application of Conventions ratified by States Members, against which severe sanctions should be considered in the case of violation. Lastly, we would like it to be recognised, if only in principle, that some Conventions must be revised. But we attach great importance to having a more thorough inquiry in this field and a more detailed report, for we fear that a premature decision might cause dangerous confusion.

I will conclude on a point which seems to me essential. It relates to the procedure for the examination of credentials. I consider the proposal to establish an independent judicial body absolutely unacceptable. Apart from the constitutional problem which would be raised by its adoption, it would have an even graver result, that is, it would deprive the Conference of its prerogatives, and would thus prevent the supreme organisation of the I.L.O. from taking its own decisions regarding credentials. I consider the examination of credentials must be improved, but it should not be done to the detriment of the sovereign rights of the Conference.

Having expressed a few of the thoughts suggested to me by the Director-General’s Report, and being conscious of the gravity of the subject under discussion, I think of the “Big Four” of the international trade union movement who laid the foundations of this Organisation. I am thinking of Jouhaux, Barnes, Gompers and Vandervelde. I am certain that all representatives of workers present here are resolved to pursue the work of our past comrades and so give the I.L.O. the opportunity of adjusting its work to the requirements of the present world.

It was once said that an American whose conception ranged between Utopia and humanitarianism—more generally speaking—the League of Nations, and that a socialist, Albert Thomas, constructed the edifice of international social justice, the I.L.O. The first edifice collapsed. The second, thanks to Albert
Thomas, has survived and brought to the world the profound changes which have begun to transform the face of our world.

In conclusion, may I interpret the faith of all those who appreciate the work of the Director-General and are convinced that under the auspices of Mr. David Morse the I.L.O. will do its job to the full.

Mr. LIANG (Workers’ delegate, China)—In taking part in this year’s general discussion on the Report of the Director-General with special emphasis on the I.L.O.’s programme and structure, I wish to join, first of all, many of the preceding speakers in expressing our appreciation to the Director-General for his evaluation of the objectives of the Organisation, as well as his proposals for adapting I.L.O. activities and its structure to the needs of the vast changes in the world today. As the Workers’ delegate of the Republic of China, I wish to comment on some aspects of the Report in the hope that it may be of help to the Conference in its deliberations.

The Director-General has at the outset of his Report indicated the I.L.O.’s commitment to peace. It should be appreciated that the I.L.O.’s commitment in this field is the paramount objective of the Organisation. Peace is a prerequisite to economic and social progress, which in turn ensures and reinforces peace. However, as the I.L.O.’s role in promoting world peace is necessarily restricted by virtue of its constitutional provisions, consequently no direct action can be expected should the world come close to the brink of either a conventional war or a nuclear catastrophe. What the I.L.O. can do to save peace, as I can believe, would be confined only to striving to foster international co-operation in order to help reduce the day-to-day tensions, and to help promote social and economic progress within each individual country as a necessity of maintaining internal political stability. It must be emphasised, however, that international co-operation and social and economic progress could never be achieved in the true sense without being based upon the principle of human and social justice. It thus becomes clear that, while peace is everybody’s preoccupation, it would appear more meaningful if, particularly from the I.L.O.’s point of view, stress could be placed on basic human rights in the social and labour fields regardless of the situation on the political fronts. The I.L.O. is an organisation with principles of promoting peace, freedom and social justice, and it should therefore be prepared to win peace in compliance with such principles as are absolutely necessary for the dignity and decent living standards of the common people, and should refrain from begging peace to suit temporarily realistic and opportunistic considerations of a political nature.

With regard to the I.L.O.’s second commitment to freedom, the attention of my fellow workers has been focused with great concern on freedom of labour, in view of the plight of forced labour still prevailing in many parts of the world, especially in the so-called socialist countries, including the mainland of my own country. The untold sufferings of millions of working people toiling under the communist totalitarian régimes see no sign of relief so long as these régimes continue to exist. It is therefore my fervent hope that, aside from inviting the wider acceptance of the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention adopted at the 40th Session of the Conference in 1957, and other instruments leading to freedom of labour and association by more member States of this Organisation, more practical means and effective devices will be developed to eradicate this evil system and similar practices wherever they still exist in Asia, Africa, Europe or America, if the I.L.O. is determined to meet its solemn obligations to preserve labour freedom. Needless for me to stress how anxiously working people, affected directly or indirectly by this labour slavery practice, look to the I.L.O. for its helping hands.

When discussing the I.L.O.’s other basic characteristics, I might, with your permission, add one more commitment which should have equality, and in fact has, conditioned the Organisation’s approach to world and labour problems, although it is not singled out in the Report—that is “equality”. The I.L.O.’s commitment to equality is clearly indicated in its Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia which points out that “poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere”. It is also the dominant spirit of a great number of Conventions and Recommendations destined to eliminate inequality among all human beings. I would therefore like to suggest to the Director-General that this third commitment be added as another I.L.O. banner for the general direction of future activities.

It is in the same context that I would like to state, in connection with the action priorities proposed by the Director-General, that the distribution of incomes and its relation to general economic and social objectives should receive first priority in the I.L.O.’s future activities. Of course, the contents of this subject are by no means confined to an equal distribution of wealth in the strictest sense of the term. It is none the less important that a better and fairer distribution of the fruits of labour should have its leading place in the work of this Organisation. I need not emphasise that a better distribution of incomes from industrial development would also have direct effect on improving skills and productivity, and on helping to promote fuller utilisation of the labour force for economic development.

In the Report the growth of trade unions and labour relations in developing countries has been graded as the third priority for future activities. It is in our opinion by no means an appropriate consideration. While we fully appreciate that the I.L.O. attaches great importance to the participation of trade unions in economic and social development, we must point out that independence of trade union organisations must be preserved without being subject to any outside interference such as tripartite supervision of I.L.O. assistance to trade unions suggested in the Report. Assistance to help build up sound organisations and for leadership training, where necessary, could be obtained only from the international free
trade union movement. In the interests of economic development and national security in present circumstances of national crisis, the trade union organisations in my country sincerely seek for harmonious industrial and public relations, whereas every precaution is taken to prevent interference of any sort from outside that may jeopardise the independence of the free trade union movement. Seminars for trade union training are conducted by the Chinese Federation of Labour from time to time with the assistance of the I.C.F.T.U. Courses for trade union leadership training are also organised on a rotation basis in various countries of the region.

I now come back to the question of manpower utilisation, which no doubt the I.L.O. will continue to push forward in the years to come. The Director-General refers in his Report to various methods which have been used for compulsory mobilisation of labour, and suggests that I.L.O. research should be intensified and supplemented by experimental operational projects. Despite the Director-General’s understanding of the different circumstances responsible for the situation in certain regions, I hope that his offer for future action will not lead to a deviation from the established principles of suppressing forced labour and similar practices. The Director-General’s advice that the I.L.O. should not confine itself to a purely negative stand is also disquieting. From our point of view, in no case should the door be left half-open for compulsory labour so long as the I.L.O. is dedicated to freedom of labour as a basic element of human rights.

Proposals contained in Chapters V and VI regarding respectively the status and conditions of the worker and automation and technological change are generally to be welcomed. The importance of the unique tripartite nature of the Organisation cannot be over-emphasised, but in order to strengthen this relation it is imperative that the Director-General and the Governing Body’s programme and structure of the I.L.O. are consciously designed to work in rural and other programmes of social and economic importance. The experience we have so gained on agricultural techniques is already being shared by an increasing number of developing free nations under various bilateral agreements. It is our sincere wish that more countries will triumph under similar principles inspired by the I.L.O. rural programme on which the Director-General has also laid emphasis in its future activities.

Mr. NUNEZ (Employers’ delegate, Trinidad and Tobago)—I am indeed very pleased to have the privilege and honour of participating in the deliberations of this Conference, firstly, because it is the first at which my country is attending as an independent member State and, secondly, because this 47th Session will quite obviously be a milestone in the history of the International Labour Conference. The United Nations have referred to the 1960s as the “Development Decade” but it would be just as appropriate to regard this period as the age of liberation of colonial peoples into independent nationhood.

I venture to offer that it is the pressure of the emergence of new nations and their impact on world affairs which have caused the Director-General to review in his Report the structure and programme of the I.L.O. and to seek guidance from this Conference on its directions and priorities. This Report has faced up to the realities of the world situation and will certainly be regarded as one of the historical documents of this Organisation.

We would be failing in our duty if we did not give expression to our views, from which the Director-General and the Governing Body could formulate a firm policy for the future. The employers of Trinidad and Tobago, on whose behalf I am now addressing you, are in general agreement with the views expressed by the Director-General and in particular with the emphasis he has placed on technical assistance and the development of human resources. No lasting progress can be made in the developing countries unless labour and social policies are consciously designed to achieve economic growth. It is not, therefore, sufficient for the I.L.O. to establish minimum social and labour standards without due regard to the means by which these standards can be achieved and maintained.

In this connexion, it seems ironical that an examination of the chart of ratifications of
Conventions shows that a substantial number of the developed high-income territories have ratified relatively few Conventions which they were jointly responsible for adopting at these Conferences.

You will forgive me if I say that this situation has given rise to grave doubts in my mind about the solicitude which is constantly expressed for the welfare of the peoples in developing countries. At every discussion one hears the economically advanced countries advocating the adoption of Conventions and Recommendations for the improvement of the status and well-being of workers in developing countries and we are led to believe that this is being done on the humanitarian ground of ensuring international social justice. We should conclude, therefore, that the social justice being advocated is exercised in the advanced countries. The record of ratifications of Conventions, however, belies this conclusion. In fact, I think it is fair to say that the record of the developing low-income countries far surpasses that of the economically advanced member States.

Now, having regard to the fact that in almost every case the implementation of Conventions and Recommendations places an economic burden either directly or indirectly on the resources of a country, does not the situation which I have just described tend to keep the low-income countries in economic subjugation? Quite recently we in Trinidad and Tobago were considering legislation for implementing the Maternity Protection Convention (Revised), 1952, and apart from other considerations we were shocked to discover that only seven member States had ratified this Convention and we were in no position to determine the extent to which it had been implemented in other countries.

What I have said leads me to put forward two suggestions for your earnest consideration. Firstly, in reviewing the structure of the I.L.O. and its principal standard-setting function, we should seek to provide a greater obligation for ratification of Conventions on governments who advocate them and who vote for their adoption. We should also examine in the proposed review of existing Conventions whether their texts were not too inflexible for universal application.

Secondly, we should examine more positively the economic consequences of our decisions on social and labour policies and take steps to adopt Conventions and Recommendations designed to facilitate a more rapid advancement in the economic circumstances of low-income countries by, for example, requiring the economically advanced States to give priority to the production from low-income territories in the world markets and adopting more liberal immigration policies without discrimination on grounds of race, colour, religion or nationality.

I am sure that the proposals I have just put forward will find support among the majority of delegates gathered in this Conference and will tend to establish more universal social justice on which lasting peace must be based.

Interpretation from French : Mr. PAOLINI (Representative of the International Confederation of Senior Officials)—On behalf of the International Confederation of Senior Officials may I first thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to speak from this rostrum, where the discussion is taking place at the highest level.

The international organisations taking part in the discussion on the Director-General's Report may do constructive work in one of two ways: either by stating very briefly their views on the various points covered in the Report or by speaking on only one point of particular concern to them. The International Confederation of Senior Officials would like today to try to reconcile these two methods, because the Report relates to so many problems of very wide scope and we have studiously avoided expressing so much interest that we wish to express some of the many thoughts which it has inspired.

First, as regards the attitude adopted with respect to political ideologies, we acclaim any action leading to the right balance in conciliation. Co-operation in this respect is important to world understanding and to peace. Men differ from each other, and it is normal that they should have different views on life. The important thing is for each to accept and respect the convictions of others, provided they do not violate human rights and that they safeguard the human personality.

With regard to aid to the developing countries, we think one should first alleviate the deep distress of the less privileged peoples. Once that has been done, aid should no longer consist of consumer goods—a system too often used and which leads only to slower development and to much abuse. It should consist of the means of production. To persist in any other course would be to impoverish the developing countries without any long-term advantage to the other countries.

One must take note of a fact which is now becoming apparent, namely that productive capacity is the only natural limit to the satisfaction of human needs. One must therefore develop this capacity to the maximum. All other obstacles to universal progress and welfare are artificial, and are the consequences of particular régimes, theories, systems or interests.

Assistance to the developing countries should be both an expression of solidarity and an attempt at economic rationalisation on a world scale. It is by improving a country's infrastructure and equipment and by providing education for all that we will be able to promote the normal development of means of production in these countries without making the economic mistakes too frequently committed, which aggravate problems rather than solve them.

I should like to say a word about the possibility of changing one's employment, to which the Report refers. This possibility is one of the most important gains secured by the workers, and the I.L.O. must ensure that it is available to all sectors of the economy, including those where this freedom has not thus far been available.

The primacy of social objectives is a fortunate formula, because it may provide a solution in the conflict between those who claim that the economic situation must condition social development and those who place social considerations first. In our view, economic and political administration must be considered
in the light of social effects. These effects must constitute an objective without being either a tyrant or a mere consequence.

As regards the work of the International Labour Conference, we are glad that its scope is widening; even if this situation creates problems only to be solved, as suggested by the Director-General, through a strengthening of the delegations. However, that strengthening should be accompanied by greater decentralisation. We do not share the fear expressed concerning the increasing size of Conference committees. These committees are composed of specialists, with a mandate from their group. We can see only advantages in the development of the Conference committees, and we hope that the I.L.O. will call increasingly upon international non-governmental organisations. This procedure would make it possible to safeguard the sovereignty of the Conference.

I should like now to refer to two points of particular interest to us. The first is freedom of association. On various occasions we have drawn attention to practices which occur in a number of countries where trade unionism is highly developed. These practices, while respecting the letter of international labour Conventions and national provisions, aim at installing progressively compulsory trade unionism for the benefit of particular organisations. Whether by adopting rules which in fact create a monopoly or by reserving advantages to members of particular organisations, these practices are based on the very denial of free trade unionism. By the force of circumstances workers’ organisations have acquired certain tendencies or are the product of such tendencies. Ideological plurality and equity demand that all these tendencies should be expressed or developed, without obstructing opposing tendencies.

My last point relates to public servants. It is still an open question whether the I.L.O. Conventions and Recommendations do or do not apply to public servants. The International Confederation of Senior Officials considers that all I.L.O. provisions should apply to public servants except those which obviously do not concern them. They are workers who have the same right as other workers to I.L.O. protection.

A profound evolution has occurred during the past few years in the composition, importance and operation of the public services. For the most part they are no longer merely executive organs. I refer here to all para-state organisations of a social or an economic character. Moreover, the public services are acquiring increasing importance in the national life as the work of the State increases. In the socially advanced countries public officials represent nearly one-sixth of all the workers. This situation means that they must receive more attention in the work of the I.L.O. in future. The present instruments are inadequate, because they are conceived for workers in the private sector, while government delegations generally act only as arbiters.

In the public services the government is itself the employer and that gives rise to problems of relationship along a completely different principle. That is why, in our view, the workers’ organisations in the public services are not being developed everywhere.

As a result of their role as subordinates they are in a delicate position vis-à-vis the government, which is their employer, when international discussions take place.

That is why we suggest, in the first place, the establishment of a joint committee composed of Government representatives selected by their group and representatives of international organisations of public officials. Only representation on this basis can make it possible effectively to defend the rights of a category of workers who are always in the minority in intergovernmental organisations.

We think that by taking such action as part of the reform of its structure, which we welcome, the I.L.O. would make a new and most important contribution to improving the lot of all workers and to improving industrial relations throughout the world.

*Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. GONZÁLEZ CUBERO (Workers’ delegate, Costa Rica)*

—I am extremely glad and honoured to be able to speak for the first time in this Conference.

I had not had the intention of speaking at this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference but, considering that my country has not been represented by a tripartite delegation in the last five years I thought I ought to speak here in the name of the democratic working class of Costa Rica, although my speech will only be short.

I should like to refer particularly to Chapter IV of the Report. The views expressed by the Director-General in that chapter, which relates to trade unions and labour relations, are such as to satisfy the working class of my country; they encourage us trade union leaders to continue our struggle in the defence of the interests of the working class.

I should like to say also that the workers of Costa Rica are most satisfied with the efforts being made by the I.L.O. through the International Institute of Labour Studies. We are convinced that by means of this Institute the relations between the two sectors, employers and workers, will be improved and will thus fulfil the hopes of which you will be aware. A great deal can be done and a great deal of progress made towards understanding by means of education of this kind.

I would like also to say how much confidence the democratic trade union movement has—namely the national sectors affiliated to O.R.T. at the inter-American level and I.C.F.T.U. at the international level—in all the I.L.O. programmes and we believe that with their aid we shall reach in the near if not the immediate future real social justice throughout the world.

The Director-General in Chapter IV also speaks of freedom of association. At least in my own country we are now struggling for trade union protective legislation and the Bill on the subject is now before our legislature. Although there is an instrument recommended by the I.L.O., Convention No. 87, we Costa Rican workers believe that it is necessary for the I.L.O. to arrange that at a Conference in the near future a study should be made of the advantages of a further Convention concerning...
freedom of association in a country's constitu­tion if it is not respected. Some governments do respect trade union movements but if there
is no instrument preventing employers with
the mentality of the last century from taking
arbitrary action, then success will not be
achieved. We think this instrument should be
adopted, thus protecting persons who are
elected by the working class to defend their
rights. If there is no such instrument then
really trade union freedom—the freedom of
association mentioned in our countries' con­stitutions—will in fact be a dead letter. So I
would like to urge from this platform that at
one of the coming Conferences this matter be
examined, and that this should happen at the
next Conference or in the near future.

Thank you very much for listening to me; I
did not want to deal too much with the
feelings of the democratic Costa Rican workers affiliated to
O.E.I.T. and I.C.F.T.U.

Interpretation from French: Mr. DAM-Sy­Hien (Workers' delegate, Viet-Nam)—First of
all, I wish to thank the Director-General for
his excellent Report, which gives a very
complete over-all picture of the programme
and structure of the I.L.O. The document contains
useful information on past achievements and the
present situation, and also suggestions for
future I.L.O. action in the near future in order
to attain the results we all expect.

As regards the first part of the Report, we
would have liked it to place greater stress on
the problems of the rural population and to
cover a broader range of programmes capable of
promoting and hastening rural development.
If we take the Asian countries as an example
rural workers constitute 70 to 80 per cent. of
the population and, with a few outstanding
exceptions in highly industrialised countries
such as Japan and Australia, they are still
living in misery and poverty. The life of this
sub-proletariat is made more miserable by the
fluctuations and uncertainties in the price of
basic commodities produced in the area, such
as rice, rubber, coffee and tea.

It is of the highest urgency that the I.L.O.
should take measures jointly with the United
Nations specialised agencies in order to achieve
rapidly a certain stabilisation in the market
for basic commodities. The I.L.O. should place
more stress on an over-all policy for expanding
development. Efforts to increase economic
prosperity and social well-being should go hand in hand, otherwise the gap between the income
of privileged employees in industrial and admi­nistrative sectors in the urban sectors, on the
one hand, and agricultural workers on the other
will grow wider. I.L.O. action will certainly
be useful and effective in helping to put an
end to this state of affairs, which is due more
to a defective system of co-operation between
capital and labour than to so-called economic
laws.

I am firmly convinced that the I.L.O. can
help enormously and play a beneficial and
necessary role in developing income distribu­tion policies in developing countries by provid­ing technical assistance to governments for
making policy decisions. Nor should it confine
itself to providing information. If the I.L.O.
succeeds in determining the best means of
enabling employers' and workers' organisations
to participate effectively in the formulation and implementation of plans, this will be an
excellent result. "Their collaboration will be
required if these policies are to be carried out
effectively; and it is only right that those
whose opportunities and whose incomes will be
affected by planning should have an effective
voice in the decisions made."

We also expect the I.L.O. to find effective
methods of "democratising planning" and
"associating workers' organisations and indus­try
more closely with the drawing up and
carrying out of economic policies".

As regards the trade unions and labour rela­tions, we believe, with the Director-General,
that it would be desirable for the I.L.O. to stress
the training aspect, it being understood that
the I.L.O. would not replace unions in this work
but would help them to carry it out. It is, of
course, for the unions themselves to find and to
train, both through the trade union activities
proper, with all that this entails, and also
through educational work by responsible union
leaders conscious of their social and economic
mission.

The I.L.O. can also help the developing coun­tries which are largely dependent on agriculture to organise and to operate a system of agricul­tural trade unionism with its own characteris­tics properly adapted to the economic and social
conditions in the uncommitted world. The
I.L.O. can also throw light on the dangers of
over-hasty or spectacular industrialisation at
the expense of sound over-all policy and, in
doing this, it will no doubt contribute to a con­ siderable extent in improving the working and
living conditions of the entire population.

As regards the second part of the Report, I
have only a few suggestions to put forward.
So far as the Governing Body is concerned,
what in my view is essential is a rational re­presentation of all the continents in the Gov­erning Body. Apart from the seats allocated,
under the Constitution of the I.L.O., to the
governments of the States of chief industrial
importance, there is no other guarantee in this
respect beyond the good sense of the electoral
colleges. Certainly no ready-made distribu­tion formula should be imposed on them, but
perhaps the I.L.O. could contemplate making
certain recommendations in this regard with a
view to ensuring a balanced representation of the
continents.

As regards the periodicity of the Conference,
I think some decongestion could be achieved by
prolonging the Conference by two weeks but
holding it only every two years. This measure
would save money, which could be devoted to
regional activities. On the other hand, regional
conferences might usefully be held at closer
intervals, for example, every three years. This
would enable the I.L.O. to assist the various
regions even more effectively than is the case
now. We think that the developing countries
are faced with a rapidly changing economic and
social situation. Thanks to more frequent
regional conferences, the I.L.O. could help
these countries to solve their economic and
social problems in a more timely fashion.
Moreover, this would contribute to decongesting the annual general Conference.

So far as the various technical bodies set up within the I.L.O. are concerned, we consider that in these bodies the principle of tripartism should be strengthened and that they should include in increasing numbers not only experts and delegates of employers but also delegates of workers. Thus the trade unions could help to make the work of such bodies more comprehensive. It should be stated, without exaggeration, that industrial and technical problems, whatever they may be, have economic and social implications for the world of labour.

Finally, as regards the position of the I.L.O. in the United Nations family, we all agree with the Director-General that the I.L.O. should be asked to take bold initiatives in the fields within its competence and that it should not fall behind others. While, as the Director-General says on page 198, "international organisation is still in its earliest childhood", the I.L.O. should not back-track at this stage when it is nearly half a century old. The conquest of tripartism, which dates from 1919, should not be lost in the I.L.O. now that that principle is gaining increasing recognition on the national level. The I.L.O., as the oldest of the United Nations specialised agencies, should show increasing vigour and vitality on the international as well as the regional level.

Mr. PLANT (Representative of the Public Services International)—The Report of the Director-General is a document of fascinating interest, and the events of the last week do not detract from this interest. It makes instructive reading for every one of us. Statesmen responsible for economic and social policy in developed and underdeveloped countries alike would be well advised to take time off for reading it twice.

As a trade unionist concerned with workers in the employ of public authorities, I note with emphatic approval the suggestion that in respect of certain rights that affect the relationship between employer and employed "every effort should be made to bring about a world-embracing network of legally binding obligations".

The human rights Conventions may not be perfect, but they are of basic importance for the whole and are guides to urgent action necessary in large areas of the world. In respect of one of these Conventions, the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), we public servants have a grievance. We resent its Article 6, which reads: "This Convention does not deal with the position of public servants engaged in the administration of the State, nor shall it be construed as prejudicing their rights or status in any way."

To those of us who by their own might have obtained the right to organise and bargain with their employers the Convention says in effect "What you have you hold", but it withholds its support from those public servants who are still being denied the rights which this Convention bestows upon all workers in private employment.

We public servants feel that this is an unwarranted discrimination and that it is particularly distasteful because it is directed against the weakest in our ranks. We therefore venture to ask the Director-General and his staff to help us secure the adoption, be it by the International Labour Conference, or be it by another appropriate I.L.O. assembly, of a resolution urging public authorities to apply the Convention mutatis mutandis to all public servants.

In support of our appeal for help we have arguments other than a grievance. The chapter in the Director-General's Report on trade unions and labour relations testifies to insight into social reality and there is nothing but wisdom in the hints and advice given to employers and to government officials entrusted with helping to maintain peace in industry. To our regret, however, in this Report, as in many other major documents of the I.L.O. devoted to industrial relations, the public service is left out. It is just as if the State and the municipalities did not rank as employers, and civil servants and public employees are not workers. This is a rather surprising gap in a document in which it is emphasised that "a basic condition for any effective social policy is the strengthening of public administration and of the other civil institutions of the State, such as the legal system and the judiciary".

The functioning of the State, including the judiciary, can be gravely disturbed—and in recent years has been so disturbed in a number of countries—by disputes between the employing authorities and their staff over rates of pay and other aspects of conditions of employment. Precisely the strengthening of public administration and other civil institutions of the State makes imperative what the Director-General describes "a realistic effort... to devise machinery which enables this conflict to be brought into the open and settled in a lawful manner, and also to arrive at a suitable basis for co-operation between separate interests."

An appeal to make such an effort should be addressed to the governments of all countries, since the settling of disputes in the public service by unilateral acts of omnipotent authorities instead of by "machinery" and "co-operation" is by no means a feature belonging especially or exclusively to underdeveloped countries.

In respect of these countries, the Director-General states the hope that—and we hope the Conference will decide to help—employers' and workers' organisations in establishing sound industrial relations. The Director-General appears particularly intent on direct assistance to trade unions whose officers are in need of training for leadership. The Public Services International is very much engaged in giving technical and educational assistance to trade unions in developing countries. The experience garnered by our representatives in Africa is that, whilst the need for education and training in matters of industrial relations is very great on the trade union side, it is often still greater on the employers' side, so much so that one P.S.I. representative suggested organising a course for employers at the African
Labour College of the I.C.E.T.U. in Kampala. If such is the condition in the public service, the state of affairs in the private sector is likely to be poorer still. Therefore we can only encourage the Director-General to forge ahead with plans for educational help and to offer this help also to employers, including officials who exercise the function of employer in the public service.

The Public Services International wishes also to put in a claim relating to the structure of the I.L.O. Before the war, there were no Industrial Committees but there existed a consultative committee for public servants which met seven times in 12 years, namely 1928, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1936 and 1939. After the war a committee for salaried employees and professional workers in private and public employment was set up as one of the Industrial Committees, but this Committee can discuss only those public employees’ affairs that are identical with those of private employees. At its Fourth Session (1957) the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers realised that this situation had become untenable and it asked the Governing Body to make arrangements for a full discussion on problems concerning public servants. Although this application was rather modest, the Governing Body needed five years to respond in a modest way. In November 1963 15 experts drawn from all areas of the world are to meet and to discuss the relations between public administrations and their personnel and the conditions of employment of temporary staff in the public service.

We are grateful for the decision to convene this one meeting but we should be more grateful still if we could have from time to time, at intervals of, say, three to five years, a conference at which we met face to face with our employers and at which we could argue with our employers and hammer out with them a set of agreed principles to be recommended to all public employers and to all public employees’ organisations. Although the civil service and the public administrations not belonging to the industrial sector represent a large branch of employment, they are left out of the chapter on Industrial Committees and problems. On behalf of 2½ million civil servants and public employees who are free to organise and who belong to the P.S.I., and on behalf of millions more who would be our members if they were free or if their freedom were not curtailed, I must plead that the Governing Body with a view to bringing about the question of the I.L.O.’s role in land reform at a forthcoming session of the International Labour Conference.

Mr. KOCANI (Workers’ delegate, China)—I wish to express my deep appreciation of the Director-General’s Report to this session. In reading the Report I noted particularly in subsection (5) headed “The Structure of Economic Power” of the section entitled “Making Social Policy” that the I.L.O. has in recent years given greater attention to problems of rural development, and that the question of land reform must be brought by the Governing Body with a view to bringing up the question of the I.L.O.’s role in land reform at a forthcoming session of the International Labour Conference.

Being interested in the question of land reform, I would like to endeavour to explain to the Conference some of the experiences of my country in land reform over a period of more than ten years, which has had unprecedented success. Land reform was started in Taiwan Province in 1951, when the Government began to sell public farmland to tenants. In 1953 the privately owned surplus farmland was transferred to tenant farmers. Each landlord was allowed to keep 7.4 acres of paddy field.
Holdings in excess of that limit had to be sold to the Government for resale to tenant farmers. Landlords received 70 per cent. of the price in land bonds and 30 per cent. in stocks in government industrial enterprises, which later became privately owned. Land bonds were redeemable in rice or in cash in ten annual instalments. The tenant purchasers paid the Government in a corresponding number of years. The land reform programme has benefited 500,000 farm families. Today 85 per cent. of our farmers are owners of the land they till. In a planted area of 830,000 hectares Taiwan farmers harvested more than 2 million metric tons of rice in 1961.

Last April, the Food and Agriculture Organisation published a booklet discussing the world food situation. In this publication Taiwan and Japan were singled out as areas where people “are relatively much better fed than in other countries in the Far East region.”

The beneficial results of land reform in Taiwan are quite obvious. Agricultural production has increased; the livelihood of the farmers has been improved; and social stability and economic progress are enjoyed by the people.

We do not only try to improve agriculture at home. We also give technical assistance in farming to a number of foreign countries. For instance, the co-operation between Africa and China in agricultural development is worth mentioning. In 1961, at the request of the Liberian Government, a team of seven Chinese specialists was sent . . .

The President (Mr. Robinson)—Mr. Sobrado Cid, Workers’ adviser, Cuba, has the floor on a point of order.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. SOBRADO CID (Workers’ adviser, Cuba)—I have seen in the list of speakers for this afternoon the name of a delegate who claims to represent China. My confusion at this is such that I would explain that I am the only Chinese which the Cuban Workers’ delegation recognises is the People’s Republic of China, the China of 650 million men and women. I really do not understand how it is possible for someone to come here to speak in the name of China who cannot represent it, since he is not in China and does not represent the will of the heroic inhabitants of the People’s Republic of China.

The President (Mr. Robinson)—The delegate has made his point of order. The Chinese delegate is here, duly accredited, from his country. The Credentials Committee decided that it could not accept the objections to the nomination of the Chinese delegation, and the delegate is entitled to speak.

I ask Mr. Chang to continue.

Mr. CHANG (Employers’ delegate, China)—In 1961, at the request of the Liberian Government, a team of seven Chinese specialists was sent to Liberia to survey the agricultural conditions. A few months later, 14 more experienced farmers were sent to Liberia to set up a demonstration farm there. By July 1962 most of the Taiwan rice varieties were ready for harvest and the yield averaged as high as 3 to 5 tons per hectare. In 1963 emphasis is being placed on proving that two crops of rice per year can be grown in Liberia.

In mid-December 1961 the United Kingdom of Libya also asked the Republic of China to send an agricultural investigation mission. Six experienced young farmers and two agricultural experts arrived in Libya in February 1962. Seeding started in April, and in mid-August the Taiwan upland rice variety yielded a bumper crop of 4 metric tons per hectare.

In addition, China has been helping to train Africans in farming during the last few years. In the first seminar held in April 1962, 25 African agricultural technicians came to Taiwan for advanced training. Those trainees, coming from 11 countries, have studied rice cultivation and seen how the land reform programme in Taiwan has brought about a socio-economic revolution by peaceful means.

At present, 49 trainees from 19 African countries are attending the second seminar, which runs from February to August 1963. The third seminar will be conducted in September this year so that more African technicians may obtain advanced training.

The above-mentioned training projects have been implemented along the lines of the I.L.O.’s principles and objectives.

As regards Taiwan’s economy, it was basically agricultural before the Second World War. However, its future economic well-being cannot depend on agriculture alone; it must also depend on industry.

Thus, the launching of the first Four-Year Economic Development Plan in 1953 put a great stress on industrial development. By 1956 significant progress had been made, and expansion was carried out in various industries. In the second Four-Year Plan, from 1957 to 1961, several important guiding principles were observed in the industrial sector. Due consideration was given to the development of both labour-intensive and capital-intensive industries. Emphasis was placed on closer co-ordination between industry and agriculture and between labourers and employers.

The third Four-Year Plan, which was launched in 1961, is essentially a continuation of the first and second Four-Year Economic Plans. The expansion of industry and the development of agriculture in Taiwan has not only strengthened the national economy but also created more opportunities for employment.

In Taiwan, fortunately, unemployment is not much of a problem despite its growing population and the need to resettle thousands of retired servicemen and refugees every year.

As regards the retired servicemen, the Vocational Assistance Commission for Retired Servicemen was established in 1954 for the purpose of placing combat-ineffectives eliminated from the military services in appropriate employment and environment. The Commission’s rehabilitation programme consists of vocational training, placement, medical care, home care and schooling.

To date, 123,000 retired servicemen have been adequately settled through the implementation of the aforementioned projects. Of the resettled, 77 per cent. were placed in jobs
and 23 per cent. in other suitable ways. Many of the resettled ex-servicemen have set up their own homes after they have found employment. As for the refugees, the Free China Relief Association has been taking charge of the Chinese refugee-escapees who have fled from communism for freedom. It will be recalled that in the summer of 1962 many Chinese on the mainland started to escape en masse, as they could not stand communist oppression any more. However, the Red chiefs despatched their troops to round up these escapees, and the Hong Kong Government utilised every possible means to stop their influx into the colony. But even so around 120,000 refugees managed to get into Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan. The Free China Relief Association is responsible for the resettlement of the refugees in Taiwan. All the refugees have been given aid in cash, clothing, food and housing. Most of them have now been placed in jobs and schools; the sick and disabled persons are given medical care. In conclusion, I wish simply to say that my country has been devoting great efforts to secure economic development and social improvement, promote good labour-management relations and to create employment opportunities. In the making of the social policy in all these fields the employers of the Republic of China are trying their best to conform to the guiding principles upheld by the I.L.O.

Interpretation from French : Mr. PFUND (Representative of the Council of Commerce Employers)—The leaders of the International Council of Commerce Employers have studied with great interest the Report of the Director-General, Mr. David Morse, to the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference. I should like to make a few remarks inspired by the Report. First, at the risk of being reproached for repeating what has already been said at this rostrum, I feel I must congratulate the Director-General of the I.L.O., who has set out the future programme of work of the I.L.O. with competence and clarity and with remarkable lucidity. It was not easy to summarise in 200 pages problems so vast in scope, so complex and so delicate as those relating to the raising of the standard of living of the peoples whose national economies are in process of development or hardly born. I must confess that after reading the first part of the Report one's mind reels before the mass of questions calling for a reply in a reasonable time if we wish to save from hunger and poverty that half of the human race whose right to life is equal to that of men and women in the economically developed nations of the world. We think therefore that the good-will of all is needed to accomplish this task. However, we feel some uneasiness when we see how many international bodies all demand —and this is praiseworthy in itself—to provide what is today called technical assistance. We have the impression that because of this multitude of private bodies, money, means and men are being wasted. There is no proof that this is the best method, and we wonder whether the necessary aid could not be given to the developing countries through the conclusion of agreements between employers' and workers' organisations in those countries and their sister organisations in the industrialised countries. Our organisations have incontestable experience and should be willing, in so far as possible, to place at the disposal of young organisations in the new countries the men and the means available to them to help those organisations to accomplish in ten or 20 years what they themselves have taken several generations to accomplish.

I would make a second remark, namely that the speed with which all these economic and social problems must be solved calls for practical and concrete achievements without delay. These achievements will be possible only with the co-operation of persons with experience, economists, financial experts, leaders of undertakings and employers' and workers' organisations. Our experience of daily life in commercial undertakings makes us conscious of the need for orderly and carefully considered action. However, we must also guard against too many preliminary studies, too many learned inquiries which lead to framing programmes or plans which are often impracticable, because the economic and social situation has continued to develop while the programme experts were working in a room. We express the hope that the I.L.O. will rely more on international organisations of employers and workers whose co-operation can be extremely useful to it in its attempt to carry out the enormous task before it.

On the other hand, we are not convinced that the question of distribution of income can usefully be studied by the I.L.O. in so far as the industrialised countries are concerned. If studies on existing systems in this field in these countries can usefully be made in order to help other Members of the I.L.O. better to appreciate the very delicate elements of the problem, there is little point in establishing general standards for the industrialised countries. These countries have their own traditions, their own methods and a long-standing practice of collective bargaining. That is why it seems to us dangerous to go beyond the information stage, and we have noted with satisfaction that this does not appear to be contemplated for some years.

With regard to the structure of the I.L.O. we have only one desire to express. In our statement last year we emphasised that one of the social characteristics of commercial undertakings was that their manpower was composed mainly of salaried employees. In other words, the social problems in the commercial sector are not always the same as those of industry or agriculture. That is why, if the I.L.O. is to concern itself with this category of workers, we wish to be directly associated with this work and to find beside us on the workers' side the trade unionists who know these questions very well. No one will deny that the I.L.O. must adapt its structure to the new tasks before it. We hope that this adjustment will be of the greatest benefit to those millions of human beings who have placed their hope in the work of this international organisation.

Mr. THONDAMAN (Workers' delegate, Ceylon)—A penetrating analysis of the I.L.O.,
and its activities, in evaluating progress made in the fulfilment of its basic principles, and a reorientation of outlook and techniques to meet changing world conditions, has been a long-felt need. The Director-General's Report provides an admissible basis for a fruitful discussion of the challenges confronting the I.L.O. and the formulation of effective methods of action for a realisation of its objectives. It is of supreme importance that any programme or activity which the I.L.O. may embark upon should be clearly consistent with the fundamental principles and objectives for which it stands. The complexity of problems and the diversity of social systems to be contended with in a rapidly changing world can in no way justify a departure from or compromise on the basic standards which the I.L.O. is pledged to follow.

The Director-General's view that the Organisation can achieve the realisation of its objectives in a climate of peace and stability in the world and that the Organisation has a distinct role and a particular place to play in ensuring that the essence of world tensions is beyond dispute. While agreeing with the proposition that world peace is an important factor contributing in no small measure to the ultimate success of the I.L.O. in the implementation of our international social policy, it would be necessary to safeguard against the tendency to overlook the transgression of basic norms by member States labouring under the erroneous belief that it would promote the cause of unity within the Organisation.

On the contrary, a tacit acquiescence in such a state of affairs—far from promoting unity—would seriously impair the efficiency of the Organisation. A glaring example is the recent event when the work of this very Conference also came to a standstill. Even now the Conference is proceeding without the active participation of all its delegates. At the time when the countries which these delegates come from became members of I.L.O., South Africa with its racial policy was also a Member of this Organisation. Then how does one account for the present situation? Whose responsibility was it to take further positive steps necessary to give effect to the resolution adopted in 1961, particularly when the South African Government treated it with utter contempt? Why should one think that this is a matter in which the initiative should emanate always from the African countries? How can the Governing Body and other I.L.O. organs explain their inaction? Some possible measures that could be pursued to give effect to the 1961 resolution were indicated by the Secretary-General in the course of his speech the other day. Why were these measures not pursued by the I.L.O. on its own initiative? Declarations and resolutions mean nothing unless they are given practical effect. In this instance South Africa is seeking the protection of our own Constitution to continue its racial and inhuman policy with no visible attempt on the part of the I.L.O. to meet the situation. In no circumstances can the I.L.O. compromise with the inalienable rights of the peoples who are victims of racial policies striking at the very roots of the Organisation.

The Director-General has quite rightly given prominence to three basic principles on which the I.L.O. is founded, namely freedom of association, freedom of labour and primacy of social objectives. His statement that freedom of association has a validity going beyond particular forms of social or economic organisations is commendable and deserves acclamation. It puts in correct perspective the validity attaching to the cardinal principles to which the I.L.O. is wedded. The freedom of labour referred to by the Director-General assures to the worker full equality of opportunity in economic and social life. The Director-General observes that even the three basic principles of the I.L.O. are not universally accepted and acted upon today. It is paradoxical that the I.L.O. should be actively engaged in ambitious projects for the promotion of highly progressive labour and social policies whereas the necessary machinery for ensuring that the basic principles of the Organisation are not violated is lacking.

As the Director-General observes, the social needs of the developing countries are far removed from the needs of the advanced countries. Political instability, weak economy, overpopulation, racial, religious and linguistic differences among different sections of the population are some of the factors contributing to the stagnation and backwardness of the emergent countries. Emergence from dependence on foreign domination has brought in its wake a whole host of problems which are taxing to the full the limited resources of underdeveloped countries of the world. The inability of national leaders to achieve the economic emancipation of their peoples owing to factors beyond their control, such as a rapid growth of population and insufficient capital formation for development purposes, have led them, in an attempt to acquire and/or retain political power, to unleash disruptive and dividing forces in the country.

These tactics of political leaders have had the effect of destroying national unity and public order. The lack of political and economic stability in these countries has contributed to a situation wherein the ruling parties have utilised the machinery of State in such a way as to discriminate against certain sections of the population for sheer political expediency, resulting in the denial of basic human rights.

It would not suffice for the I.L.O. to be content with addressing pious appeals to these member States exhorting them to conform to I.L.O. standards. Freedom of association, which guarantees the right of a worker to choose the employment of his choice, would ring hollow and remain an empty phrase devoid of significance to a considerable majority of the peoples in the underdeveloped countries who are unemployed. Freedom of labour, which is yet another of the primary principles of the I.L.O., is subject to considerable strain in some of the underdeveloped countries. The crying need of the emergent countries of the world is positive action on the part of the I.L.O. to ensure that the basic standards of the Organisation are observed and honoured, without which the whole very purpose of the I.L.O. would be defeated.

While appreciating the need for training and education activities, it is difficult to support the
suggestion of the Director-General that the policy lietherto followed of supporting the work of the trade unions in this field be changed to enable the I.L.O. to undertake trade union training independently of the trade unions. It must be emphasised that it is the sole prerogative of the trade unions, and the authority of the trade unions in this respect should not be interfered with, even less by an intergovernmental organisation which must necessarily operate under the auspices of the government.

As to international standards and their observance, it is extremely desirable that machinery should be set up for on-the-spot investigations to enable the Organisation to obtain a first-hand account of the conditions that militate against ratification of standards, thereby obviating the necessity of relying solely on observations submitted by member States.

As regards technical assistance, it would be a salutary practice if all such assistance is related to the observance of I.L.O. principles and standards to create an awareness of the obligations of member States to adhere to the basic standards.

Dealing with the role, organisation and procedures of the Conference, the Director-General advocates departure from the normal practice as regards credentials procedure and suggests that a judicial body examine the objections to ascertain whether there has been a violation of article 3 of the Constitution. It is argued that the tripartite composition of the Credentials Committee will not be conducive to an impartial consideration of the objection. The I.L.O. is not only a tripartite body for discussion, but a tripartite body for decision as well. This suggestion would tend to weaken the tripartite character of the Conference.

Finally, I take this opportunity of congratulating the Director-General on the comprehensive document which he has placed before us and conclude in the hope that the suggestions and constructive criticisms made will give this great Organisation a new impetus to achieve our deserved goals.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. TORRES CERECEDA (Government delegate, Chile)—It is a great satisfaction to me to speak at this great Conference of responsible representatives of the labour world. I ought to speak of the Director-General's Report—the first item on the agenda—but before I do so I feel I must refer to a matter which has been coming before the Conference for years and which I myself have referred to in previous years and which figures again in the report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

My country is attacked for not applying the Right of Association (Agriculture) Convention, 1921 (No. 11). As I have said frequently in the past, and only last week in the Committee, one cannot judge the situation of my country regarding the problem of rural organisation, as regards application of Convention No. 11, without having careful regard to the real situation. Our economy has such an agricultural basis that it would be affected by the disturbances which demagogic elements have recently sought to introduce in Latin America in order to disturb the whole democratic structure. We believe that in this ideological struggle it would not make for stability of our institutions to leave the peasant class exposed to foreign elements who preach hatred and violence. The worst harmed would be the workers themselves, because there would be a shortage of agricultural food and other products.

Furthermore, the agricultural working class in my country has no obstacle to putting forward its requests under our laws and Constitution. On many occasions these requests have been accepted by the Government and by Parliament. Proof of this is the recent approval of the Agrarian Reform Act, which provides for the distribution of land to the peasants, grants credits and technical assistance and provides for the establishment of rural villages, of which more than 35 already exist.

I must remind you that Chile was the first Latin American country to give freedom of association, in 1924, and that there are now thousands of trade unions which act in complete independence. The unions have the right to conclude collective agreements and most of them also receive a share in profits. In this way we show that our country is not an enemy of trade unionism, but it does not accept the demagogic trade unionism which enemies of representative democracy seek to introduce in our rural class, because it would affect the national life and our economy in general.

We have not denounced Convention No. 11. What we do believe in is its gradual application, with complementary and previous action, such as the struggle against illiteracy, the construction of housing, etc., in order to provide conditions favourable for the full exercise by the peasants of trade union rights, safe from self-interested interventions by politicians, employers, demagogues or any other group of persons foreign to the interests of the workers themselves.

With this very proper objective we issued at the end of last year an important Act on agrarian reform, which is one of the most interesting structural changes in the Chilean economy. It has a very important social content, since one of its objectives is to enable the peasants to own the land which they work. This Act will permit a just distribution of the land, putting an end to the big estates, and at the same time will give effect to the human doctrine of the social function of the land.

I point out also that Chile is studying various reforms of its Labour Code, because we think that with regard to some Conventions reform is required. We do not believe in partial reforms. According to our juridical conception we prefer a thorough, comprehensive reform of the Code.

I point out these facts because I consider that the legal reality of our country in the social and political fields should be considered by the international organisations when judging our position.

As a last word on this subject: in the Latin American countries only four have social insurance for the rural populations. The Chilean Compulsory Social Insurance Act, 1924, introduced for the first time in the Americas social insurance for the whole employed popu-
ederation. This insurance covers medical assistance, hospitalisation, and old age and death. The Amending Act of 1952 (No. 10383) which established the social insurance service extended assistance to all members of the workers’ families.

In 1960 Mexico put into force a Compulsory Social Insurance Scheme for rural workers. The other American countries which have social insurance schemes do not apply them to the rural populations. I should point out, regarding social insurance for the rural population, that the Sixth Inter-American Conference on Social Security, held in Mexico City in September 1960, handled as the fifth item on its agenda social security for rural workers. Chile introduced this with its first Compulsory Social Insurance Act, issued on 8 September 1924.

I may be forgiven if I say something now which I believe is inexplicable—indeed, unheard of. Only 66 States Members of the I.L.O. have ratified the Right of Association (Agriculture) Convention, 1921 (No. 11), out of the 108 member States.

It is astonishing that States Members of the I.L.O. which have not ratified Convention No. 11 are represented (some by a Government member) on the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations and consequently act as judges of countries like Chile, which are seeking to ratify the maximum number of Conventions.

I should like to call the attention of the Director-General to this fact so that this matter may be considered in future reports: the countries which do not report at all on the application of Convention No. 11 and have ratified it are not the object of any definite observation, so that no one knows how they apply it or whether they do so.

If I may go on to another subject, I think it appropriate to say that the Chilean delegation believes it its duty to refer, through me, to the position adopted by the Republic of South Africa, which systematically refuses to give effect to the resolutions of the Conference and of the United Nations adopted within their respective competence.

I say this because our country has come to Geneva convinced that the 47th Session of the Conference would be especially important for the developing countries. We, the American, Asian and African countries, had placed our hopes on the discussions and results of this session. We believed that the important matters dealt with in the Director-General’s Report for the application of our activities were directed towards a definite improvement in the position of the peoples of our countries. This was also the understanding of our active friends from Africa who wanted to take part in the discussion on improved procedures so that discussion of the Report could be constructive and would give positive results. However, the position of the Republic of South Africa has made this Conference a meeting from which the vital part of its spirit is absent.

Conscious of the importance of the presence of our friends, we of the Chilean delegation contributed, by all possible means, to seek a formula which would enable satisfaction to be given to the legitimate aspirations of the African group. This was not difficult. We Chileans are entitled to imbibe with the spirit of liberty, equality and democracy. We ensure equality before the law and freedom of employment and have done so for more 150 years when many countries of the old traditions, including many in Europe, still accepted slavery and other servitudes. We did this in Chile without revolution and without violence.

It was said in this Conference last Thursday by the Ukrainian Vice-President that the Latin American proposal was anaemic and came late, and that Latin America had not been present on previous occasions in the African struggle against apartheid.

I must speak the truth here: Latin America was present, and very much so, on all occasions on which the racial policy of South Africa was discussed, and it brought its condemnation on all occasions on which a resolution was approved. You have only to look at the records of last year of the General Assembly of the United Nations to see what I say is correct. The Latin American proposal did not come late, because we think now as ever that it is never too late to construct.

We are in the middle of the Conference, with or without the African delegations, with a view to taking an attitude which will give some satisfaction to our African friends. We have taken the effective weapon of a resolution, which is a lively and positive form of action, more so than sitting with folded arms suspending and postponing procedures, which, in our opinion, is an anaemic attitude. The Latin American proposal is a hand stretched out to our African friends. Our proposal pointed out that South Africa had not given effect to the resolution of the Conference, and how this hampered the work of the I.L.O., and it condemned the policy of that Government.

I can say all this because in Chile we have no racial problem and, consequently, we can consider discrimination problems impartially, independently, and with a view only to justice and the future of mankind.

If I have spoken at some length it is only because, as leader of the Chilean delegation, I could not come to this platform without taking the opportunity to expound the philosophy and describe the achievements of my country’s policy in the social and economic fields, which aims at strengthening the prestige and welfare of our democracy.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. LENNON (Workers’ delegate, Chile)—It is for me a great honour to speak from this rostrum on the Director-General’s Report.

As you will readily understand it is not easy to cover this document, perhaps the most important before us, in the short time available. Fortunately those speakers who preceded me have saved me the task, which is not always rewarding, of discussing certain fundamental problems which arise out of the Report.

I shall therefore confine myself to dealing with certain aspects of the Report which in my view constitute the fundamental objectives of the Organisation.
First of all, may I be allowed to correct a statement made by the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions, Mr. Sallant, who erroneously asserted, in complete disregard of the facts, that the Chilean Workers' delegation did not represent a truly representative organisation. In deference to the truth, the present speaker is a national leader of a trade union—the Federation of Public Utility Workers—and is moreover national president of the Chilean Confederation of Private Employees, which is a central organisation, membership of which is made up of non-manual workers—and is moreover national president of the Federation of Public Utility trade union—the Federation of Public Utility Workers, and is a member of the executive committee of the World Federation of Trade Unions and an official delegate to the International Labour Conference. Moreover, I have been designated by unanimous nomination of the national officers of my union.

I think it is desirable that representatives of such powerful organisations as the W.F.T.U. and other organisations, when they make statements, should first of all make sure that they have got their facts right.

I would like to reiterate our firmest support for the principle of absolute respect for international labour standards. If we take as a point of departure the premise that any economic development must be planned first in a rational manner in order to deal with the serious problems raised by world demographic development, then it follows that it is absolutely indispensable for international labour standards to be generally enforced. We believe that in order to maintain a permanent social and economic balance between the various countries which at present form any given regional economic concentration, such as the Latin American Common Market or the European Common Market, it is absolutely necessary for legislative standards laid down in respect of labour to be uniform, so that production costs of articles for export and for international trade may also tend to be uniform, and that national economics may not be harmed. This will also stimulate the economic and social development of the people.

We think that the I.L.O. must lay special emphasis on this task which, as we see it, constitutes one of the main objectives which justifies the I.L.O.'s existence and which leads, in the final analysis, to raising the living standards of workers throughout the world as a result of balanced economic development of all countries, particularly as regards freedom of association needs to be brought into unique with the principles laid down in these international instruments, particularly as regards freedom of association for state servants, the right to strike of public utility workers, and so on.

All of this shows once again that the I.L.O. should find legal ways and means of ensuring that member States do not evade their international obligations, obligations undertaken with such enthusiasm by their representatives at the Conference. There is an obvious contradiction in the subsequent attitude of governments which do not even submit the instruments to their parliaments for approval or rejection, even though they have generally been approved by an overwhelming majority of Government, Employer and Worker delegates. The I.L.O. should regard it as a fundamental objective for the future to find a suitable solution for the problem of enforcement of international labour standards at a universal level and this will, as we have already pointed out, promote unification of labour standards at a universal level.

As for the problems with which the Director-General deals in the second part of his Report and which relate to structural changes in the International Labour Organisation, many speakers have referred to a number of questions of considerable significance for the effective working of this Organisation.

Now, the experience we have acquired in the course of various I.L.O. Conferences has convinced us that it is indeed necessary to modify certain aspects of the structure of the Conference. We have found that the work of committees takes place simultaneously with the plenary sittings, and, as a result, the work of the committees is not always as effective as it should be because the delegates are constantly preoccupied by the right of what is going on in the plenary sitting. Of course, some delegations may have enough advisers to attend the various committees, but the great majority of countries, especially the less developed countries, are not normally able to
accredit a large number of advisers and therefore they cannot attend the plenary sittings; and, no one, in any event, disregards the legitimate desire of delegates of such countries to attend the plenary sittings.

We therefore propose that in future the Conference should devote one half of its working time to the work of committees and the other half to hearing, discussing and taking decisions on the Report of the Director-General, and this would be in keeping with the principle that all persons attending the Conference have a right to be heard by a substantial audience.

At present, we have found that delegates often make statements before an empty hall and this can only result in the future in declining interest in the discussion of the many problems which arise out of the Report of the Director-General.

It will be readily understood, therefore, that there are powerful reasons in favour of adopting the procedure which I have just suggested. There is another fundamental issue on which we should like to express our opinion and that is the question of the adoption of the annual budget of our Organisation.

Recently we had a situation in which, during the budget discussion, there was a danger that the quorum would be insufficient for the adoption of the budget. It therefore seems to us indispensable to protect the Organisation by establishing in the Constitution a safeguard which will resolve this serious problem, so that, in the event that in any particular year the required quorum is not fulfilled, in such a case the budget for the previous year will remain in force without prejudice to the possibility of its increase either at the following regular session of the Conference or at an extraordinary meeting, if desirable. It seems to us indispensable that machinery of this kind should be adopted for an organisation like ours, just as no government can be expected to be left at the mercy of a possible lack of economic resources, and we hope that the Governing Body will submit to the next session of the Conference a draft amendment to the Constitution to deal with this extremely serious problem.

So far as technical assistance is concerned, particularly in the field of vocational training, the workers hope that the I.L.O. can proceed with its programme of accelerated training of skilled labour within the framework of more intensive development plans, because, in countries such as ours, and even in other comparatively developed countries, there is a lack of that skilled labour in various occupations which constitutes an indispensable adjunct to industrial development.

We wish to thank the Organisation for all that it has done in this field, as, for instance the accelerated training courses which have been so successful in many countries and particularly in mine. This has made it possible for private bodies, jointly with the State, to provide accelerated training for skilled workers.

Before I conclude, and although I would like to have covered other aspects of the Director-General’s Report, I should like to be allowed to mention the opinion of the workers of my country as regards the problem of racial segregation, or apartheid, which is widely repudiated by all sectors of the working class in my country.

We are in full solidarity with the African peoples and we strongly condemn countries such as the Republic of South Africa which maintain such a state of affairs, contrary to the dignity of mankind and the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and to the principles of the I.L.O., and which entail violation of the Conventions and Recommendations on living and working conditions.

We think that States which violate the principles of the I.L.O. in this manner should lose their rights as Members of this Organisation as long as such a state of affairs exists. We are accordingly suggesting concrete and effective action in order to require any State which practises this reprehensible policy to abandon apartheid permanently and absolutely since it is repugnant to the conscience of free men and constitutes a throwback to the dark past which is unacceptable in our present stage of civilisation.

We sincerely hope that the Governing Body will find ways to ensure that the next session of the Conference will carry out a constitutional amendment, the effect of which will be to suspend the rights of a member State which infringes the legal and moral principles which are basic to the survival of our civilisation.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—The next speaker on the list is Mr. Sallabanda, Employers’ delegate, Albania. Is he in the hall? He appears not to be present, so I will call on Mr. Martínez Espino, Employers’ delegate, Venezuela, to come to the rostrum.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. Martínez Espino (Employers’ delegate, Venezuela)—At the beginning of my speech on the Director-General’s Report I would like to offer respects and greetings from the Venezuelan workers to the President, Mr. Dreyer, and to the ex-President, Mr. Johnson, and also to our Vice-President, Mr. Robinson, for placing their experience and knowledge at the service of the Conference.

In common with the majority of the previous speakers in this discussion, I agree in regarding the Director-General’s Report as a bold and important document and an instrument which enables us to face with determination the situation raised for the International Labour Organisation by present world problems.

In my view it is imperative to maintain the tripartite system of the I.L.O. The experience of more than 40 years of application proves its efficiency despite the particular problems which may have arisen. The fortunate fact of the entrance of more and more new sovereign nations does not mean that there must be a radical change in the basis of the system; rather, it serves to demonstrate the agility and flexibility of the system and its capability of adjustment to the growing requirements of a constantly developing world. If we struggle in good faith for social justice, well understood and better applied, we can all without ideological distinction agree to co-operate in meeting the urgent social and economic needs of the
developing countries, and especially those which are still celebrating their political independence.

The discussion and approval on a tripartite basis of international labour standards is perhaps the best guarantee of their application, provided they stem from principles which are generally accepted by a sufficient majority of the member States. As the facts have shown, it is no use formulating Recommendations and Conventions which are then not applied by the countries which have voted them. One should not come to the I.L.O. in order to exhibit one's country before the world as the home of systems which are represented as a universal panacea for the evils of mankind. On the contrary, it is necessary that the instruments which are produced by the Conference be objective and correspond to a policy guaranteeing freedom and respect for human dignity; that they encourage economic development and ensure social justice.

We therefore accept several of the suggestions made by the Director-General with a view to making existing Conventions more effective. They should be adjusted to new technological and social conditions, and those which have achieved their object might well be discarded.

The procedure for the examination of resolutions by the Resolutions Committee is a subject of discussion in the Report. Not only the number but the contents of the draft resolutions submitted to the Conference lead to an excessive workload and cause serious difficulty. The Report discusses this in the following terms:

"The basic issue is how far the Conference should take the world for its parish and express the views of the I.L.O. on some of the most difficult, controversial and explosive political questions of the day. Most, if not all, of these questions have some social implications or aspect; there are therefore few of them concerning which the I.L.O., or at least a majority of the Conference, may not have something, and perhaps something important, to say; but as regards many of them the I.L.O. alone can take little or no useful or constructive action. Here again, a balance of conflicting views is necessary, and no procedural or institutional device can adequately replace a wise restraint on the submission to the Conference of proposals relating to matters in respect of which the responsibility for action on behalf of the United Nations family rests primarily with the political organs of the United Nations. It may sometimes be highly desirable that an I.L.O. view on such questions should be expressed to the United Nations by reason of their economic or social implications or aspects, but the value of such a view will tend to depend on the extent to which it represents a general consensus of opinion within the I.L.O., and this is an added reason for hesitation before submitting to the Conference proposals which are likely to divide rather than to unite it as regards such matters."

In the light of these unanswerable arguments we believe it is necessary to give effect to a system, which might be studied by the Governing Body, under which there would be established an order of priority regarding the subject-matter and the number of resolutions submitted to the Conference, without of course interfor-
ment of capital and, wherever it comes from, it enjoys the same advantages and treatment as national capital and enjoys free convertibility if so desired. In Venezuela we welcome investors who come to fight together with us on an equal basis to utilise and develop our economically sound and stable productive resources, preferably in those fields which have not yet been sufficiently covered by Venezuelan capital.

I cannot conclude without drawing attention to one point—perhaps a most important point for countries whose economy depends mainly on the export prices of their primary products. Even more than investment, in whatever form, we need a guarantee of stable and economic prices for our primary products. This would undoubtedly provide a stable basis for economic development for many countries in more than three continents, and would give us the means of satisfying the need to improve the living standards of the great majority of our peoples.

In conclusion, may I express the thanks of the Venezuelan employers, and my own thanks, to my fellow employers who have made it possible for Venezuela to have a deputy seat in the Governing Body of the I.L.O. In accepting this honour, we promise to intensify, as far as possible, the co-operation which we will give to the I.L.O. in the discharge of all the functions which it performs in respect of the situation that has arisen regarding the withdrawal of the African delegations.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—With respect to the four questions which the Workers' delegate from Jamaica has asked, the Chair would make the following statement.

By an overwhelming majority, the Conference yesterday decided to refuse to admit the Workers' delegation of the Republic of South Africa. The President of the Conference, when announcing the result of the vote on the proposal to refuse to admit the Workers' delegation of South Africa, formally informed all members of the Conference, including the official representatives of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, of the decision of the Conference. The credentials of the Workers' delegation of the Republic of South Africa were accordingly invalidated. The place reserved for the Workers' delegation of the Republic of South Africa was immediately removed from the conference hall. That is all that is required.

Mr. McPherson—There is one question to which I noticed you have not given any answer, that is whether information has yet been passed on to the South African Government in respect of the situation that has arisen regarding the withdrawal of the African delegations.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—May I inform the Workers' delegate from Jamaica that two representatives of the Government of South Africa, fully accredited to participate in this Conference and to represent the Government of South Africa, were in attendance at all times during the events about which he is inquiring. It is my understanding that, being so informed, and having participated in these events, the Government of South Africa would have been officially advised of what has taken place.

Mr. McPherson—On behalf of my country I should like to make a statement, and this statement is germane to the situation which exists here today.

It is to the continued disgust of this Conference that we still have in our midst, participating in this Conference, representatives of the Republic of South Africa. Yesterday's decision by this Conference to withdraw the credentials of the so-called Workers' delegate of this Republic is a step forward in the struggle within this Organisation to expunge from its guts the disagreeable and nauseating elements involved in the membership of South Africa in the Organisation. We are faced today . . .

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—Mr. McPherson, I understood that you were allowed to raise questions, not to make a speech.

Mr. McPherson—I did ask to make a speech.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Robinson)—I would indicate to you that the matter which you are discussing is not one which has come officially before the Conference.

Mr. McPherson—At the end of my statement there will be a motion.
We are faced today with the situation in which a fascist, inhuman and worthless régime, known as the Government of South Africa, is foisting itself on the membership of the International Labour Organisation and undermining the Constitution of the Organisation by taking the fullest advantage as a Member of the democratic principles on which the Organisation is based. In the meantime, while the Government of South Africa is enjoying this democratic advantage, it is brutally denying its own people the rights inherent in these very principles.

I have come to this rostrum to raise Jamaica's voice most vehemently against the continued membership of the Republic of South Africa in the International Labour Organisation; to raise Jamaica's voice against racial discrimination, brutality and other denials of human freedom as practised by South Africa; to raise Jamaica's voice quite loudly in the hope of securing the quickest and most effective results consistent with the expressed wish of this Conference. It is the desire of the Prime Minister of Jamaica that this Conference should be informed that the Government of Jamaica stands four-square behind the International Labour Organisation to see to it that no member nation be allowed to have its own way against the will of the majority. Nor will Jamaica, by default, permit anything to mar the Organisation's reputation or weaken or destroy its foundation. It is established in the principles of peace and love among individuals and nations, a foundation which bears a superstructure that has been raised up for the betterment of the whole human race.

It is now my hope and my suggestion that the Governing Body of this Organisation immediately give consideration and take the most effective steps to secure the earliest expulsion of the Republic of South Africa from the membership of the International Labour Organisation.

(The Conference adjourned at 5.45 p.m.)
TWENTY-SECOND SITTING

Monday, 24 June 1963, 10 a.m.

President : Mr. Dreyer

REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE ¹ : SUBMISSION, DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—The first point on our agenda for today is the report of the Standing Orders Committee. May I ask Mr. Ago, Government delegate of Italy, who is Chairman and Reporter of the Committee, to be so kind as to come to the platform and read the report to the Conference.

Interpretation from French: Mr. AGO (Government delegate, Italy; Chairman and Reporter of the Standing Orders Committee)—The report has been circulated.

As you know, the Standing Orders Committee had elected Mr. Vlachos, Government delegate of Greece, as its Chairman. Under his effective and brilliant chairmanship the Committee held most of its meetings. It was only at the last minute that, as he had been called to fill a very important post in his Government, I was asked to take his place.

The matters before the Standing Orders Committee related chiefly to questions submitted to it by the Governing Body with regard to the procedure for the deposit and examination of resolutions. The reasons that underlay these proposals for amending our Standing Orders were that the number of resolutions has very much increased in recent years and that owing to the increased number of members of the Conference it is to be expected that the number of resolutions will increase further in years to come, rather than diminish. Some means, therefore, has to be found, though without extending the duration of the Conference, of allowing the largest possible number of resolutions to be considered, with as great a saving of time as possible, so as to avoid a repetition of what happened at the Conference last year, when a good many of the resolutions submitted to the Conference could not be considered.

You therefore have before you a number of proposals which have been adopted by the Standing Orders Committee after long discussion. Some members of the Committee would have preferred to postpone consideration of these proposals to a later date—that is, until after the discussion on the Director-General's Report had ended and had borne fruit, but the great majority of the Committee considered that in view of the urgency of the proposals it would be better to adopt them immediately. All the proposals were adopted by a great majority in the Committee, although some members made certain reservations.

The Committee has made a few slight amendments in the proposals made by the Governing Body, mainly in order to correct certain totally erroneous impressions which might have been created by these proposals and to emphasise that the object of the proposals was to try to save as much time as possible in order to consider the largest possible number of resolutions in the time available.

The first proposal merely endorses a practice which has been followed for a very long time by the Officers of the Conference, namely to provide that in order to be accepted by the Conference a resolution must be submitted by a delegate. The only change which the Standing Orders Committee made to the original proposal of the Governing Body was to remove the word “accredited” so that a person who is later appointed as a delegate might have the right to submit a resolution even if when actually submitting the resolution (that is, in the fortnight before the Conference) his appointment as delegate has not yet been made.

The most important proposal is of course the second, which relates to the determination of the order of consideration of resolutions. The Committee devoted most of its time to this question, in an attempt to find a means of saving time and to prevent a waste of valuable time in the consideration of procedural points, particularly discussion of the order in which resolutions should be considered. To determine the order of priority, the system adopted by the Committee, on the basis of the proposals made to it by the Governing Body, has been to combine the principle of talks among the various members—which is still, of course, the basic principle—and of a vote to be held at the beginning of the Committee's proceedings in order to select the five resolutions to be considered first, so that the Committee may begin its substantive work without loss of time, while allowing the discussion to continue meanwhile with a view to determining the order in which remaining resolutions are to be taken.

¹ See Appendix III, p. 479.
the very first sitting of the Committee, without any discussion before the vote, would have been rather a mechanical way of proceeding, particularly as the vote might take place without the members having a precise idea of what was contained in the resolutions on which they would have to vote. That is why a small amendment was introduced, to the effect that as soon as the Committee meets the authors of the various resolutions will make a brief introductory statement taking not more than ten minutes, and that in that statement each author will comment on his resolution in order that the right to submit such criticisms levelled. There is no such thing as perfection in the realm of procedure, and the object is likewise to try to enable all the work of the EeSolutions Committee to begin its work as soon as possible after the opening of the session. That is why it is provided that the Committee will be completed before the end of the Conference, in order to enable it to consider comprehensively all the resolutions on subjects not on the agenda. The essential point is that the Chair be avoided by every possible means.

The third proposal comes under the heading of "Terminal Date for Work of Resolutions Committee". There, in the Standing Orders Committee, we had perhaps the most important amendment. I wonder whether this title should not now be amended, because in fact it is no longer only a matter of fixing the date but also of fixing the date on which the Committee is to begin its work. The object of this proposal was to ensure that the longest possible time during the Conference would be available for the work of the Resolutions Committee. That is why it is provided that the Resolutions Committee shall begin its work as soon as possible after the opening of the session of the Conference, in order to enable it to complete its agenda not later than the Saturday preceding the close of the Conference. If, nevertheless, any resolution has not been considered by the Committee by the date on which it terminates its work, the Conference shall not discuss or act upon that resolution.

It can be seen from the provisions of that paragraph that the object is to avoid what occurred last year—that is to say, a large number of resolutions having to be left without consideration by the Conference—and to ensure that that situation will be only a possibility to be avoided by every possible means.

Finally, there is a very small amendment in the fourth proposal with regard to the adaptation of the Standing Orders for Committees of the Conference to the needs of the Resolutions Committee. The object is likewise to try to enable all the work of the Resolutions Committee to be completed before the end of the Conference. The essential point is that the Chairman may, after consultation with the two Vice-Chairmen, submit to the Committee for decision without debate a proposal to reduce the time limit for speeches on a specific topic to five minutes.

We hope that these proposals will facilitate the work of the Resolutions Committee.

Of course, reservations can always be made and criticisms levelled. There is no such thing as other amendments concerning, and the proposals before you are open to review in the light of experience. However, we hope that by this means we shall enable the Conference, without sitting longer than it now does, to exhaust its agenda in regard to resolutions and to cope with the new, but obviously inevitable and important development which consists of the increase in the number of resolutions.

I think I have told you all I need in introducing this report, and I thank you.

The President—The general discussion is now open.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. KLUSÁK (Government delegate, Czechoslovakia)—We now have before us once more a proposal concerning partial amendment of the Standing Orders, submitted as usual by the Governing Body and based on recommendations of the famous ad hoc committee. The delegations of the socialist countries, whom I have the honour to represent, have already stated in previous years that the Standing Orders of the Conference were ripe for general revision. They have already drawn attention to the fact that, in the present situation, such partial revisions do not improve the Standing Orders but, on the contrary, render them more complicated. This is why we have from the beginning of this partial examination pressed our point of view that general revision of the basic documents of the Organisation should include over-all revision of the Standing Orders. The developments which have occurred at this Conference have fully justified our point of view.

In the discussion on the Director-General's Report a number of delegates have emphasised that it is urgently necessary to ensure an over-all revision of the Standing Orders of the Conference. Moreover, in view of the crisis which has arisen and which has led to the departure of more than 40 per cent. of delegations, the Conference is now concluding its work in an atmosphere of extreme distortion of its political aspect and its procedural situation. These developments have once more emphasised and underlined the need for a comprehensive revision of the Standing Orders. Discussion in the Standing Orders Committee on the proposals put forward by the Governing Body concerning changes in the procedure for submission and consideration of resolutions, have clearly demonstrated—in so far as this is possible in the present situation at the Conference—that partial revision of the Standing Orders, as things stand at present, would be unsatisfactory and very complicated because they would not be simplified but rather made more complicated. Moreover, we are not enabled to consider comprehensively all the views and proposals put forward by delegations at this Conference, in accordance with the basic purpose stated by the Director-General. This refers also to such proposals and views as are directly connected with the questions under consideration.

I do not intend to give any further detailed analysis of the proposals submitted, but I feel it is necessary to draw attention to some important facts. Consideration of the first amendment concerning, and the proposals to omit resolutions on subjects not on the agenda of the Conference has shown that it stems from the desire to limit the right to submit such
resolutions and touches upon a number of problems connected with this very important aspect of the Conference's work. Members of some delegations at present have pointed out various practical problems which may arise from such amendments, and it has been suggested that the Conference should consider the right to submit resolutions in a broader aspect. Therefore, the amended text to article 17 is not generally acceptable.

The other proposals are similarly conceived, and serve as a whole even further to hamper the procedure for consideration of resolutions by the Resolutions Committee. The method of determining priorities in discussing resolutions, initially suggested by the Governing Body, resembles a mechanical voting machine far more than a method for thorough discussion on the importance and topicality of individual resolutions. Although the weight of arguments caused the initial text to be partially improved, basically it continues to constitute a restricting force. Its spirit is not such as to promote initiatives and aim at improving the work of the Organisation through submission of resolutions on subjects outside the agenda of the Conference. I fail to understand, for instance, why the activities of the Resolutions Committee should be limited in time by a specific provision of the Standing Orders, which is not the case for other committees.

It is quite clear, and I do not intend to deny it, that the work of the Resolutions Committee, in the light of the work of past years, does call for improvement. The Committee is in need of assistance in order to be able to cope with its ever-increasing work. But genuine assistance cannot be restricted to permanent limitations. Instead, greater positive measures should be taken enabling this Committee to use all the possibilities open to it to consider even an increasing number of resolutions. As was noted in the Standing Orders Committee, it is not only a time factor; it is also a question of using more flexible and more effective means of considering the different draft resolutions.

For all these reasons we do not think it right that the Conference should now adopt the proposal for amendment of the Standing Orders as suggested. In this connection I would like particularly to emphasise that amendment of the Standing Orders is of direct interest to all Members of the Organisation. Therefore, all Members should have the right to participate in approval of such amendment.

I therefore wish to propose, on behalf of the workers of all socialist countries represented at this Conference, that the draft submitted by the Standing Orders Committee should not be approved as a final amendment, but rather, in view of the exceptional circumstances, adopted only as a recommendation regarding consideration of resolutions submitted outside the agenda, for the next session of the International Labour Conference. The practical experience gained thereby would be of value in a comprehensive revision of the Standing Orders.

This proposal is in my view even more acceptable if we take into consideration the views put forward by Mr. Ago, who emphasised the value of experience in developing procedural ways and means in the Resolutions Committee. If the Conference does not accept this proposal, our delegation will be compelled to abstain from voting on the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders.

Mr. KAPLANSKY (Workers' adviser, Canada; Vice-Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee) — May I, as Workers' Vice-Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee, express our appreciation to the Chairman, Mr. Ago, for his excellent introduction to this report and for the manner in which he took over the chairmanship of the Committee and conducted its sittings. This, of course, goes also for Mr. Vlachos, under whose chairmanship we started the work of the Committee, and I should like the Conference to know that we, on our side, appreciated his impartiality and the manner in which he conducted the proceedings.

I think we have a good report before us, because this report was carefully prepared over a period of years. It was not only prepared by this Committee, as was pointed out before, but it started by a special Working Party, an ad hoc committee of the Governing Body, then it was considered by the Standing Orders Committee of the Governing Body, and then by the Governing Body itself, and now, for several weeks, by this Conference.

I think we can discuss this matter quite passionately because, as far as we are concerned in the Workers' group especially, and I am sure it goes for all the members of this Committee, the amendments to the Standing Orders have not been conceived with the idea of denying anyone the right to submit, or the privilege of submitting resolutions. They were not conceived with any idea of restricting the rights of any delegate, present or future, but solely from the point of view of finding practical means by which to tackle the ever-increasing number of resolutions which are being submitted to the Conferences.

I would like to appeal to those who have reservations with regard to these Standing Orders to please consider them again, carefully and passionately, shedding fears and all prejudices as to the motives of the proponents of these changes, and to look upon them as members of this Organisation who are interested in its effective and efficient functioning, including the effective and efficient and speedy functioning of all the committees which this Conference elects and on the basis of whose work it, itself, takes decisions for the future of this Organisation.

I speak on the basis of my own experience. For the last four years I have been the Workers' Vice-Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee and I know, on the basis of my own experience and of the experience of all of my colleagues, regardless of their political tendency or the geographical place from which they come, that it was impossible to deal with the Resolutions Committee agenda on the basis of the provisions which are now inscribed in the Constitution and Standing Orders. From the very first day that I came to the Resolutions Committee, it was not only my feeling, but the general feeling of every member of that Committee, that the Resolutions Committee cannot
work under Standing Orders which apply to the technical committees of the Conference; because if it is not a technical committee; because it deals with a type of agenda which is altogether different from those of the technical committees of this Conference.

Technical committees have an agenda prepared in advance. Government, Workers' and Employers' delegates know months and months—sometimes a whole year—in advance, the subject-matter with which they are going to deal. They can take prepared positions; they can do their research and preparatory work; they can discuss it with their governments and with other delegates. They discuss it for two years as a rule—and to deal with one subject, whereas the Resolutions Committee has to deal with resolutions some of which are of a scope and character which are much more complex than most of the items which come under the regular agenda of this Conference, and they have to deal with these problems on 15 days' notice at best, and most of the time they become seized of these problems with which the Resolutions Committee is going to deal on the day on which the Conference opens, when they look, as a rule, at the Provisional Record, No. 2, where the resolutions are usually printed.

And when they get ten or 15 or 20 resolutions of this type, as happened two years ago and last year, and have only two weeks in which to prepare their report—because it takes a couple of days for the committees to get constituted and start working, and they have to finish it so that it can come back to this plenary, so at best they have 12 working days, even if they work morning and afternoon—and they have to deal with this complexity of problems which touch on most of the issues with which the whole of the United Nations family is seized (issues of the greatest political, economic and social importance, which the other agencies, and especially the United Nations, which meets for three or four months, could not tackle in very long sittings)—when we are expected in two weeks, on the basis of the Standing Orders, to deal effectively with all the resolutions which constitute thereby the whole time available to this Committee equitably, equally and justly to all. Surely there ought to be some rationalisation with which to tackle these resolutions. Logic dictates it and it should be tackled in a logical way and that is the reason why we decided to introduce these amendments.

And what is their aim? They aim to divide the time which is available to the Resolutions Committee equitably, equally and justly to all the delegates. Therefore, the Chairman of the Committee must have the right to cut down the time a delegate can speak, if necessary. Therefore we must change this system by which a delegate can speak six and seven times on each question before the Committee, on each amendment, on each subamendment, before the vote and after the vote. The Standing Orders are wide open and therefore a group of delegates can hog all the time to themselves and prevent others who are not so aggressive, so to say—and I mean it in the best sense of the word—from participating in the work. As regards freedom to submit resolutions, we have a situation today in which there are over 100 member States and each delegate has in theory the right to submit a resolution which is not on the agenda. So there is the possibility, if we are to speak of democracy and each delegate having the right to speak, of having 100 resolutions, if each delegate submits only one. But theoretically each delegate can submit as many resolutions as he wishes. It is true that only a certain group of delegations has specialised in submitting resolutions in the past, but if they continue to submit resolutions the others will also submit resolutions. Therefore we must have a responsible method of dividing the work among all the delegates, all the participants in the Resolutions Committee and in the Conference.

What is suggested here? They are very simple proposals. Let us not attach as much importance to these proposals as if they were going to change the whole nature of the Organisation and undermine the spirit which prevails in this Organisation. No; they are technical questions; practical questions dealt with in a practical way. The proposals ought therefore to be adopted.

In conclusion, let me deal with one more argument which has been put to us. In my opinion and with all due respect to the delegate from Czechoslovakia who spoke before me, his argument is not a logical one. He says that we are now discussing the Director-General's Report, which goes into the whole question of the reorganisation of the I.L.O. as such, and because of that we are going to have a look at the entire Constitution and Standing Orders; and he goes on to say that, if we are going to do that, why deal with this question piecemeal, why deal with only one aspect of this Organisation? I submit to you that this "all or nothing" attitude is wrong, is not logical. Let me ask this question: I am in favour of revision of article 35 of the Constitution—the so-called colonial clause; would the representative of Czechoslovakia be opposed to the Organisation's dealing with the revision of article 35? Would he suggest that we wait until the whole Constitution is revised before we tackle that article? I do not know what his reply will be, but I am in favour of dealing with article 35. Then there is the question of constitutional amendments as regards member States which do not comply with the principles and decisions of this Organisation. Would the representative of Czechoslovakia oppose changing the Constitution on that score on the argument that we are waiting for a complete revision of the Constitution? I do not know what he will say to that, but I for one and I am sure many others in this House are opposed to any delay. And I said that we should tackle this problem and not wait until the whole Constitution is changed.

We are going to have a Resolutions Committee next year, and it will have to work, and complete its agenda and prepare a report for the Conference. Therefore we say, regardless of what the outcome of this discussion may be, let us tackle the problem which is on the agenda now and which we have in order that the Resolutions Committee next year may be able to do its work efficiently and effectively.

It may be that we shall not have many resolutions next year, in which case there will
be no problem. But if we should have many resolutions we would like, through these amendments, to be able to save the time of the Committee so that it should not as in the past have to devote a lot of time to deciding how to tackle the resolutions, but should go to the heart of the matter and start discussing the resolutions right at the beginning because the Standing Orders are clear as regards how they should be tackled. We do not want the Selection Committee, as has happened in the past, and the Resolutions Committee itself, to waste time discussing the question of when to finish the work of the Committee; we want the Standing Orders to be specific so that the Chairman and the members of the Committee do not have to waste time deciding when to conclude its sittings but know from the beginning that they have a certain amount of time and must apportion it accordingly and not get involved in procedural arguments and discussions which spill over into the Selection Committee and into the Conference itself.

For these reasons and on behalf of the majority of the workers' group of the Standing Orders Committee, I call on the workers' delegates to support the proposals which are before us.

Interpretation from French: Mr. KUNTSCHEN (Employers' delegate, Switzerland; Vice-Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee)—May I first of all on behalf of the Employers' group add my own thanks to the two Chairmen, Mr. Vlachos and Mr. Ago, for the distinguished manner in which they presided. We all appreciated their competence and their authority, and we are deeply grateful to them.

I should now like to refer briefly to the subject-matter of this discussion. The Director-General's Report sets out very clearly the problem now before us. It refers to the great difficulties, the acute and repeated difficulties, which have arisen in the Resolutions Committee. The Director-General says that these have a triple origin: the increase in the number of resolutions before the Conference; the increase in the proportion of these which raise wide political problems; and the increase in the number of members of the Resolutions Committee.

The Resolutions Committee has thus been faced with grave difficulties, particularly regarding the time available to it. Therefore the Governing Body considers it indispensable to take action for the more rational, practical, direct and effective organisation of the work of the Committee.

This brings me to the main points in the proposals made to you. First of all, regarding the deposit of resolutions the new text states quite clearly and in a mandatory way that each delegate has the right to submit resolutions, provided of course that he has regard to the time limit fixed by the Standing Orders—a time limit which every assembly must lay down. The right to submit resolutions has not been changed; this right remains absolute for all delegates. In this respect the text before you, as modified by the Committee, in a way strengthens this right because the proposed Standing Order states that when priorities for the discussion of the resolutions are being determined each sponsor shall have ten minutes to present his resolution and explain it, if the reasons for its being submitted are not clear enough to all.

I said just now that the main question was one of time. I think that here the proposals before you do provide a rational settlement on lines of self-discipline. As compared with the original proposals of the Governing Body, the Committee is striving to provide for a still more effective use of the time available by proposing amendments on three new points.

First of all, it is provided that the Committee shall establish a Working Party right at the beginning and that the latter shall make recommendations on the order of discussion; so that at the opening of the session the Working Party will be established and will thus stimulate the decisions to be taken in that regard. Next the text proposes that the Resolutions Committee shall start its work at the very beginning of the session. There will be no loss of time in the early stages which might restrict the freedom of discussion and decision. Here again, therefore, a step forward is to be taken.

Thirdly, the Committee is to take action to complete its agenda so that it is finished on a certain date. This will certainly require the Committee to start its work early and to get on with its work efficiently so as to reach positive results in the time allowed to it. I am convinced, therefore, that the proposals made to you will improve the proceedings of the Resolutions Committee and thus assist the whole Conference.

Lastly, it has been proposed from this platform that we should defer decision on this question. I think it is important to take a decision immediately so that, as Mr. Ago said just now, we can get experience, and if in the course of time the new arrangements do not seem satisfactory the Conference can always introduce better and more appropriate Standing Orders.

In the name of the Employers' group, I propose that you should adopt the proposals now before you.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. Kanaiev (Workers' adviser, U.S.S.R.)—First of all, I should like to say that the Workers' delegation of the Soviet Union fully agrees with the view put forward here by the representative of the People's Republic of Czechoslovakia. However, I should like to dwell on one amendment suggested by the Standing Orders Committee which, it seems to us, affects the interests and restricts the rights of workers' organisations. This is the amendment to article 17, paragraph 1 (1), stating that only delegates may submit resolutions outside the agenda of the Conference.

The proposals now before the Conference are aimed at achieving a radical change in the activities and structure of the Organisation so that it may more resolutely and effectively participate in the solution of vital problems facing workers all over the world. The work of the Conference committees should also strive towards this purpose, and in particular that of the Standing Orders Committee, whose report
has been put before us by its Chairman, Mr. Ago. In the course of the discussion on the Director-General’s Report, many speakers have pointed out that the time has come to put an end to discrimination in the bodies of the International Labour Organisation regarding the vast mass of workers who are united by the World Federation of Trade Unions and other autonomous trade unions. It cannot be denied that, so far as the composition of delegations to International Labour Conferences is concerned, major international trade unions which very often represent the great majority of the workers of a given country are not included. As things still stand, neither the Constitution nor the Standing Orders indicate who has the right to submit resolutions on subjects which are not on the agenda of the Conference. However, it is generally recognised that submission of such resolutions is an important method of considering problems and questions which are of substantial and immediate interest to specific governments and organisations. Regarding the question of who is authorised to table resolutions, reference can only be made to article 14, paragraph 1, of the Constitution of the I.L.O., stating that suggestions as to the agenda may be made by “the government of any of the Members or by any representative organisation recognised for the purpose of article 3, or by any public international organisation”. It would be logical for resolutions outside the agenda to be brought in line with the provisions of article 14, because very often these resolutions are of no less importance to the workers than the subjects on the agenda of the Conference. However, the so-called Ago Committee and the Governing Body chose to follow a different course, the course of limiting the right to submit resolutions to delegates of the Conference only, thus strengthening discrimination against many representative workers’ organisations.

In the course of discussion in the Standing Orders Committee, with regard to the proposed amendment to article 17, paragraph 1 (1), the limitation was deleted requiring that resolutions could be tabled only by persons accredited to the Conference at least 15 days before the opening of the session. But the discriminatory and anti-democratic character of this amendment has not changed in spite of the deletion of the word “accredited”. Adoption of this amendment would mean that the leading representative workers’ organisations, whose governments do not wish to recognise them as such, would not be able to approach the Conference as representatives of workers. That would place those organisations which they represent. Delegates after all are delegates of organisations or institutions. I think we have got to be perfectly clear on that and not be amused by the suggestions that industrial organisations which do not send delegates have any right at all in the Conference to put forward resolutions because those organisations exist. We might have resolutions, in that case, from an allotment-holders’ association putting forward some resolution which of course had no bearing at all on the work of the International Labour Conference. However, I think the whole thing is so ridiculous as to be dismissed.

I would, since I am here, like to refer to the remarks of some previous speakers very briefly. It seems to me that the argument of the Czechoslovak Government delegate is that if you have a big hole in the roof don’t deal with it because there may be some leaks elsewhere. Mr. Kaplansky has dealt very adequately with that.

The suggestion has been made again and again that this new procedure will limit the number of resolutions which can be put forward. That again is just nonsense, and
Mr. Kaplansky has made it clear that there could be an infinity of resolutions put forward, though God forbid that should ever be.

Then the earlier speaker made reference to the fact that this Conference is not fully representative. That is regrettable; we all regret it of course. But is the whole work of the Representative. That is regrettable; we all regret though God forbid that there should ever be. Mr. Kaplansky has made it clear that there
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in spite of the fact that we have objections as to the substance. The proposal is simply to adopt it on a provisional basis and to leave the final decision to the 48th Session of the International Labour Conference.

If we were to listen to the appeals made by Mr. Kaplansky to reject passion and prejudice and to be logical to the very end, then it would appear to us that indeed logic and the absence of passion and prejudice in our behaviour should call on this Conference to adopt this very proposal submitted by Mr. Klusák. In spite of the fact that Mr. Klusák has already said that he was moving this proposal on behalf of the group of socialist countries, I nevertheless think it necessary here officially, on behalf of the Government delegation of the U.S.S.R., to second Mr. Klusák's proposal that the recommendations concerning the procedure for considering those resolutions not placed on the agenda, as suggested in the report of the Standing Orders Committee, should be adopted on a provisional and experimental basis, to be applied at the 45th Session of the International Labour Conference, but that we should not take a final decision to amend the Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any further speakers? There are no further speakers, so I declare the general discussion closed.

We will now turn to paragraph 8 of the report of the Standing Orders Committee. I will put the proposal contained in it to the vote of the Conference. It is a proposal to amend subparagraph (1) of paragraph 17 of article 17 of the Standing Orders. The text is given in the report.

We shall take a vote by show of hands.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. The recommendation contained in paragraph 8 is adopted by 127 votes in favour to 4 against, with 31 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—We will now turn to the next proposal, which is contained in paragraph 12 of the report of the Standing Orders Committee. It is a proposal to insert in article 17 of the Standing Orders a new paragraph 5. The text is given in the report.

We shall take a vote by show of hands.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. The recommendation contained in paragraph 12 is adopted by 132 votes in favour to 1 against, with 33 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—We now turn to paragraph 15 of the report. The proposal is to insert in article 17 of the Standing Orders a new paragraph 6. The text is given in the report.

We shall take a vote by show of hands.
(A vote is taken by show of hands. The recommendation contained in paragraph 15 is adopted by 144 votes in favour to 2 against, with 35 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—we will now turn to the proposal to insert additions to articles 55, 62 and 64 of the Standing Orders. These proposals are contained in paragraph 17 of the report. If there are no objections, I shall take a vote on all these three articles.

No objection to that?

(A vote is taken by show of hands. The recommendation contained in paragraph 17 is adopted by 144 votes in favour to 1 against, with 35 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—now only one thing remains and that is the adoption of the report as a whole. May I take it that the report as a whole is adopted by the Conference?

(The report is adopted.)

The PRESIDENT—I should like on behalf of the Conference to thank Mr. Vlachos, Government member, Greece, even though he is not here, and Mr. Ago, as Chairman and Reporter, for the very useful work they have done for the Conference. I should like to add to that a special word of thanks to Mr. Ago for the very clear and informative way in which he submitted the report to the Conference.

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

The PRESIDENT—we will now take the second point on the agenda of this morning’s sitting, the continuation of the discussion on the Director-General’s Report.

Interpretation from French: Mr. de CASTRO (Government delegate, Brazil)—I should like to make some remarks which have been suggested to us by a reading of the Director-General’s Report. It is the view of the Brazilian Government that this document is extremely significant. It is so not only for the Organisation, as an I.L.O. report, but as a document which the whole United Nations family can study and reflect upon. It gives a profound analysis of the important problems of today, problems of international policy, and therefore I consider it a document meriting deep reflection. Of course I cannot in a few minutes analyse it all. I shall therefore make a few brief reflections of a general character, in order to show how important it is, for I regard it as extremely significant.

Submitting the Report the Director-General really speaks as a prophet. It is in the true sense a prophecy, for it analyses our Organisation as it is, in the world as it is; the Director-General stresses what is significant and thus can start the Report with the following words: “The I.L.O. is at one of the critical points of its history, at one of those points where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action.”

Thus he foresees the crisis—really, a succession of crises—in the Conference. But it was not only to a procedural crisis that he referred; he is alluding also to crisis in the philosophic sense, as understood by Ortega y Gasset when he said that an historic crisis is a crisis in which all the values of life lose their significance without new ones being found, without new symbols appearing that can explain the new facts.

That is the case with this Organisation. We are now finding that the I.L.O., as it exists now, is out of date and that facts have moved past it, without our having been able to rethink and recreate the Organisation, to give it a new dimension so that it could move forward in a wider orbit than that contemplated when it was set up. We realise that the I.L.O. was born in a now outdated age. It was established long before the Second World War, which changed the world. The I.L.O. was conceived at a historical moment when the duty of each generation was to remake the world. We in the present generation have a much heavier task: to ensure that the world is not destroyed.

This new conception and task of today, this preoccupation with a weighty present is out of harmony with the outdated structure of the I.L.O., conceived on the basis of the class struggle, which has been left behind. The struggle today is much deeper, much more extensive. It is not the class struggle as conceived in previous centuries but a much bigger economic struggle, an ideological struggle, for the world is divided into two ideological camps and into two economically different blocs—the industrialised countries and the poor underdeveloped countries, proletarian countries as some have called them, and these have different philosophies of action and conception.

The I.L.O.’s task is to harmonise these antagonisms, because we have to coexist in the same planet. The I.L.O. should work for coexistence of economic and ideological systems which happen to be different. That is why the I.L.O. must be rethought on a new dimension, which I think must be genuinely international or universal. Unfortunately we have not yet introduced into the United Nations. What has happened in this room is not anything specific to the I.L.O.: it is a disease also of the United Nations which was conceived after the Second World War, but on a basis of pre-war ideas. Its basic structure was not appropriate to face the transformations which have taken place throughout the world, and the United Nations and the I.L.O. are in danger of falling apart if we do not remodel them according to a new and more far-reaching view of the world.

The United Nations is an international organisation but it is inter- and not multinational; it is a collection of national interests. Each nation goes to the United Nations or the I.L.O. to defend vigorously its egoistical point of view and that does not give the organisations a really universal feeling. We in the United Nations family are living in the spirit of Ptolemy’s time, thinking that our particular world is the centre of the universe. Each country thinks it is the centre of the world. The big powers want the world to move
round their own country. That is a view which fills me with horror, because Ptolemy is long dead and his ideas have disappeared. Copernicus proved that the world was not the centre of the universe but only a speck of dust in the solar system. Einstein proved that all is relative, and we live in the age of Einstein, technically speaking, but politically speaking we are still living in the age of Ptolemy.

This view, held in the United Nations, cannot persist. So I think that the recommendations of the Director-General in his Report to this Conference must be followed. He says that it is absolutely essential to revise not only the procedural rules of the I.L.O. but also the structure. This proposal must be supported by the Government members of the Organisation so that at the Conference we may do constructive work in reforming the Organisation so as to make it capable of solving the great problems of our day.

What are these great problems? In our opinion we in the I.L.O. must seek to help in the solution of three problems which are linked together and mutually complementary: development, decolonisation and disarmament. I think it is our duty to take part in that work because the future of mankind depends on these three problems.

I read with interest the Director-General’s statement that “the first basic characteristic of the I.L.O. is that it is a part of the United Nations family of organisations, linked with the United Nations by a formal relationship agreement, and fully committed to the United Nations objective of preserving and strengthening foundations for world peace”.

There lies the primordial problem. Peace depends on these three things—development, decolonisation and disarmament.

I am glad to see that the Director-General also refers specifically to the resolutions put forward on the problem of disarmament. At the last session I submitted a resolution concerning the repercussions of disarmament on labour problems. Unfortunately, this was not placed before the Conference, against our wishes and perhaps those of the majority of the delegations. However, we are grateful to the Director-General for recognising the importance of this problem. If we are really to achieve disarmament we must remember that we shall never reach it by saying that we want peace while we are working for war. Really to work for peace is to reconvert the industry of the world. We must be prepared to transform the war economy, which can only lead to catastrophe, into a peace economy. Peace economy requires the use of the labour forces of the world in different ways and in new sectors. This is an extremely important and essential task of the I.L.O.

If it fails to deal with it, saying that the problems of disarmament are political ones and the I.L.O. is a technical organisation, then in my opinion it is done for, because it will not have moved forward with events.

The second important problem is that of development. We live in a world divided by increasing antagonism between the rich developed countries where people eat well, and the world of poverty and hunger, where two-thirds of the people do not get enough to eat. From this division stems a social tension. The two-thirds who do not have enough to eat would revolt because they know that their position is not normal, is due to the outdated economic structures. The other group is composed of those who cannot sleep out of fear that the rest may revolt.

We must integrate world economy as a whole. In order to develop the underdeveloped world we must use the labour forces of those countries. They are underdeveloped because they are undercapitalised. Without capital, manpower is not used as it should be. The great economist Myrdal rightly stressed that the essential problems of underdeveloped countries are underemployment and unemployment. Therefore we must use the labour force of the peoples of those countries.

So we must be able to disarm the world and work for real economic development, balanced and harmonious. That has not been done so far, and it is an important task that the I.L.O. could carry out if it got rid of the outdated structure and a Constitution which would permit it to move forward more freely, and if it were not tied to out-of-date pre-war conceptions which restrict its action and do not correspond in any way to present needs. I do not understand why we are always behind in solving problems. The people are always ahead, the governments half-way along, and the I.L.O. behind.

The third task is decolonisation. We are in the twilight of the colonial age. The colonies are coming to an end, but decolonisation is not an historic moment, it is a process. You cannot decolonise just because a certain Act is passed through parliament saying that a colony is free, but by working to emancipate the ex-colonial regions economically and politically. I had a good deal more to say but my time is up. I think actions speak louder than words.

I will close by saying that we live in an epoch in which we must make a choice between coexistence and non-existence. Our Organisation must work for coexistence; and for this it must be qualified to perform its task.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. CHAJN (Government delegate, Poland)—In my 11 years of participation in the Conference of the I.L.O. I have never found myself in such an embarrassing position in connection with the discussion on the Director-General’s Report as at this time.

When I prepared myself for this session I had the intention, in accordance with the request of the Director-General, to make a substantial contribution on behalf of the Polish Government delegation concerning the proposals of the Director-General, the methods of work, structure and organisation of the I.L.O.; and, in spite of the fact that on many questions our views diverge, I fully appreciate your personal attempt, Mr. Director-General, to embark immediately upon the adjustment of our Organisation to the historic changes which are occurring throughout the world. My positive assessment of your Report was based on the following understanding: that you, Sir, felt it necessary to improve the unsatisfactory position which exists in the I.L.O., that you showed the will to remove the obstacles which
push it to even more reactionary and more dangerous positions. Not only have we been unable to correct past mistakes, but we have even added new and serious errors to the list, errors which, in the near future, will have to be paid for and at a higher price than we have paid so far.

A few days ago I heard, in this very room, energetic words concerning the respect for law, legitimate procedure, etc., words imbued with concern about the future of our Organisation. I really felt sometimes that those words were frank, that they reflected the subjective truth, and that, in spite of difference in views on the appraisal of the situation and ways and means of resolving the acute conflict, they were directed towards lofty ends.

But, two days later, steps were taken which led to a denial of justice, a gross violation of law, and this Organisation incurred the displeasure of public opinion. We cannot deny the fact that, with the assistance of an artificially created majority, the adoption of a very important act was imposed upon us, the implementation of which is bound to lead to remorse on the part of its instigators.

Attempts have already been made to still this remorse by having two enigmatic resolutions adopted. However, when legal measures were taken to oppose this pantomime, then the very man whose tact, common-sense and experience during the critical moments of this tragic crisis prevented even worse developments and more serious consequences was laid open to attack. Yes, Mr. President, I can tell you that in Mr. Slipchenko you found a very worthy substitute. Not only were there unjustified attacks on Mr. Slipchenko but, once again, the echoes of the cold war were heard in this room, and all kinds of accusations were made against the socialist countries. The substance of these was not changed by the fact that this role was undertaken by some members of the Workers' group. There was not even any logic in them. We have been reproached with the fact that we are trying to destroy the Organisation but, in the lobbies, the very same persons, seeing us in the plenaries and committees, were crying out that the Organisation was saved.

We are defending the standards of international life and legal principles, which have been democratically accepted irrespective of whether we are in the majority or minority.

But we must emphasise once again that we shall certainly fight all those who violate basic human principles, who undermine the rights of man and who move to positions of genocide. We shall denounce those who delete from the list of voters the African delegations, who, with the aid of a "fig-leaf" resolution and by rearranging the seating in the Conference hall, try to humble public opinion and would like to proclaim the eradication of the painful African problem.

We stayed behind in this hall because we want to defend the standards of international life, human integrity and the progress of all nations; we want to denounce all those who, in the floods of resounding phrases, want to extinguish burning problems. Our great writer, Stefan Zeromski, put this most tellingly when he said that "wounds would not heal with a skin of infamy".

The voice of Africa has found an echo in our position. Last week the W.F.T.U. protested against the credentials of the so-called Workers' delegate of the Republic of South Africa as being without substance and not legally receivable. This opinion was endorsed by the majority of the Credentials Committee. Now you have recognised the impossibility of defending yesterday's stand. That is very good, and even if it is only a small step forward, even if it is only a tactical move dictated by the needs of the moment, we take note of it with satisfaction and we think it shows a realistic attitude.

The delegations of the Eastern European countries, which expressed full solidarity with the African delegates, remain at the Conference to defend the standards of international life and the justified interests of the African Continent, and they have put forward certain constructive proposals which tend not only towards the solution of the topical and burning African problem but also to the creation of an appropriate climate and favourable conditions for a good discussion on the Report of the Director-General.

Unfortunately, those proposals were rejected. We must recognise that they were dealt with in a rather primitive fashion. They were called propaganda—and it has been suggested to us that we should listen to a lecture on democracy, based on the interpretation of article 29 of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

But how far can we avail ourselves of such methods in an international organisation? Of course, we can do so as long as the Conference is amputated, but what of tomorrow? Will not the results of the elections of the Governing Body impose a responsibility upon us to try to find other ways and means of international co-operation?

In this very building, in another room, a few days ago, an agreement was concluded on a direct line between the White House and the Kremlin. Now, we seem to need dozens of direct lines which would unite us on the basic question of social progress and social justice in the world. The time for this is overdue.

I hope that such a situation will come soon and I would like, within the remainder of the time available to me, to revert to the problem which concerns my delegation, the questions of the programme, structure and methods of work of our Organisation.

One of the founders of the Organisation many years ago wrote: "In Geneva we have but one objective: the organisation, the establishment of peace"; and I would, frankly, Mr. Director-General, like to feel that the words I have quoted would become a symbol of our Organisation. All the promises are there to implement this basic idea. This was very convincingly set out by Mr. de Castro, Government delegate of Brazil.
No other organisation could carry out more thorough and over-all studies and better prepare proposals concerning disarmament in connection with the economic and social consequences of the armaments race, the increase in defence expenditure, and also the economic and social aspects of a programme to limit the defence expenditure which would ensure a gradual transition to general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

During the 44 years of its existence, thanks to its international character and tripartite structure, the I.L.O. has accumulated considerable experience in the study of the social and economic problems of our time.

Such research, of course, must precede and not follow agreements concerning the programme of disarmament, in order to pave the way for its implementation. This work could at the same time contribute to strengthening the political arguments in favour of disarmament by offering valuable economic and social supporting data; it could indicate the best ways from the social point of view of eliminating possible difficulties during the period of transition in certain countries—for example, a temporary drop in employment—and making adjustments to the new conditions of a world without arms.

The I.L.O. should put these tasks on its agenda at once and make the necessary appropriations in its budget for their implementation.

It is also important to make provision for co-operation by the I.L.O. with a view to achieving a large and permanent volume of international trade as a factor in the more complete utilisation of world resources which is indispensable for the achievement of the objectives laid down in the Declaration of Philadelphia and the strengthening of peaceful relations between countries. In this connection, the collaboration of the I.L.O. as regards the preparatory work for the organisation of the International Trade Conference which is expected to meet in March 1964 is its most urgent task.

The heavy responsibilities I have just mentioned cannot be discharged effectively without profound changes in the working methods of the I.L.O.

In declaring the Polish delegation's support for the main points in the Soviet memorandum, I consider it essential to emphasise the following. In order to ensure the democratic character of any organisation it is necessary to insist on the principle of the sovereignty of the general meeting of its Members—in this case the General Conference. The present situation in the I.L.O. is not in line with this principle; it violates the principle of fair division of authority among the responsible legislative organs—the General Conference—and the executive organs—the Governing Body and the Director-General—by debasing the Conference, limiting its powers and delegating too much power to the Governing Body. Those are the characteristics of the existing situation in the I.L.O.

A fairer division of responsibilities between the General Conference and the Governing Body must be secured, first, by establishing the Governing Body's responsibility to the General Conference as regards the implementation of the programme adopted by the Conference, and, secondly, by adopting the principle of the Director-General's responsibility to the Conference, and not to the Governing Body, for his actions.

We hope to have an opportunity to discuss these principles in greater detail in the committee which will work out concrete and constructive proposals based on the Director-General's Report.

The President—In agreement with the Vice-Presidents and in accordance with article 14, paragraph 10, of the Standing Orders, I am permitting a representative of the International Organisation of Employers to make a statement to the Conference. I call on Mr. Lagasse.

Interpretation from French: Mr. Lagasse (Representative of the International Organisation of Employers) — I am addressing the Conference on behalf of the International Organisation of Employers—that is to say, on behalf of the employers' confederations of 59 countries, all of which have been represented in as many tripartite delegations and to which many free employers at this Conference belong. I shall deal with a number of points, most of which are raised in the Director-General's Report, of which I should like to say that it provides an excellent basis for the discussion which has taken place so far.

The great majority of the Conference will understand that it has not been our intention to follow the example of many speakers who, instead of speaking of the programmes and structural problems of the I.L.O., have raised political issues, doubtless important, such as colonialism, disarmament and the representation of particular political systems, although the Conference is not the place where such problems should be discussed. Those people should understand that their opinions are so well known that endless repetition of them merely provides evidence, if any were needed, that their aim in coming here is not to unite the Conference but to divide it, to sow discord and destruction. I would add, before coming to the Director-General's Report, that we must find a means of eliminating speeches having nothing to do with the I.L.O.'s activities and of assuring equal treatment for all delegates in accordance with the Standing Orders but not with the interpretation of the Standing Orders given by the previous speaker.

The Director-General's Report deals at length with the tripartite principle. We agree with Mr. Tata and the great majority of speakers that this system is still the best. Unfortunately it is not by any means observed as it should be in all the I.L.O.'s activities. In societies which respect individual freedom, including freedom in the economic sphere, which have proved that they are also the societies which have reached the highest stage of economic development and which show the greatest active solidarity with new countries, discussions between labour and management have proved the value of the tripartite system whenever
the two sides have been able to act in full independence and in accordance with the national interest. Of course, this is despite the fact that the I.L.O. was explicitly from this rostrum. They cannot fit in with the tripartite system, and they know this perfectly well. There are other countries in all continents in which the independence of employers’ and workers’ organisations of their governments is not yet a well-established tradition and is not officially recognised. For them the trivalent principle seems to be a luxury which they appear to think they cannot afford, convinced that they know the only way of coping with economic and social underdevelopment. Let them look at the example of countries where these freedoms have been constitutionally independent. Let them learn from those countries and apply the lesson to their own needs. There is perhaps scope for persuasion and education there, and we hope that the I.L.O. will undertake this task successfully, with the assistance of employers’ and workers’ organisations.

The tripartite system should not remain an empty formula and there are two things in the Director-General’s Report which worry us very much. First, we cannot agree with the author of the Report when he states that, in connection with the problem of the coexistence within the I.L.O. of two conflicting ideologies, the rule of law and equity has prevailed, and that, on the whole, all the parties have accepted the procedure of the Appeals Board and the decision of the Conference with regard to the credentials of employers from communist countries. I think the Director-General is indulging in wishful thinking. The free employers reject in 1963, as they did in 1959 and as they have done since 1954, both the decision of the Conference and the Appeals Board system. We find now that certain Workers’ delegates are beginning to recognise that we are right. Since I do not have time to deal with this at greater length, I refer you to the report of the Appeals Board, which reproduces, without giving any valid reply, the arguments of the free employers put forward by the Chairman of the Employers’ group. Both the conception and the application of this system are contrary to the tripartite system of the I.L.O. and are seriously detrimental to the autonomy of the groups and therefore to the stability of the Organisation. It has been stated that the three independent persons who are members of that Board are governed by the principle that all delegates are equal but that some are more equal than others.

The politically ingenious system contemplated in the Director-General’s Report as a substitute for the credentials procedure would also be contrary to this basic principle. We are not the only ones who cannot admit the Conference should renounce its right to take decision on objection concerning the credentials of one of its members. Instead of sterilising the existing procedure on the pretext that it has raised serious problems and challenging the intellectual honesty of certain delegates whose independence we respect, let us recognise that the principal reason for the failure of the existing procedure is the political opportunism of Government delegates. Let us call on non-governmental delegates to be truly representative of employers and workers and independent of their governments. You saw this attitude, which I have just described, at work recently, and you have seen it at work over the last few years in connection with the complaints against employers from communist countries, particularly Hungary and Cuba, who are no more independent of their governments this year than they have been in the past. I would add that we support the proposals which have been made, in particular those asking for detailed information to be supplied by governments concerning the non-governmental delegates they appoint and the organisations which they had to consult before appointing these delegates, as well as the size of these organisations.

We think that, after a critical period in which Industrial Committees have often appeared to be mere claims committees rather than forums for the exchange of views and experience, these Committees are now serving a useful purpose. That does not mean the results justify the expenditure involved and that no changes are desirable. In particular, it would be necessary to direct the work of Industrial Committees towards the practical problems of industries in developing countries. This would call for a change in the selection of members of Industrial Committees to give greater weight to the wishes of employers and workers. Changes are also needed in connection with the selection of items to be placed on the agenda, and with regard to the rules which govern the choice of the places where meetings are held. They should be held in countries where the industries in question are growing rapidly.

We think the problems now involved in organising a Conference such as this at annual intervals deserve to be considered. We should try to see whether it would not be possible to hold such a Conference every alternate year. We are not opposed in principle—quite the reverse—to meetings and discussions between Employers’ and Workers’ delegates in the presence of Governments, but the cost of such a lengthy Conference, both for distant countries and for the budget of the Organisation as a whole, should be lightened. One should also take account of the relative importance of the various forms of activity of this Organisation. Another system would be to hold a big Conference every two years, and to have in the intervening year a session dealing only with necessary work, related either to the double-discussion procedure or to performing such constitutional obligations as the adoption of the budget and supervising the application of Conventions and Recommendations, those being essential aspects of the Conference’s work.

With regard to the standard-setting functions of the Conference, the burden of the existing membership of the Organisation it will be unrealistic to continue to adopt Conventions when we know very well that often they can
only give rise to false hopes among millions of workers in countries which cannot ratify these instruments, and could not apply them even if they did ratify them. A number of Conventions have not doubt been of very great value, but in many countries a large number of them are dead letters. It has been correctly stated that new Conventions could be more flexible in order to take account of different situations, and that old Conventions could be revised and adapted to conditions in countries which were not Members of the I.L.O. when these instruments were adopted by the Conference. We agree with this, but it should be said that a concern for flexibility should not lead to the adoption of standards, particularly in the field of human rights, which do not impose the same obligations on all ratifying countries. We cannot agree that there should be one kind of freedom of association for the U.S.S.R. and another kind for the free countries.

I do not have time to deal with the question of the work of Conference committees, but I would refer you in that connection to the statements of our colleagues from the Federal Republic of Germany and Argentina, all of whose suggestions have our support. For reasons of principle—the autonomy of groups and the respect for free and proper elections—we are entirely opposed to the suggestions made to alter the procedure for elections to the Governing Body, and, for practical reasons, we are entirely opposed to suggestions to limit the competence of that body and to weigh down even further the already heavy agenda of our Conference.

We think, like other speakers, and particularly the Iranian Employers' delegate, that the regional activities of the Organisation, meetings of various kinds and technical co-operation, could be useful and of practical value if they are planned and carried out in close co-operation with employers' and workers' organisations. This will certainly raise problems, but it has happened all too often that meetings or operational activities at the regional level have had only a limited success because the agenda or the objective aimed at was not in accordance with the priorities in the countries concerned, and because political issues played too large a part.

The composition of the staff of the I.L.O. should reflect the composition of the Organisation. While paying tribute to the integrity of officials, we should like to defend the Office against the infiltration of persons whose aims and ideologies are contrary to those of the I.L.O. and to the policy which the staff is expected to apply.

Finally, we are in favour of sound division of activities in the international field, respecting the fields of competence of each organisation. We want to avoid overlapping. However, we think that the autonomy of the I.L.O. must be defended whenever it is challenged by other organisations in New York or elsewhere, since this Organisation is the only one which admits employers and workers on an equal footing, and this unique feature—and I think this cannot be too often repeated—has been and must continue to be a guarantee of the effectiveness of the I.L.O.'s work. This autonomy could well be defended in particular by tripartite delegations of the Governing Body whenever it is challenged.

Since I am short of time, I should like to conclude by saying that while we are critical and demanding, with regard to the existing situation and with regard to certain proposals, this is because we have faith in the I.L.O. and because we want to save it, if possible, from the crisis which has been forced upon it, and we want to prevent the repetition in future of past errors for which we are still paying the price.

Mr. WAGNER (Employers' delegate, United States)—I think it is proper that the Director-General's Report calls for an assessment of the future role and programmes of the I.L.O., and I wish it had been possible to devote our time exclusively to those things which make a lot of sense.

The unhappy events of recent weeks point out forcefully, however, the major failings of this Organisation. It has not faced up to the necessity of maintaining its basic principles. Those principles are admirably stated in the Declaration of Philadelphia. They are concerned with free labour, free employers, social justice and economic development. In addition there have been resounding declarations on human rights, freedom of association, freedom from discrimination, and on the elimination of forced labour and a number of other worthy objectives. But until now this Organisation has closed its eyes to the necessity of fighting for and protecting these principles of human freedom. Like practically everyone here, I am opposed to racial discrimination, but this is not the only question with which we must concern ourselves. We must insist on the elimination of repression of freedom of association, of repression of free speech, and of the continuation of forced labour wherever these practices are condoned or sanctioned by legislative edict or monolithic governments. Until and unless we find a way to make all of these practices, which are condoned by the force of laws or general practice, a mandatory basis for invalidation of credentials or suspension from activity, this Organisation will experience crisis after crisis, if it continues to exist.

The free employers have in the past undertaken to bring to your attention the importance of these matters and the necessity for action. They failed to receive support or consideration for their position. Chaos has been the result.

The forthright position of the I.L.O. on these fundamental principles is well known, and it is high time that nations which do not conform to those fundamental principles should either withdraw from this Organisation or be relegated to the status of observers.

There is another unresolved matter which will sooner or later result in another crisis. Mr. Lagasse has just touched on it, and I will not go into great detail, but it is the gradual breakdown of true representative tripartism. This began when the Workers' group and the Employers' group were deprived of complete group autonomy through the mockery called the Appeals Board. While this procedure is not sanctioned by the Constitution, people who are not truly free workers or free employers, but who are in fact agents of their
from the Soviet Republic recently said in his talk that there should be places for state-controlled employers. The Appeals Board should be abolished and genuine group autonomy re-established.

When the I.L.O. was first established there was a genuine need for a world organisation which would promote sound labour-management relations, develop programmes by which nations would improve the wages, working conditions and living standards of workers and their families and provide a forum through which labour, employers and governments might exchange mutually beneficial experience on social problems. The purposes and objectives of the I.L.O. were inherently sound at the time of its inception and for more than a quarter of a century thereafter. They are still sound in today's world if the Organisation pursued only those purposes and objectives. The emergence of many new nations with virtually no experience in handling their own affairs—economic and social—creates a new need which the I.L.O. should be serving. The deplorable fact is, however, that in the face of its new-found challenges and opportunities for effective service, the I.L.O. has been diverted by the Eastern European nations from its original purpose and has essentially degenerated into a cold-war forum and an instrumentality for political propaganda.

I protested at last year's Conference and again at the Asian Regional Conference against the use of this platform for such propaganda purposes. I had hoped that this year's Conference would witness an objective discussion of structural and programme matters without the same old propaganda clichés. But we have heard much more of the same. My country has been mentioned frequently with accusations that we are blocking disarmament. I do not think I have to tell here what the real facts are. I think they are well known. When these people come to this platform pretending to be champions of human rights and human freedoms, I can only say to them that when the foreign troops are withdrawn from Hungary and the wall is removed in East Berlin I will begin to have some faith in what they say.

Free speech is one of the cornerstones of human freedom and when they mention Alabama but fail to talk about the attacks on Africans in Prague and other racist incidents in Moscow and elsewhere I am a little lost as to why they do not bring up those things which also have some impact in their own countries. The Communists not only do not permit free speech in the strictest sense of the word but it is a fact that anyone who voices an opinion which is not acceptable to the State is incarcerated or worse. I feel strongly that it is high time that these people come to this platform pretending to be champions of human rights and human freedoms, I can only say to them that when the foreign troops are withdrawn from Hungary and the wall is removed in East Berlin I will begin to have some faith in what they say.

I would like also to call attention to the fact that the Director-General made it patently clear that the primary issue which had developed at this session was freedom of speech and the orderly process of organisation and procedure. As a free American employer I would—and shall—support orderly procedures to wipe out legalised discrimination, but I shall always oppose organised movements to circumvent established rules and laws which are the product of the total Conference.

It is indeed ironic that the socialist totalitarian bloc should advocate non-legal procedures in the course of this meeting we have had here. In the countries under their iron control, no segment of the population is permitted to challenge the supremacy of the State and the laws of the State. This is what we have been talking about with respect to this Conference and should have been talking about with respect to law and order, and finding ways and means under constitutional procedures, and under the Standing Orders to correct whatever it is that needs correction as we go along. I want to make it crystal-clear that I am completely in sympathy with the African nations, their problems and their objectives. However, I cannot be in sympathy with the use by anyone of methods which destroy not only the ability of the I.L.O. to eradicate discrimination or to support other basic principles of human rights for which the I.L.O. stands, but which would destroy the I.L.O. itself. We have got to look at these things objectively and get back to the proper position in this matter.

I would have liked, rather than go into these things I have talked about, to talk about the structure and policies and the role of the I.L.O. objectively. I am sorry—in fair fact, I am sad—that it becomes necessary again to talk about things which make for discord, because they are thrust at me every time I come here. I would, however, come to one section of the Director-General's Report in a little happier vein and this is the discussion of human rights and economic development. I regret that this has been referred to by so few speakers. I believe that the future policies and programmes of the I.L.O. should give a great deal of attention to this subject.

At the Asian Regional Conference, on economic development, some speakers from developing nations, commenting on their problems, said that they need more financial assistance from industrial nations; that they lack capital; and that their material resources are not adequate. The fact is, however, that their needs cannot be adequately met or satisfied by the assistance only of developed nations. There simply are not enough combined means in all of the major industrial nations to provide satisfactory living standards for all the nations of the world who have so little and who need so much. Some of these nations do have resources which have not been utilised actively and adequately. Some of them have gone into hiding, if you please. Capital has not come forth and done the job that it should because the environment in which these countries is not conducive to the use of capital in a manner in which those who possess it feel that they can do it with safety. There is a great need in
these nations for the creation of an environment which will induce not only such capital as is owned by their own nationals to be brought into active use, but also an environment which will induce private capital from the outside to go in and do the job of creating enterprises, creating jobs and promoting economic growth.

One great resource which every country has is human resources, but this, too, must be tilled and cultivated. It cannot be permitted to lie fallow. Technical assistance, vocational training, education in skills—both labour and management—are prime requisites for human and economic development. Education brings self-reliance, and that brings initiative and ingenuity and the product of these is growth and opportunity. At first this process is gradual but it pyramids rapidly as progress is made. That progress cannot be gained by edict; it comes through unleashing the latent capacities of people. The I.L.O. can do much to assist in this cultivation and development of human resources and it should be a major part of our programme.

From the wealth of ideas expressed here one thing stands out above all others to me. The majority of people who attend I.L.O. Conferences sincerely advocate policies which will protect human rights and promote economic progress for men and women everywhere. We want better standards of living; freedom from discrimination, opportunities for education and economic development. The dedication which most of you have shown towards these objectives is a long step towards realisation of them. That dedication speaks eloquently of the high purposes of the majority of the delegates who come here. The fact is that most of the leaders in my own country, whether they are in business, labour or government, come from humble beginnings and they are fully aware of the struggles our nation had in its beginnings when it achieved its independence. Therefore we feel kinship with the new nations of the world who have so recently attained their independence.

It was stated from this rostrum by a speaker from Eastern Europe that the Declaration of Philadelphia adopted about 20 years ago no longer has much validity and probably should be completely changed. It is true that we have had many changes in the world—technological, in communications, in speed of travel and in the establishment of new free independent nations—but may I remind you that the Declaration of Philadelphia declares age-old principles of freedom and justice, which are just as fully applicable today in a world of rapid change as they were then. These are not idle words adapted to shades of meaning and interpretation. They express the desires of the emerging nations of the entire world. They represent aspirations of human beings everywhere. They reject the idea that people must be moulded into a pattern of conformity and controlled thought. These principles are positive, not negative. The faults and the weaknesses of the I.L.O. pertain not to its essential principles but to the Machiavellian terminis who for years have used their membership to undermine the true purposes and effective services of this Organisation. The I.L.O. was not conceived as a forum for ideological warfare; it cannot survive as a forum for ideological warfare.

The challenge of this 47th Session of the Conference is to strengthen and then revitalise I.L.O. procedures and organisational methods so that its full membership shall be required to collaborate upon solving economic and social problems, generating economic growth, raising standards of living and preserving, or in many cases, reviving freedom of association for workers and for employers.

Mr. MICHANEK (Government delegate, Sweden)—A definition of the aims and methods of the I.L.O. in the family of international organisations cannot last long. In a world of change it must often be revised. The task of the international community is constantly changing, and the institutional set-up is likewise changing.

In general terms, I think it might be said that the I.L.O. was created primarily to define and to defend the interests and needs of workers in an industrialised society, a society in which workers needed special protection and assistance. Labour policy was equivalent to social policy, and social policy was primarily of interest for people of modest means. It is true that today workers still need protection, security and sometimes assistance, but it is also true that the same applies to all groups of the population of all countries in the world of today.

We have often been reminded, for example, that in developing countries the problems of the great agricultural population as a whole, whether employed or self-employed, must be observed and dealt with by the I.L.O. As another example of the broadening of the task of the I.L.O., we might note that social security in industrialised countries, to an increasing extent, is being built upon the principle of universal coverage, bringing the total population within the framework of social policy. Labour and social policy consequently has broadened its scope and become a policy not only for workers in the traditional sense but for the whole people.

Social or labour policies in earlier days were distinct from other policies, economic, commercial, educational, etc. Today we are all aware of the interdependence of all social and economic considerations in the development of our countries. We realise that trade and tariff policy is of paramount importance for labour. Those responsible for education and training are guided by the needs of production and of the labour force.

In fact, considerations concerning labour and social welfare have become primary objectives of public policy. In some countries full employment and social security for the whole population make up the basis of public concern and government policy, equally important as external security, defence and civil order. The right to work and the right of economic freedom
are as basic as the freedom of expression and other fundamental rights.

In this situation, the I.L.O. today has to find its place. The fundamental Labour Organisation cannot deal, of course, with all aspects of economic growth and public welfare. Trade and tariffs in general must be left to others: investment and taxation policies likewise. Fundamental education, although a basic social objective, is not our task. Nor can food production or the explosive increase in population in some parts of the world, although basic elements in the field of public welfare in general, be among the questions of immediate concern to the I.L.O. as far as the work programme is concerned.

The task of this exercise of ours in this debate is how to define and limit the work of the I.L.O. in order to enable this Organisation to make its contribution as efficiently as possible and in the best interest of those who are parties of the I.L.O.—workers, employers and governments.

The international organisations together make up a team, a fighting army if you like, working for the welfare of man, for peace and security; but a team gets its strength from the individual capability of its different members, working in concerted action for a common goal. In technical co-operation activities, for example, I should like to see the I.L.O. represent more often on expert teams and survey missions, including also experts on economic and financial policies, agriculture and health—and such collaboration with other United Nations agencies should, if necessary, be undertaken at the expense of individual I.L.O. experts drawing up programmes for action in isolated fields.

There is a tendency in the Report before us, if I have understood it rightly, to suggest that the I.L.O. should deal on its own with too many aspects of economic growth and public welfare. Research undertaken by the I.L.O. is asked for in a number of fields discussed in the Report such as employment objectives, incomes, labour relations, ergonomics and technological change.

In regard to research, the bottleneck in most fields is the lack of qualified personnel available for international service. We would think the I.L.O. should confine itself as a rule to the function of a clearing house for research undertaken by existing institutions and as a disseminator of valuable findings in its field of work. This has already been ably shown by central and regional I.L.O. institutions mentioned by different speakers in the present debate; and may I, for my part, point to the International Institute for Labour Studies, which I would like to see further developed as a model institution for carrying out the I.L.O. programme.

A number of new intergovernmental regional institutions have been built up in recent years. The I.L.O. should co-operate with them, to the advantage of both parties, but not duplicate their work; and it is for governments to see to it that these regional institutions do not in their turn duplicate the work of the I.L.O.

The expert function of the I.L.O. is important, but even more important, I think, is the function of the I.L.O. as a pool for ideas and, as it were, a school for policy-makers. It is essential to use available funds and personnel resources for seminars, study tours, specialised meetings and other conferences to which are invited trade unionists, employers and civil servants to discuss and to exchange knowledge and ideas. It is not always essential to formulate conclusions or to produce resolutions. The kind of discussion we had two years ago on employment policies at the International Labour Conference was, to take an example, of the greatest value and we welcome the conference to be held this autumn on the same topic. We believe this kind of discussion in itself to be at least as important as the resolutions or instruments which are produced by it.

The I.L.O. must concentrate its efforts. Among the fields of activity mentioned in the Report I think we should sacrifice certain parts of what is referred to as "incomes policy". General ideas of fair distribution of income have, of course, a place in I.L.O. ideology, but the more concrete interpretation of ideas regarding wages policy and income distribution cannot, I think, be given in international instruments. Instead, I think, we should aim at assisting the organisations of the employment market, labour and management, in handling wages matters with as little as possible of government interference. We should do that, inter alia, by promoting the idea of tripartism in all labour and social affairs. In social security, however, which has been dealt with in the Report under the heading of "incomes policy", both national governments and the I.L.O. have a very important role to play in the future, as hitherto.

In a world of rapid change our instruments and our institutions must be flexible. We demand mobility and adaptability from the labour force. Let us do the same in respect of our own methods of work. The system of Conventions, for example, is in need of review so that old instruments can be more easily adapted to new requirements and conditions.

This Conference has demonstrated the basic importance of the I.L.O. as a bridgehead in the field of human rights. We might accept a pause in certain fields of our technical work to allow for a regrouping of forces, but we must not for one moment keep silent or be inattentive as regards such fundamental principles as non-discrimination in employment and freedom of association, and, may I add, the right of the individual to productive work for his own well-being. But, while carrying on this struggle against the evils remaining from systems of domination of man by man, we must obey the rules of law. As the Director-General of the I.L.O. said in his fervent speech the other day, "Without law there can be no respect for dignity, no civilised recognition of equal rights and equal opportunities".

Besides the field of human rights there is one over-all priority which I wish to stress. The operational activities and technical co-operation directed towards the developing countries must, in the opinion of the Swedish government, be afforded all the efforts we are able to mobilise. Resources in money and manpower are always scarce in comparison with the needs in the field of work of this Organisation, but we are willing to favour every effort in directing
available resources to carrying out, as far and as well as possible, the workload of the I.L.O. under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, the programmes under the Special Fund of the United Nations and other such activities.

In his Report the Director-General has pointed to the significant division which exists in the ideological and political fields between East and West of this globe, but he has done so in order to stress another division which, in his opinion, is at least equally significant, namely the division between North and South —that is to say, between the industrial countries of the North and the low-income countries of the South.

We should not, of course, hide the division which exists between East and West, but I think we must concentrate our efforts to bridging the gap between the North and the South. From the far North I should like to invite the I.L.O. to turn South, to devote all the efforts it can to assist such member States of the South, old and new member States, as wish to avail themselves of the services of this great Organisation.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. BORISOV (Government delegate, U.S.S.R.)—The U.S.S.R. Government delegation welcomes the decision taken by the Director-General of the I.L.O. to submit the programme of activities and structure of the International Labour Organisation for discussion by the Conference.

A discussion of this kind has long been necessary, as many delegations at previous sessions of the Conference have pointed out. There must be no further delay in examining the future of our Organisation or in considering what measures can be taken to increase the effectiveness and purposefulness of its activities in pursuance of its constitutional tasks. We have learnt from experience not to be content with half-measures—a reorientation of the I.L.O.’s work in certain ways or a shift in the emphasis from certain types of activity to certain others; what we have to do is to formulate a bold programme of action that will meet the interests of the millions of working people. The implementation of such a programme calls for new and more democratic procedures within the International Labour Organisation, in keeping with present-day conditions and the new situation that has arisen in the world.

Radical changes of paramount importance have occurred in the world since 1944-46, when the Organisation last revised the principles underlying its Constitution and objectives. We have seen the rise of a world system of socialism—a social, economic and political community of free and sovereign nations advancing along the path of socialism and communism. The colonial system has been undermined and is crumbling away; certain countries still suffer under the colonialist yoke, but the peoples of the young sovereign States have already embarked on a new stage in their development and have arisen as the creators of a new life and as active participants in international politics. In the struggle for peace, for better living conditions for the working people and for the preservation and extension of their democratic rights and freedoms, the international labour movement is growing and gathering strength, despite the harmful division in its ranks. These changes in the world have also transformed the membership of the International Labour Organisation and make it imperative for us to undertake a thorough revision of its programme, organisation and methods of work.

If the I.L.O. does not want to be left behind in the irreversible course of history and fall short of its requirements, it must take these changes fully into account, adapt itself to them and assess the results of its activities by reference to them. Its success and its very existence as an international organisation entirely depend upon its doing so.

"It would be unrealistic for the I.L.O. to become the advocate of one system or set of institutions in opposition to others", says the Director-General in his Report. The I.L.O. would indeed be embarking on its own destruction as an international organisation if it were to defend any particular social system in present conditions of world progress. The Soviet delegation regards the Director-General’s attitude as evidence of his willingness to take steps to create an atmosphere within the I.L.O. of genuine international co-operation based on the full equality of all member countries, irrespective of their social systems, and on the final elimination of all forms of discrimination inside the Organisation itself. To achieve this end, however, sound declarations, however numerous, are not enough. What is needed is that the I.L.O. should be genuinely guided in its activities not by the interests of a narrow, privileged group commanding the wealth created by the labour of millions but by the interests of the millions of workers in all countries. This is what the workers of the world demand; it is also what the Constitution of the I.L.O. itself lays down. "As far as the Soviet Union is concerned", stated the Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, N. S. Khrushchev, in his message to the Conference in 1959, "it will fully support all measures taken by the I.L.O. to raise the living standards of the workers, improve their conditions of work and strengthen peace and co-operation between nations."

To fulfil the tasks laid down in its Constitution, the International Labour Organisation must first of all concentrate its attention on the major problems of today.

Millions of workers, the vast masses of the population in all countries, are vitally interested in safeguarding and strengthening peace. All genuinely international organisations, whatever their concrete and specific tasks, must serve as instruments of peace and peaceful coexistence between States. In the present case the I.L.O.’s obligation is particularly clear, for without a durable peace there can be no possibility of economic and social progress and no possibility of improving the condition of the working people. The Organisation can and should contribute to the achievement of this noble purpose.

The struggle waged over a period of years by the Soviet delegation, and by the delegations of many other countries, to transform the I.L.O. into a true instrument of peace and international co-operation will naturally con-
I.L.O. may try to represent this struggle as a progressive force in the I.L.O., to persuade the other socialist countries, as well as by all genuine desire felt by the Soviet Union and by peace. This struggle is an expression of the participation in safeguarding and strengthening the Organisation to take effective measures in the genuine and burning question of the I.L.O.’s propaganda device, there is no escaping the As the only organisation in which representatives of governments sit side by side with representatives of trade unions and employers from the majority of countries of the world, the I.L.O. can bring the whole weight of its authority to bear in helping to solve this cardinal problem of today, which affects the fate of all mankind. By adopting an unambiguous position and expressing itself firmly in favour of general and complete disarmament as a radical means of securing peace, the I.L.O. would render a definite service to mankind. Through a series of concrete studies showing what beneficial consequences would follow from general and complete disarmament in hastening the social and economic development of the less developed countries, expanding employment, reducing unemployment and improving the living and working conditions of the working population, the I.L.O. could help to provide a practical solution to this problem. Furthermore, the I.L.O. must be prepared, in the event of an agreement being concluded on general and complete disarmament under strict international control, to make recommendations not only on the appropriate use to be made of the resources thus released for social purposes and for the provision of assistance to the developing countries which have freed themselves, or are about to free themselves, from the colonialist yoke, but also on such problems as the vocational training of manpower, labour legislation and social security. The possibilities for I.L.O. action in this field are endless. What is needed is readiness to act.

The necessary prerequisite of social and economic progress in the developing countries is the complete liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism and its consequences in the political, economic and social fields. Here, a great measure of responsibility rests with the I.L.O. The International Labour Conference took a significant step in the right direction when, in 1962, it adopted a resolution concerning the activities of the I.L.O. to contribute to the eradication of the adverse consequences of colonialism in the fields of the conditions of work and standards of living of the workers. Nevertheless, neither the Governing Body nor the International Labour Office has hitherto taken sufficient measures to help implement the resolution, and the fact that this is their direct responsibility.

What has to be done is not merely to make a start on the effective implementation of this resolution, which is one of the most important to have been adopted within the I.L.O. in recent years; what is also needed is for the I.L.O.’s activities in connection with the eradication of the consequences of colonialism to become one of the main aspects of its entire work. This would be in keeping with the importance of this problem in the modern world. To this end the I.L.O. will have to take broad and vigorous action in the field of technical assistance to the developing countries, and also substantially increase its standard-setting and research activities. All long-term projects will have to be designed to secure not only political but also genuine economic independence for the new States and to afford equal rights and welfare for the working people. These objectives cannot be achieved without eliminating the vestiges of racial and other discrimination, creating national reserves of skilled labour, drafting progressive social legislation, industrialising the national economy and solving a number of other urgent problems, including land reform.

The next group of questions which must be in the centre of the I.L.O.’s attention relates to the rights and the working and living conditions of workers in the member States of the I.L.O.; these questions are of importance not only for the developing countries but also for the highly industrialised nations. There can be no question of singling out certain of these questions as being less important and capable of being omitted from I.L.O. activities in the immediate future; even here, however, certain cardinal problems stand out, and the I.L.O. must concentrate its attention on solving these first of all.

The social and economic progress of any country is vitally affected by the extent to which the working people and their organisations—participate in the drafting and implementation of national development plans. One of the I.L.O.’s paramount objectives is therefore to give effect to the principle of freedom of association, which is proclaimed in its Constitution. No one in the I.L.O. denies the importance of trade union rights. But there are considerable defects in the Organisation’s activities. Fields of work which should have helped to throw light on the true situation in the matter of trade union rights and activities in I.L.O. member States have been eliminated, while bodies which are based on undemocratic principles and whose activities are not in keeping with the interests of the working people and the objectives of the I.L.O. itself have been retained and fostered.

The I.L.O. activities in connection with the defence and extension of trade union rights should not take the form of interference in the internal affairs of the trade unions or interference in the natural process of their growth, nor should they take the form of attempts to propagate one particular method or trend of trade union activity which has been developed in the countries of one particular system. Rather, its activities should seek to guarantee the right to establish trade unions in full freedom and to ensure the necessary conditions for their free operation, the full implementation of all trade union rights and the abolition of anti-trade union legislation and practices, where such exist.
The General Conference has adopted several resolutions on these questions, although they have not always been drafted as effectively as they might have been. In the opinion of the U.S.S.R. delegation the I.L.O. should eliminate such defects as exist in its organisational work on the protection and extension of trade union rights.

The expansion of employment and the reduction of unemployment, both in the less developed countries and in those industrially developed countries where unemployment exists, must also figure prominently throughout the I.L.O.'s work. It is to be hoped that these matters will occupy a place commensurate with their importance both in the I.L.O.'s research work and in the work of the General Conference and the other bodies of the Organisation, so that recommendations can be drawn up for specific measures to be taken at the international and national levels to ease the acuteness of these problems. The Organisation has favourable opportunities ahead of it; by taking part in the International Conference on Trade and Development it could definitely help to solve one major problem directly related to the question of employment and unemployment. It must express its support for non-discriminatory development of international trade as one of the essential factors in world economic development directly affecting the interests of the working people in the I.L.O. member States. The I.L.O.'s opposition to all forms of discrimination in international trade must be unconditional and must more particularly extend to the actions of such narrow and exclusive economic and political groupings as the "Common Market", which has established a discriminatory customs régime against third countries. Vigorous action by the I.L.O. to reduce unemployment and expand employment would, we consider, demonstrate its ability to respond effectively to the demands of our time.

At the same time the I.L.O. must not, of course, neglect such specific aspects of improved working and living conditions as the reduction of working hours, the elimination of discrimination in employment, equal pay for equal work and social security. On some of these problems the I.L.O. has already taken its first—but only its first—steps; on others its achievements fall short of all expectations. Its standard-setting activities must therefore not only retain their importance, but even be given fresh impetus. What has to be done, of course, is not merely to revise any obsolete Conventions and Recommendations and prepare new ones (which is, in itself, of great importance). What is also needed is for the I.L.O. to secure the effective application of these Conventions and Recommendations in practice and to find ways and means of increasing its possibilities in this field.

As a summary of the foregoing comments on the I.L.O.'s programme of activities it is fair to say that the I.L.O. is faced with various major groups of problems, on which it will have to concentrate. These are:

- problems of promoting the maintenance and strengthening of peace as an essential condition for the improvement of the circumstances of the working people and for social and economic progress throughout the world;
- problems of facilitating the elimination of the adverse consequences of colonialism;
- problems of improving the working and living conditions of the working people and of protecting and extending the democratic rights of the workers and their occupational organisations.

The Soviet delegation realises that a more or less successful answer to the above-mentioned problems can be found within the framework and competence of the I.L.O. only if the Organisation's structure and methods of work are made more democratic, if all member States are given an equal opportunity to participate in determining its policy and practical activities and if an atmosphere of genuine international co-operation is created within the Organisation itself.

The Soviet delegation accordingly considers that a definite and even fundamental reorganisation should be undertaken in this field. In particular, measures must be taken:

- to enhance the role of the General Conference, as the highest authority of the I.L.O. responsible for formulating its programme and guiding its activities;
- to regularise relations between the General Conference and the Governing Body, which is the executive organ and should strictly perform its functions as such;
- to ensure effective supervision over the implementation of the resolutions of the General Conference, to the exclusion of any delays or obstacles attributable to its subordinate bodies;
- to ensure that the principle of universality is effectively applied in the membership of the I.L.O. and that the representatives of countries belonging to different geographical areas or having different economic and social systems take a fair and equal part in the work of all its bodies;
- to remove from the I.L.O. Constitution any obsolete provisions affecting special rights for metropolitan countries;
- to review and alter any rules governing the organisation and operation of the I.L.O. which hamper its normal and effective work on a democratic basis.

The U.S.S.R. Government delegation intends to submit more concrete proposals for the implementation of these measures at a later stage in the discussion of this question.

The U.S.S.R. Government delegation expresses the hope that the discussion of these questions, which are of such importance to our Organisation, will be fruitful and will lead to the adoption of constructive proposals enabling the Organisation to become more democratic and its work to be improved.

You will have noticed that I have read the memorandum by the Government delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the 47th Session of the General Conference of the I.L.O. on the programme of activities and structure of the International Labour Organisation. This memorandum was sent to the Secretary-General of the Conference on 7 June with a request that it should be distributed as
an official document. However, it was not circulated among delegates, and I was therefore obliged to read the memorandum in extenso from this rostrum.

Interpretation from French: Mr. WALINE (Employers' delegate, France)—Having the privilege of being one of those who have taken part in the work of the Organisation for the longest period, I would like to pass on to you the reflections to which this discussion had led me. The discussion has lost some of its value owing to the absence of our African friends, who I hope will soon be back with us.

The Employers' delegates of the U.S.S.R. said the other day that "The Conventions have always been a basic element in the I.L.O.'s standard-setting work and must continue to be so ".

It is true that one of the reasons for which the I.L.O. was established in 1919 was the hope that international Conventions, ratified by the greatest possible number of the countries concerned, might avoid the adoption of measures of social progress by one of those countries which would penalise it in international competition. That is why the first Conference adopted several Conventions, particularly on hours of work in industry.

From that time, there was fear of the difficulties which the ratification of Conventions might meet with. Not only did they include in the Constitution an article permitting States which had dependent territories to decide whether their ratification applied only to the metropolitan country involved, but they also foresaw the possibility of including in Conventions clauses which would be more flexible for a given State, and this was done in the Hours of Work (Industry) Convention, 1919. Several years later, when Albert Thomas, despite his arduous skill, did not obtain the ratification of the main States for this Convention, the Employers invented the idea of conditional ratifications, in which certain countries might make the coming into force of their own ratifications dependent upon the ratification of the same Convention by their main competitors. But all these efforts have given highly unsatisfactory results.

How can one fail to recognise that today the difficulties are greater still? The facilities or expedients I have mentioned have been more or less abandoned. One can hardly see how they could play their part in an Organisation of 108 member States. Furthermore, those 108 States have very different levels of development, so different that the less favoured might complain if their development were hampered by adoption of Conventions in the light of conditions in the industrialised countries.

The result is that often the Conventions which we adopt are in quite general terms and the conditions for their application are embodied in mere Recommendations.

Does this mean that the policy of Conventions has been a failure? Certainly not.

The best proof of this lies in the fact that we have just adopted a Convention concerning the guarding of machinery. It would be unreasonable to deny the influence of these Conventions, even when insufficiently ratified, on social progress in the different countries.

I am glad that I was one of those who, in 1945-46, promoted the new draft of article 19 of the Constitution, which requires States to inform the Organisation of the reasons why they have not been able to ratify a given Convention. This extended the competence of our excellent Committee of Experts when examining of annual reports. Now we are able, though we have not used this means sufficiently, to proceed periodically to exchanges of views on the state of labour legislation throughout the world.

Nevertheless, in the near future, the adoption of Conventions worthy of the name will often be difficult. Some people tell us that it is at the regional level that we can do what becomes too difficult here. No doubt there is some truth in that, although it has not yet been proved; indeed, in many parts of the world there are the same differences in development as there are internationally.

There is certainly one field in which our international Conventions retain all their value and where they could not be replaced by regional agreements. It is the creation of the I.L.O. itself. The creators of the I.L.O. threw open when they gave the Organisation a second mission: to proclaim and to safeguard the essential principles which are, in a way, a social reflection of civil rights.

At Paris in 1919, at Philadelphia in 1944 and at Montreal in 1946, those who drafted or revised our Constitution stated these great principles on which our Organisation is founded. Unanimously or by large majorities our Conferences have laid down in Conventions several of these principles, such as freedom of association, the right of collective bargaining, the prohibition of forced labour and the prohibition of discrimination.

Unless I am mistaken, no one here has ever dared openly to object to these essential rights. The best proof of this is that the moral action of this Organisation is as important as its technical cooperation, as it is now called—which has become our third function.
One cannot exaggerate the eminent service rendered by Mr. David Morse to these young countries when, soon after the war, he showed the very great importance of this operational activity, which has been added to our legislative work. We are going in the right direction, and we should now join our efforts to those made on the same lines by other organisations and by countries, in the forefront of which I am proud to see France.

I am sure that if the I.L.O. has been able to survive the League of Nations and render such services it is due above all to its tripartite character. The value of our Conventions and Recommendations is largely due to the fact that they are elaborated with the participation of trade unionists and employers who are independent of their governments, and the agreement of the two groups directly concerned is their best claim to ratification by the governments.

As for the great principles which I have mentioned, we—our trade union colleagues and ourselves—are the most ardent advocates of these. Freedom to work, freedom of association and their corollaries are the very foundation of the activities of our national organisations. As my compatriot, Mr. Farine, speaking for Mr. Bouladoux, so rightly said on Saturday, tripartism plays a useful part in the elaboration, application and control of technical assistance plans. This is particularly true as these plans deal with education programmes in which the trade organisations and government departments and co-operatives can provide the I.L.O. with experts who have sound practical experience.

It is not by chance that our Constitution, in article 2, indicates that the Organisation includes, besides the Conference in which the national delegations meet, a Governing Body composed, as far as the non-governmental groups are concerned, of persons who take instructions only from the Workers' and Employers' delegates to the Conference. This body is thus a permanent embodiment of tripartism. Its expansion and renewal will now give it still greater authority than in the past.

The Employers' delegates from the communist countries assert, it is true, that the Employers from the countries which they call capitalist unfairly monopolise the Employer representation in the Governing Body, as in the committees of the Conference. We could reply simply that they are the only ones who have appealed to the Conference's Appeals Board and the only ones who complain at the results of the Governing Body elections. However, as their claim throws confusion into the reasons for which the Employers from the free countries do not give them their confidence, it is necessary to recall our attitude once again. It does not stem from the fact that these delegates direct nationalised undertakings. At the Conference as in the Industrial Committees, such as the Coal Mines Committee and the Inland Transport Committee, directors of such undertakings from other countries have often sat among us and have had our complete confidence. Nor is our attitude due to any personal animosity against the persons concerned, even when they pile disagreeable epithets on our heads. We are, however, absolutely convinced that as a result of the political and social régime of the communist countries, subject to the authority of a single party which controls the whole economy and society, it is impossible for those delegates, whatever their personal qualities, to be independent of their governments.

Again as my compatriot said, "Tripartism is conceivable only if the parties are placed on an equal footing of mutual respect for the independence of government, employers and workers", for these things are very closely linked to respect for freedom of association.

That is the reason for our attitude. We believe it to be defending the higher interest of the Organisation, quite apart from our own right of free selection.

In conclusion, I should like to remind you of the advice given us a few months before his death by an eminent man who had been President of the Conference and Chairman of the Governing Body. In his moving speech of 10 March 1961, after saying that the essential elements of the I.L.O.'s work were the workers and the employers, Paul Ramadier added that if the organisations of workers and employers are to be real, powerful, if they are to make a profound and far-reaching impact on world opinion, they must express independently, without any pressure, the common feeling that they are free, free in their establishment, free in their organisation and free in their action. I hope that these wise words will not be forgotten when we come at a later stage to discuss the conclusions to be drawn from this debate.

(The Conference adjourned at 1.15 p.m.)
TWENTY-THIRD SITTING

Monday, 24 June 1963, 3 p.m.

President : Mr. Dreyer

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT ¹ : SUBMISSION, DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—The first point on the agenda of this afternoon’s sitting is the report of the Committee on Termination of Employment. I would ask the Chairman of this Committee, Mr. Bland, and the Reporter, Mr. Douty, to be so kind as to come to the platform.

I call on Mr. Douty to submit the report.

MR. DOUTY (Government adviser, United States ; Reporter of the Committee on Termination of Employment)—It is a great honour for me to present for your consideration the report of the Committee on Termination of Employment. The report has been published. I shall briefly call attention here to the objectives sought by the Committee and the general nature of its conclusions.

The Committee was concerned with the formulation of procedures to be followed in cases of individual dismissal, which are often related to the personal behaviour of the worker, and in cases of reductions of the work force, which almost invariably have their roots in economic circumstances. These matters are clearly of major importance to both workers and employers. Moreover, they have general implications for economic progress. Termination procedures that hinder desirable redistribution of workers among firms and industries, or which undermine industrial discipline, tend to retard economic development. On the other hand, the absence of fair and orderly procedures tends adversely to affect worker morale and productivity.

These dual considerations were fully reflected in the vigorous debate that occurred in the Committee both last year and at the present session. A set of general principles to govern termination of employment has emerged from this debate. These principles are calculated to provide the worker with protection against unjustifiable termination, but not to prevent necessary personnel actions by employers. The fact should be emphasised that the question of the proper size of the work force of an enterprise is not involved in the Recommendation before you.

In summary, the Recommendation states that termination of employment should not take place unless there is a valid reason relating to the capacity or conduct of the worker, or the operational requirements of the enterprise. Certain circumstances or conditions, including union activity and membership, race, sex, and religion, are specifically excluded as grounds for termination. An appeals procedure is provided for cases of alleged unjustifiable termination, with the Appeals Board authorised, where an allegation is found to have substance, to award appropriate remedies. Some form of income security for terminated workers, through social insurance or private benefits paid for by the employer, or a combination of the two, is recommended. In cases of dismissal for serious misconduct, a period of notice or compensation in lieu thereof, and separation benefits paid for by the employer, may be withheld. These, together with certain other related provisions, make up the standards designed for general application.

The Committee also adopted a set of supplementary provisions concerning reduction of the work force. These include the principle, when a lay-off is in prospect, of early consultation with workers’ representatives on ways to minimise its incidence, and the enumeration of a variety of subjects on which consultation may prove beneficial. It is recommended that precise criteria be established to determine the selection of workers in a reduction-of-force procedure.

Note is taken of the role that might be played by the public authorities. General principles are established for the re-engagement of laid-off workers.

You will note that the scope of the instrument, in terms of worker and industrial coverage, is quite broad. The instrument is before you in the form of a Recommendation to be implemented in a variety of ways consistent with national industrial relations practices. In this connection, I should like to call attention to the statement in the Director-General’s Report (page 170 of the English text) to the effect that “a standard [that is, an instrument in the form of a Recommendation] which can be widely accepted as such may well be more effective in practice than obligations which are unlikely to be equally widely assumed”. The present Recommendation represents a pioneer effort by the I.L.O. to develop standards in

¹ See Appendix VII, p. 578.
this area of vital concern to both workers and employers. The area is characterised by many difficult and subtle problems and contains numerous implications for managerial and worker behaviour, for productivity, and for industrial peace. The Committee hopes that its work will have many fruitful applications throughout the world.

It is a great pleasure, on behalf of the Committee, to pay the highest possible tribute to our Chairman, Mr. Bland of Australia. His firmness and experience gave direction and discipline to a complex and controversial discussion and drove us to the completion of our work with unfailing fairness and good humour. Great credit attaches also to our Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Geijer of Sweden for the Workers, and Mr. Yllanes Ramos of Mexico for the Employers. Although they differed at many points in the discussion, they both strove diligently and effectively for the construction of a viable international instrument.

Finally, the Committee would not want me to conclude without expressing its deep appreciation to Mr. de Givry and his colleagues from the Office, whose first-rate reports and highly efficient technical services provided the basis for its work.

I present for the approval of the Conference the report and the proposed Recommendation of the Committee on Termination of Employment and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDENT.—The report is now open for general discussion.

Interpretation from Spanish : Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Employers' delegate, Mexico; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Termination of Employment)—The Employers' group of the Committee on Termination of Employment attended the meetings and took part in the work of this Committee in a spirit of constructive endeavour.

Of course, we feel that in a world where apparently people wish to shut their eyes to the fact that the employers and the system of free enterprise are best placed to raise the standard of living and to help stabilise the economic situation of the country, employers are apparently thought of as only someone you can tax and criticise. Psychologically it is very agreeable for us to see that there is some initiative left to us. However, we did not come with any other criterion and spirit than that of wishing to work on a human problem and on a technical problem in a spirit of constructive co-operation.

I should like, first and foremost, to express the thanks of the Employers' group—and I think I can speak for all three groups—to Mr. Bland for his extraordinarily fine leadership, to Mr. Douty for his very discreet action as an honest and objective Reporter and to the Office, Mr. de Givry and his fellow workers for the very splendid preparatory work. Without these elements we certainly could not have accomplished anything at all.

In the nightmare of the abnormal working days that we passed through we did not lose our spirit of initiative in the three groups and thus we were able to continue with our work. I should like to be very clear about one problem in connection with which unquestionably there will be some speeches from Employer members. We have legislation, systems of collective agreements and collective bargaining and employer-worker relationships which are very different and contrasting in many countries. In the field of termination of employment there are many very different systems, philosophies and principles which are very different and which necessarily clash. There is no system necessarily better than another one, provided that it works well for the welfare of a given country itself, given its history and a given atmosphere. We must respect the conditions in every country and therefore when the first problem was raised as to whether this was to be a Convention or a Recommendation we were in favour of a Recommendation by a very large majority of votes, due to one very important factor.

Mr. Douty quoted from the Report of the Director-General where he explains what a Recommendation is. However, I would invite you to read our Constitution, article II, paragraph 6, where it is made very clear that a Recommendation is not simply a written expression of something which some day or other will be applied. It is more than that. It requires, first of all, communication within the period of one year to the competent authorities. Secondly, it is essential that the Director-General be informed. And thirdly, the Governing Body periodically will request reports on the implementation of it. Therefore, there is a certain responsibility on the Governing Body and I hope that the Governing Body will know how to shoulder this responsibility and ask for reports regularly.

We cannot accept a Convention because this is something of a technical nature which is determined by individual circumstances and which does not really lend itself to a Convention, unless we have a Convention which would be simply on paper without ratifications. Therefore, this is a problem which is typically a problem for a Recommendation and that is the conclusion which we reached.

It is necessary to realise that a Recommendation is what is suitable and adequate, more particularly when it affects Federal States government where the question of labour law does not come within the jurisdiction of the federal Government.

The problem of national solutions was to respect what should be respected. In Paragraph 1 you find that effect may be given to the Recommendation through national laws or regulations, or collective agreements or in such other manner as is consistent with national practice. There you have the essential and indispensable flexibility which you could not find in a Convention. Immediately thereafter we find in this Recommendation certain definitions. Our experience in previous years in the field of terminology and definitions was such that we decided to keep these definitions down to a bare minimum because this is very shaky ground.

We have to distinguish very clearly the following points: first of all, this document relates exclusively to the problem of termination of employment, not suspension. This is of interest because here we have included the two main
problems of termination: first of all, what is properly at the initiative of the employer, in cases where by reason of acts of omission or commission on the part of the workers, the employer has the right to terminate employment. On the other hand we have what we have called in English "redundancy", of which there is no better definition, perhaps, than to say it is the system under which, in an undertaking, the number of workers exceeds staff requirements, and therefore there has to be a reduction.

Having outlined the problem in these terms we must examine certain aspects thereof in order to make clear the position of the employers. There is one concept which is a humane one and a just one—and that is the idea of stability in employment. The last barrier in the way of absolute individualism in the relationship between employer and worker is broken when there is a philosophy which tends to establish permanency in employment.

It is just, it is right, that if a worker does his job properly you cannot say to him the next day: "Go on, get out: I don't want to see you any more." That is not fair. We employers have accepted the principle and the philosophy that what is desirable is permanency and stability in employment. Let us accept, from the humane point of view, that that is desirable and adequate; but the employer is responsible for the undertaking—for the discipline and efficiency and productivity of his plant—and it may happen that at a given time he finds he cannot keep workers surplus to the requirements of the undertaking. The employer must therefore have guide-lines on which to base his decision.

Accordingly, and in line with the concept of stable employment, if the employer is responsible for the efficiency and the permanency of a source of employment, it is necessary that he have available to him the possibility of eliminating undesirable elements; this is one of the main problems we have before us—up to what extent can the employer apply as a subjective criterion, or yield to the claim of a worker who does not want to be dismissed. The employer of course has to give his reasons but all of you who have connections with bodies, which are not empowered to intervene in the undertakings and in accordance with the procedures established by the law of the country, it is a pity, because then we would have had this in the Recommendation.

The problem of compulsory reinstatement was discussed. You will see something very peculiar in the Report. First of all, the text establishes a situation where, on the one hand, if the decision is to reinstate the worker, the employer's responsibility is discharged by reinstating the worker and paying unpaid wages. On the other hand, if the worker is not reinstated then he is entitled to compensation. If we take this literally and if we also take into consideration what was said by the representative of the Office in paragraph 29 of the Report, we will find that this is not laid down and that the problems of essential reinstatement were not settled.

Unfortunately my time is up and I cannot go on, but I should like to ask for a couple of minutes more, as Vice-Chairman of the Employers' group. If I could have about four
more minutes, I think I could give you a complete picture.

But since there is a rule I shall simply say that the report was not voted on, as you can see from paragraph 58. I shall myself vote in favour of it; other Employers' members will not be in favour of it; others will abstain. However, I believe that this is a just, well-balanced document and the best we could obtain. It will be a Recommendation which I sincerely hope the different countries will apply.

Mr. GELDER (Workers' adviser, Sweden; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Termination of Employment)—First I should like to join Mr. Yllanes Ramos in expressing our appreciation of our Chairman, Mr. Bland, and our Reporter, Mr. Douty, and the staff of the Office.

The total membership of the Committee on Termination of Employment last year was 147. This year the Committee consisted of 176 members. There were more members of this Committee last year than in any other Committee of the Conference. That indicates that the problem of termination of employment is at present of great importance in most countries all over the world. The reason for this is easy to state. In many countries there is no particular protection against unavoidable dismissals. Fifty years ago the situation in most countries was that the employers had freedom of dismissal. That meant that an employer could dismiss a worker not only if he had a valid reason but even if he had no reason at all, and he had no obligation to state his reason. That right was based upon the general principle of freedom of contract. Today the theory is accepted that the general principle of freedom of contract leads to injustice in labour-management relations. In the private undertakings the employers have the better position and the workers, unless they have strong trade unions, have to accept what the employers order. The new doctrine runs that the employers have duties to the community; the relations between workers and employers are to be seen not only in their economic aspects but, far more, in their social aspects.

The I.L.O. has adopted several Conventions on conditions dealing with fundamental human rights. For example, the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948, the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958, and the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951. The problem of job security belongs to the same category of fundamental human rights. It would therefore have been natural that the international instrument we have to discuss today should have taken the form of a Convention. At least it would have been appropriate if the instrument had taken the form of a Convention about the general principles and a Recommendation containing supplementary rules. The majority of the Committee has taken the position that we should adopt only the Recommendation. In the Workers' group we regret this, and we hope that next time we discuss this problem in the International Labour Conference the result will be a Convention.

In the meantime we have to draw attention to what the Director-General says in his Report to this Conference about the radical change in the effectiveness of Conventions since 1946. I will now make some very brief remarks on the main points in the proposed text. The basic principle in this Recommendation is stated in Paragraph 2: "Termination of employment should not take place unless there is a valid reason for such termination connected with the capacity or conduct of the worker or based on the operational requirements of the undertaking, establishment or service." The adoption of this principle is of the greatest importance, not only for developing countries but also for some highly industrialised countries. In my own country, Sweden, for example, the employers legally have the right to dismiss workers without obligation to give a reason for this action. The Recommendation contains no definition of the term "valid reason". Perhaps it is impossible to give an exhaustive definition. But the important thing is that the Recommendation enumerates some situations which should not constitute valid reasons. It is to be observed that this enumeration is in no way exhaustive but only gives examples—of course, the most important.

The proposal of the Employers to include non-membership of a trade union was rejected. This question is not, as the Employers say, a question of human rights; it is a question of how to prohibit agreements with trade unions that only organised workers shall be employed.

The right place for this is not in a Recommendation dealing with protection of the workers against action by the employers but in a Recommendation protecting employers against trade unions, and I think there is no need for such a Recommendation. The employers have the power to protect themselves.

The next important principle in the Recommendation is the workers' right to appeal against the dismissal to a neutral body. We on the Workers' side agree that it is desirable at first to try to find solutions on the level of the undertaking, or by machinery established by collective agreement, but this should not deprive the worker of his right to appeal directly to a neutral body.

The third general principle in the proposed Recommendation is that the neutral body should be empowered to order that the worker, unless reinstated, shall be paid adequate compensation. There was a lengthy discussion in the Committee, from the Workers' side, that reinstatement should be the normal remedy for an unjustified dismissal. We had no success, but it is to be noted that the Recommendation presents both the possibility of reinstatement and the possibility of compensation.

The question of consultation of the workers' representatives in individual dismissals has not been satisfactorily solved in the proposed Recommendation. In many countries rules on such consultation already exist and experiences of this aspect may express the hope that countries where such consultations do not exist will take advantage of these experiences and introduce, as soon as possible, such rules in their countries. The Recommendation should not, as is said in the report, simply maintain the status quo but should point the way for social progress.
Finally, I shall summarise. The proposed Recommendation is not satisfactory in every detail but as a whole it is a step in the right direction. It will be a good guide for workers, governments and, perhaps, for employers too, on the way to good labour-management relations, so I hope it will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. MEHTA (Government delegate, India)—Two interludes occurred this year which interrupted the work of this Committee and, I dare say, that of the other Committees. Firstly, there were the Governing Body elections and then the African crisis. The first involved, among other things, a temporary absence of the Chairman of this Committee. The second resulted in the absence of some members, some temporarily and others not so temporarily. I deliberately avoid the word “permanently” for I have no doubt that those who are absent today will return to the fold in the near future. The Chairman was back very soon; hence this early report. Let me congratulate him on his success in the elections. He came back to us reinvigorated and soon made up for lost time. Unfortunately, it was not so easy for those members of the Committee who had to be absent during the African trouble. On return to work they found themselves like schoolboys who had played truant (or, as they say in the United States, played hookey). There were heavy arrears, and for many days they had to struggle with more homework than usual.

Reverting to the African question, may I just say that even before the French Revolution the desire for equality was Europe’s main political preoccupation. In the last fifty years it has also become a dominant political factor in Asia and Africa. The urge to be equal asserted itself in the American revolution, in the English Civil War and by the sixteenth century Anabaptists. It is perhaps in the long run the inevitable political consequence of the Christian belief that all men are brothers. Since all are equal in the eyes of God, this also requires a rather gymnastic form of philosophical reasoning to prove that men should not be equal in their own so much lesser eyes. Nineteenth-century history no less than twentieth-century history is, above all...

The PRESIDENT—I would call your attention to the fact that we are discussing the report of the Committee on Termination of Employment, and I would ask you to stick to this subject.

Mr. MEHTA—Half a second more, Mr. President, and I will revert to the report.

Nineteenth-century history, no less than twentieth-century history, is above all an assertion of equality by every group which had been suppressed, whether on the grounds of religion, language, economics, sex or class. I make this reference to show that the discrimination practised by the Republic of South Africa on the basis of colour is against the current of history and cannot go on for long. If constitutional agitation and the conscience of the world do not put an end to it a revolution will.

Coming more specifically to the report of the Committee on Termination of Employment, I have only one general point to make and two particular points; I shall make them very briefly. Both while participating in the deliberations of the Committee and while reading the report I was struck by the sincere and ceaseless efforts to make the recommendations broad-based enough to embrace the practices obtaining in most countries, and the feeling of satisfaction that all derive from this achievement seems to indicate that there was virtue in this approach; that, in the words of Hamlet, it was “a consummation devoutly to be wished”.

To me, two consequences seem to flow from this approach. Firstly, it dilutes the Recommendation to such an extent that it does not have even the semblance of boldness, freshness or newness about it. Secondly, in so far as it sanctifies existing practices it perpetuates them and stands in the way of any further advance. The danger in conforming to practices already obtaining is that the standard is set by the least progressive, the weakest link in the chain, which we accept. In this connection, take the statement made by the Representative of the Director-General with reference to the comparative merits of reinstatement or compensation in proven cases of unjustified dismissal. Here is what he says: “In Africa the point the Office had taken into account the recommendation public servants, except where constitutional provisions exclude the application of one or more provisions of this Recom-
mendation. No definition of "public servant" is given and therefore the term includes all categories. An industrial worker, however, is defined by law in my country. He is a person getting less than 500 rupees per month and not engaged in managerial work. All public servants and industrial workers as defined are covered by this instrument. This leaves out a very large number of educated young men and women who take up a commercial career and become executive assistants, as they are called, in various commercial houses. In my country these men and women have no guarantee against arbitrary dismissal, no court of appeal, as they have no contract. They live from year to year if not from month to month. They have no social security system, no trade union, no unemployment benefit scheme and no employment service. I think the instrument should have covered these also.

My second point is about consultation with unions before discharging a worker. In India, where trade unions are divided on political considerations and there is a good deal of rivalry between them, it is not possible for a union to agree to the dismissal of one of its members without committing "hara-kiri" or, at least, losing its workers to its rival. Consultation, therefore, is likely to worsen industrial relations and not improve them.

Lastly, by a majority vote the Committee decided that marital status did not constitute a valid reason for terminating employment, and took the trouble to define "marital status." The definition runs as follows: "... 'marital status' referred to such things..."—please mark the word "things"... as being single or getting married or divorced or becoming a widower or widow or the establishing of other permanent forms of domestic relationships. Please note again the words "domestic relationships." It is obvious from the definition that we were thorough in our work in the Committee. Even the editors of the Oxford or Webster's Dictionary would object before such a definition. And, if this definition leads anyone to think that there is a lack of sense of humour in the Committee, let him read this article in his dictionary and I quote from the draft report: "The definition and interpretation of such things..."—"things" again—"should be left to the national law and practice."

Incidentally, we did not attempt a definition of "sex" as constituting a valid reason for terminating service. If we had attempted that, I am sure we should have out-Freuded Freud. We shrank from this task, and I am glad we did.

All this shows that we enjoyed our work in this Committee, which was made possible in no small degree by the able stewardship of Mr. Bland, the Chairman, and by the able co-operation of the Employers' and Workers' groups.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. MONTT BALMACEDA (Employers' delegate, Chile)—To clarify the situation of the delegation which I represent in connection with this proposed Recommendation concerning termination of employment at the initiative of the employer which has now been submitted to this assembly for its consideration, I feel it my duty to make the following statement.

This draft will be voted against by my delegation, because we considered that, as a general principle, termination of employment of all personnel without any discrimination whatever, even for justifiable cause, is unacceptable in my country. In general terms, it is incompatible with the whole life of our undertakings, where the needs of operation may make it necessary at any given moment to change the quality or the quantity of composition of the personnel. These elements, we feel, are not sufficiently covered in the document proposed, for although it is true that the proper functioning of an undertaking may constitute a justifiable cause for termination of employment, it is no less true that the proof of this cause is subjected to a whole process which will always be dilatory and complicated and will not really operate very satisfactorily.

I should like to add that in a new country, such as the one I represent, in full course of development and beginning to reach maturity in the field of labour relationships, making the termination of employment subject to causes which would be difficult to prove would be a most negative factor for the management of any undertaking.

There are certain aspects of the proposed instruments in which the Chilean legislation is still more advanced, because under our legislation circumstances such as the fact of being a candidate for the office of representative of the workers, or having acted as such, constitutes a sufficient element to prevent a person from being dismissed, unless there are serious causes properly proved.

Moreover, legislation in Chile provides for special laws in the case of termination and, during the period of notice, the worker is given a certain length of time without loss of wages, so that he can find a new job; and, in connection with the collective reduction of the work force, our legislation lays down exceptional notice periods and also exceptional arrangements in favour of the workers affected.

Finally, I would say that our vote was against the proposed Recommendation in general, since it constitutes a whole which cannot be broken down into individual and separate paragraphs for approval or disapproval. Therefore we have to approve or reject it as a whole.

Mr. DURGAWAT (Workers' adviser, India)—Mr. President, I am thankful to you for giving me time to express my few observations on the proposed Recommendation on Termination of Employment. I am not here to oppose the instrument, but I cannot help disagreeing with some of the points contained in it.

The question of job security is the most important factor in the life of a worker. The feeling of insecurity is not only detrimental to the moral, mental and material development of an individual but it is also the cause of the deterioration of the moral and mental standards of the worker which is the cause of so many complex social problems.
I strongly feel that an international instrument of this kind ought to have been expressed in the form of a Convention rather than that of a Recommendation.

Another point which is agitation my mind is the use of the word "employer" in the instrument. Today we have advanced much in the field of technology and science and we are trying to reach the moon, and our brothers and sisters are moving in space, but I am sorry to say that, as far as human relationship is concerned, our mentality belongs to the eighteenth century. The use of the word "employer" conveys the existence of a master and servant relationship which again reminds me of the feudal age.

Let us examine who is the employer today in this age of big corporations and public limited companies. The so-called employer is merely managing the money of the public, that is to say of the shareholders, and for that he is being paid by way of commission or salary. He is only a worker on the managerial side, getting greater advantages and sharing a greater responsibility than the ordinary worker of the concern. He is only a co-worker and servant relationship which again reminds me of the feudal age.

The second point is that the big companies and enterprises are there to cater to the needs of the people; therefore it is the consumer who gives employment to both the management and the worker. It will thus be much more appropriate if we can replace the word "employer" by the word "management" in the instrument under consideration. It will give dignity to the worker and will remove the eighteenth-century mentality in the field of industry.

In our own country we are experimenting in the field of industrial relations by constituting joint management councils consisting of an equal number both from the side of the workers and the management. And I may mention here that we are making good progress in this field. The relationship has improved, the production and efficiency of the worker has risen and he is being educated every day to be responsible and to look towards the problem in a wider context. It is in the interest of the industry to give the feeling of partnership to the worker in the undertaking, so that he may feel one with the concern. It will raise his moral and mental standards to the benefit of all.

The workers of the developing countries want to look towards standards established by the I.L.O. as their goal, but I am sorry to say that we are disappointed when the standards recommended by the I.L.O. become so flexible that they do not meet the aspirations of the workers.

Mr. President, through you I want to appeal to this Conference that the time has come when management and governments should change their outlook towards workers and should consider that a worker in the joint enterprise, which must be seen for the good of the people.

I am not opposed to the proposed text, but I am opposed to the mentality and spirit which forced us to make so many compromises, as is reflected in the report. We have witnessed a storm here in this hall over South African affairs and I am afraid that if we delay in granting dignity to the worker we may face many more storms in the industrial world in all the nations.
therefore vote against the proposed Recommendation.

Interpretation from Bulgarian: Mr. IVANOV (Workers' delegate, Bulgaria)—Questions concerning the termination of employment have always been of the utmost importance for the living and working conditions of the workers and their families. Before expressing my views on the draft document, I should like to say that both at the previous session and at this one the Workers' group of the Committee was unanimous in its views on these questions. This unanimity shows that the time has come to adopt international standards which will encourage the regulation of termination of employment on a unified basis irrespective of the varying conditions and practices in the different I.L.O. member States.

We are of the opinion that the Conference should adopt a final international instrument on this matter at the present session. In the draft submitted to us the following important principles are set out: that workers should not be dismissed without good reason; that race, colour, sex, religion, national and social origin, participation in trade union activities, etc., should not be considered good reasons for dismissal. These provisions for reinstatement or severance pay for dismissed workers, and other matters in connection with the reduction of the work force, and so on, are dealt with. If these and a number of other provisions were correctly applied in the various countries this would help in the protection of workers.

Last year and again this year the Workers' group of the Committee insisted on the adoption of a Convention. We consider that on a question of such importance to the workers the Conference should adopt a Convention rather than a Recommendation. Termination of employment is no less important an issue than freedom of association, the elimination of discrimination and forced labour and a number of other matters on which the I.L.O. has already adopted Conventions. An international instrument addressing this subject would be particularly important for the developing countries where there is little legislation concerning access to employment or dismissal.

In substance the proposed form of the instrument reduces its ability to protect workers, since the provisions are only recommendations. This protection is further reduced by a number of provisos in the text in favour of the employers, where the words "as far as possible" appear.

The proposals of the Workers' group and certain Government members of the Committee to eliminate this conditional character were not adopted by the Committee, mainly because of resistance from the Employers. The proposed form of this document, and the conditional phrases contained therein, will not help to reduce arbitrary dismissal by employers in the capitalist countries.

I would also like to mention a few specific aspects of this draft. Last year the Conference adopted the principle of mandatory consultation between the employers' and workers' representatives before any final decision to reduce staff is made, and where practicable in the case of individual dismissals. Again because of resistance from the Employers, the principle of consultation was deleted from the text in the case of individual dismissals. The removal of this important provision, which was provided for in last year's preliminary draft which was adopted by the Conference, lessens the value of the instrument, and makes it possible for the employers in capitalist countries to dismiss workers as they think fit. Further, the type of consultation provided for in Paragraph 10 is a step backwards compared with the practice of compulsory consultation accepted in some countries' industries and individual undertakings.

Nor can we agree with the assertion of the Employers that absolute job stability will jeopardise production and labour discipline. If you look at existing practice in certain countries, you will find that the more the jobs are guaranteed the better the production and labour discipline. Furthermore, no economic or operational conditions can justify the objections of employers to a limitation of their freedom of action in effecting dismissals.

The sole means of subsistence of workpeople and their families is their income from their work. When dismissed, the worker in capitalist countries has no resources; he has to rely on the dole and unemployment benefits which are insufficient. That is why the most effective protection of a dismissed worker is to reinstate him when he wishes to go back to his old job. This is a perfectly normal state of affairs which cannot be replaced by any guarantees or compensations. In the draft document, however, emphasis is quite wrongly placed on compensation and not on reinstatement.

Before concluding, I should like to refer to the abnormal situation obtaining during the discussion and vote on the draft before us. About 40 delegations are not participating in the work of the Conference as a token of protest against the inadmissible conduct of the leadership of the I.L.O. that is doing all in its power to perpetuate the presence of delegates from the Republic of South Africa at the Conference, and who are also refusing to take the necessary steps to eradicate racial discrimination in that country, where the most elementary human rights and freedoms are being crushed under foot. The absence of so many delegations had undermined the representative character of the Conference, thus reducing the value and significance of decisions to be taken. This also applies to the draft instrument at which we are looking now, and which we have to adopt in its final form. The draft Recommendation, although it has many shortcomings, nevertheless does represent an important step forward in protecting the workers in this particular field. Therefore, the Bulgarian Workers' delegation will vote in favour of the Recommendation.
scientific personnel-management policy. I am supporting it for the following reasons.

First, security of employment means industrial peace. Provided this peace is not bought at high price, which may bar the introduction of scientific, organisational and technological improvements in any undertaking, then developing economies should definitely recognise that the worker is a factor of production—and a human being too. Secondly, I am supporting the instrument because security of employment is not established by allowing dismissals which are not connected with capacity or efficiency, conduct or redundancy. This is a good down-to-earth personnel policy that pays. If an employer wants to get away from this provision, then I feel it is only right for the sake of good labour-management relations that compensation should be paid.

Of course there are provisions which, if applied by hard trade union thinking, may upset industrial peace. One such provision is Paragraph 9. Application of this paragraph because security of employment is not established by allowing dismissals which are not connected with capacity or efficiency, conduct or redundancy. This is a good down-to-earth personnel policy that pays. If an employer wants to get away from this provision, then I feel it is only right for the sake of good labour-management relations that compensation should be paid.

First of all, the attitude of the Workers' union organisations in the undertaking. Any other procedure would be inconsistent with the law. Here it is not even a question of agreement but only of consultation with them and even this is not acceptable to some. The argument seeking to regard consultation as being tantamount to dictating anything to the employers seems to me insufficiently founded. There is no juridical obligation arising out of such preliminary consultation, and so the interests of the workers would be in no way endangered by an adoption of this principle.

I had hoped that the text under discussion

Mr. FORSTADIUS (Employers' adviser, Sweden)—I will be very brief. There is no doubt that the employers have to take their responsibility in situations where employment for one reason or another, has to be terminated, and employers in my country have taken that responsibility, in co-operation with the trade unions in my country, to the effect that any termination of employment might be objectionable from the trade union side can be submitted to a joint body called the Labour Market Board. This system was created by the parties themselves in 1938 and has ever since provided effective machinery for solving disputable cases of termination of employment. I may perhaps also add that the indirect effect of this machinery has been no less important. The existence and the guidance of the Labour Market Board have helped workers and employers in my country most effectively to avoid all unnecessary disputes concerning these matters. It follows from what I have already stated that I take the view that the workers should have the right of appeal against termination of employment if they have an objection and if the question is not settled in the ordinary way of negotiations between the parties themselves. From that point of view I agree upon one of the most basic principles of the instrument before us.

But there are some elements in this Recommendation which raise considerable doubts as to the possibility of giving support to it. I recall the fact that, in accordance with Paragraph 3 (a), a worker can be dismissed for the reason only that he is not a member of a certain trade union even if he is not allowed to be a trade union member by the union itself.

Without wanting to open a debate on that point with my distinguished friend from Sweden, Mr. Geijer, I want to stress that I feel this point is a very fundamental one and really a question of human rights.

I also want to state that Paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the Recommendation in several respects contain principles which from a Scandinavian point of view are not acceptable. Looking upon the instrument as a whole, I find the scope of this instrument too wide. This is a most essential point to me, and not only to me, but to many employers, not least the employers in all the Scandinavian countries.

For the reasons which I have indicated briefly, I have to state on behalf of the Employers of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden that we cannot vote in favour of the instrument as a whole, but have to vote against it.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. GRIGORIEV (Workers' adviser, U.S.S.R.)—The 47th Session of the International Labour Conference is discussing the question of adoption of an international instrument on termination of employment at the initiative of the employer.

The I.L.O.'s prime task is to protect the interests of the workers. It should therefore not merely reflect the situation in the various countries or give an apathetic academic generalisation concerning national practice and legislation; it must find forms for actively influencing legislation in countries in order to help the workers.

The International Labour Organisation is dealing with a question which affects the vital interests of hundreds of millions of workers for whom work is the only means of subsistence. If they lose it they and their families are often subject to hardships and privations. The very fact that this has been brought up before the Conference is one that should gratify us. It seems to us that it is essential to regulate this question, especially in those countries where workers continually suffer from unemployment and underemployment. Social and labour legislation is therefore indispensable to protect the workers from the fluctuations of the economic cycle and from arbitrary actions by monopolistic employers.

Recent facts have shown that in the struggle against the organised workers who are defending their social and economic interests the employers' associations do not hesitate to use such terrible, grossly anti-democratic and immoral methods as lockouts or mass dismissals. We should stress that such dismissals do not take place as a result of the requirements of production but are used as a form of repression and a form of pressure on the workers, preventing them from moving their legitimate demands for better working and living conditions. We could quote many examples to show how in undertakings in the economically developed countries in Western Europe and America, dismissals are not merely because workers take part in the activities of various progressive political parties or trade unions, or because they uphold the idea of peace and friendship among peoples. Does this not show that the I.L.O. must be more active in defending the interests of the workers and the free activities of the trade unions?

The workers in our country are constitutionally and legally entitled to work. This is not only proclaimed in the Constitution but is really guaranteed. In particular, termination of employment issues are regulated by legislation. Labour legislation in the U.S.S.R. on the termination of employment is based mainly on the essential need to protect the interests of the workers themselves. In all cases dismissals
at the initiative of the employer can only take place with the assent of the factory, plant or local trade union committee. Any decision to dismiss the worker without the agreement of the trade union is illegal and invalid; this right is a very useful instrument in the hands of the trade unions in protecting the workers from any arbitration from the administration.

In this connection we would like to recommend that Mr. Wagner, who spoke this morning on behalf of the employers of the United States, and who made some remarks concerning the trade unions in the socialist countries, should read the official reports of the I.L.O. mission The Trade Union Situation in the U.S.S.R., and then let him have the courage to renounce these assertions, borrowed from the cold war arsenal.

We should like the document that will be adopted at this present session to have a positive influence on the legislation and practice in countries where dismissals are not generally regulated by legislation, where termination of employment is only partly dealt with in legislation and only covers certain categories of workers. In the opinion of the Soviet Workers' delegation the proposed Recommendation submitted to the Conference, restricted though it is, and despite the weakness and vagueness of certain paragraphs, nevertheless does mark a certain progress and could play a role, especially in those countries where legislation in this field is absent, and also in the developing countries where social and labour legislation is being overhauled. For this reason, and only for this reason, we shall vote for the proposed Recommendation.

However, we said in the Committee, and we consider it necessary to repeat here at the plenary, that there are certain fundamental deficiencies in the Recommendation which reduce its significance and weight. Firstly, I am thinking of the form of the document and of Paragraph 10 of the proposed text. At the Committee meetings the representatives of the Soviet trade unions, in agreement with the Workers' group, and indirectly with the Workers' representatives in other countries, as in the previous Conference, were decisively in favour of adopting a Convention and not a Recommendation. However, in the Committee, the unanimous proposal of the Workers met with opposition from the Employers and also from the majority of Government delegates, and that is why it was not adopted. In our opinion the wording of Paragraph 10, as accepted by the Committee despite the opposition of all the Workers' group, is completely unsatisfactory. This wording was possible only because the majority of the Government delegates conceded, in our opinion, too much to the Employers and that showed partiality to the detriment of the workers.

We stressed, and we would like to stress once again, that we can have a proper decision, a democratic decision, only when in each concrete case, whether we are dealing with individual dismissals or with reductions in the work force, dismissals take place only after agreement has been reached with the workers' representatives. Any other solution to this question would render the workers powerless to counteract arbitrary measures by the employers.

We think we should emphasise here that the discussion of the fate of this document at the I.L.O. cannot serve as an example of the principle of equal rights on all sides and, even less, of that harmony between Employers and Workers concerning which so many flowery phrases have been uttered and written in the I.L.O. What actually lies behind the general, bare words of the report of the Committee on Termination of Employment? It is stated that as a result of the vote on the form of the document—520 in favour, 405 against, and 15 abstentions—the form of a Recommendation was adopted. The proposal of the Government representative of the U.S.S.R. to word Paragraph 10 as it was adopted at the previous Conference, providing for consultation between employers and representatives of the workers regarding individual dismissal, was rejected by 20,025 to 14,147. But what does the word "majority", or "minority", mean in deciding the fate of the most important provisions of this document? This document deals with termination of employment at the initiative of the employer: in other words we are above all concerned with the interests of the workers, and the instrument should embody the wishes and suggestions of the workers. In our opinion this shows clearly the value of the proposals made by the Soviet Government in its memorandum on the need for a radical readjustment of the I.L.O., a revision of its structure and working methods.

The Soviet Workers' delegation deems it its duty to make these fundamental remarks on the substance of the document which is before the Conference.

Mr. BRANCH (Employers' adviser, United States)—I noted with interest that a preceding speaker devoted much of his remarks to attacking the free employers in these tripartite committees. He deplored—as did all of us—that occasionally an employer is guilty of locking out employees. I would not deplore the practice of some newly imperialist nations of locking in the workers with rigid, punitive regulations and brick and barbed wire barriers.

The employers of the United States desire to pay tribute not only to the excellent Officers of our Committee but also to the objective attitudes and the spirit of co-operation which existed among the members of all three groups of our Committee. I would imagine that few, if any, of us gathered here today would contend that the Recommendation which our Committee produced is perfect. We doubt that any international instrument could be perfect. The members of the Employers' group are chiefly disappointed with certain inclusions and exclusions in various portions of the document.
am sure that the members of the Government group and the Workers' group likewise have their own particular disappointments. These disappointments have been discussed at great length in all of the meetings of our Committee, but it is important that we do not forget that this document is a combined product of a very large number of able men. These men have laboured diligently and conscientiously over the past two years to provide a workable and acceptable instrument which could serve as a guide to the developing nations and which could be of real benefit to workers throughout the world.

The Recommendation has properly and necessarily been designed with sufficient flexibility to give full effect to local laws, rules and practices. It is axiomatic, of course, that the only way that the workers of any nation can truly and fully enjoy the benefits under this or any other instrument is for government, workers and employers to act together in a responsible manner to increase efficiency and productivity while maintaining a maximum of individual incentive and freedom of association.

Bearing all of these things in mind, the employers of the United States of America are prepared to vote in favour of this Recommendation.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. VILLA-LOBOS (Employers' adviser, Venezuela)—The Venezuelan employers believe that the inherent right of management to terminate employment should not be exerted abusively, and it is their general rule not to dismiss workers except for good reason. This is because of elementary reasons of human solidarity in our country—we are proud of our social and racial equality—and also because the employer, when he employs a worker, must make his profit, for the prosperity of the undertaking depends on there being the greatest possible number of people in employment and with purchasing power. In our country the vocational training of the workers is due largely to the undertakings, which, by training him, make a valuable investment which they do not wish to lose. Venezuelan employers have already, therefore, for some decades, practised the policy that the abusive exercise of the right to terminate employment involves compensation, which under Venezuelan law is a month's salary for each year's service. We want to retain stability of employment, because the prosperity of undertakings, and more investment—and also the employer, when he employs a worker, must make his profit, for the prosperity of the undertaking depends on there being the greatest possible number of people in employment and with purchasing power. In our country the vocational training of the workers is due largely to the undertakings, which, by training him, make a valuable investment which they do not wish to lose. Venezuelan employers have already, therefore, for some decades, practised the policy that the abusive exercise of the right to terminate employment involves compensation, which under Venezuelan law is a month's salary for each year's service.

It is therefore clear that the real problem is that of unemployment, which must be studied after centuries of struggle. In our country we are establishing the principles of freedom and human dignity which our legal systems are now achieving after centuries of struggle.

In our country we are establishing the principle of freedom and human dignity which our legal systems are now achieving after centuries of struggle. It is inappropriate to use any open or concealed compulsion, since the bases of our legal system are incompatible with such formulae, and because every obligation involved by our law cannot be compulsorily enforced without recourse to compensation and, as I have stated, we already have much more advanced arrangements in this respect in our country.

I would like to call attention to the fact that this Recommendation we are discussing is not merely a matter of adjusting ordinary law, but rather a re-casting of the fundamental principle of the whole legal system. It is not without significance or by chance that the few institutional precedents for enforced stability originate principally in the totalitarian countries. The problem of mankind, is not enlightened or enabled by the inspired principles of freedom and human dignity which our legal systems are now achieving after centuries of struggle.
be dismissed without justification; we are in favour of employment stability; but since we believe that coercion will lead to contrary results, we shall vote against anything in the instrument which could lead to compulsion, directly or indirectly, openly or by implication. Therefore we shall vote in favour of the clauses providing for compensation for workers when they are unjustifiably dismissed. However, if the whole thing is voted together, we shall have to vote against the whole instrument.

Mr. SPARSIS (Government delegate, Cyprus)—From the ocean of words which have poured from this rostrum three distinct streams seem to have emerged. The first stream is composed of those who are for the proposed instrument. The second is the stream against. Then there is a stream which cries for perfection.

To the first group I have nothing to say but to congratulate them on their good sense. To those against I would say that the basic principles propagated in this instrument are contained in Paragraphs 2, 4, 6 and 12. At the risk of oversimplification I would say that the basic principles involved in these paragraphs are: firstly, that no worker should be dismissed without valid reason; secondly, that dismissed workers have the right of appeal against unjustifiable dismissal; thirdly, that dismissed workers be provided with some form of income protection. Finally, that all measures including consultation should be taken to minimise and avert, if possible, reduction in the number of workers.

None of those who spoke against adoption of the Recommendation has given any valid reason why they should reject these basic principles. They have spoken about their national laws and legislations and, as a matter of fact, pointed out that they are far more advanced than the principles quoted here. But in spite of that declaration they have still told us they are going to vote against the instrument.

Finally, to those who cry for perfection I wish to take the liberty of quoting our Chairman who said that everyone in this room could probably devise a better instrument if he had the time. But you must remember that this is the outcome of a compromise in a tripartite committee. It is an effort to bring together and merge the different opinions on a very vital and controversial subject. Anybody who cries for perfection is really crying for the moon. What does the instrument before us really do? In my opinion it is a very wise and diligent compromise on the one hand between the limitation of managerial prerogatives of employers—the prerogative to dismiss indiscriminately—and the admission by the workers of the need to behave well and efficiently in an enterprise without resorting to industrial violence.

This is the compromise before us: the abrogation of the prerogative to dismiss indiscriminately and the subjection of the worker to the rule of law.

I want to say one final word before I leave this rostrum. It has been pointed out—I am sorry to say it—but I have a very good friend of mine who says the instrument is so diluted, it is so vague, that it worsens rather than improves industrial relations. I wish to take issue with that statement and to congratulate the authors for their courage in bringing before this international forum one of the most controversial subjects in industrial relations. That feat in itself is great enough to merit for them all the congratulations of everyone in this room.

For that fact and the fact that I consider the instrument a reasonable compromise, I stand for its adoption.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. APARICIO VALDEZ (Employers' delegate, Peru)—I should like to explain my vote against the Recommendation, despite the fact that I agree that the philosophy of the world is to avoid abusive dismissal of the worker. I do so because I fear that, if workers can insist on being reinstated, it will not promote harmony in management-labour relations and will cause much discussion.

Peruvian legislation already provides compensation for long service and further compensation for untimely dismissal equal to three months' wages, if the worker is not given 90 days' notice.

Furthermore I think that the proposed Recommendation, in opening up the possibility of claiming compensation although the worker has committed an offence, will cause discussion.

I shall therefore vote against it, while congratulating Mr. Yllanes Ramos on his work in the Committee.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BOCCARDI (Employers' adviser, Italy)—I also should like to explain, as briefly as possible, the reasons for the attitude of the Italian Employers, namely abstention. Although this proposed instrument has the form of a Recommendation, the General Confederation of Italian Industry considers that, in order to enable all countries to proceed in accordance with the ideas of the Recommendation, and with tradition and collective agreements in force in each country and each sector of production, the instrument, though acceptable in some respects, should have been more clear and more flexible, also more possible to put into application, having regard to the need for fair equilibrium between the parties.

I should like to say what I have already said in the Committee. In Italian industry, since 1950, two collective Conventions have been put into force, signed by the competent confederations, governing all cases of individual dismissals and for reduction of personnel, in such a way as to reconcile the social and economic interests of the workers and the responsibilities of the management.

In other sectors of production, such as agriculture, commerce, banking, insurance, the same rules are not valid, but each of these, according to employment needs and characteristics, has adopted its own equivalent system having regard to the particular needs of the situation.

I should not like my attitude to be taken as a merely personal one. This accuracy of this opinion is proved by the fact that collective agreements are still in force after 13 years and neither doctrine nor precedent regards...
them as inadequate, no law has been passed to change them.

I regret that in the exclusions mentioned in Paragraph 18 reference has not been made to the fact which relates to certain public services, such as water, electricity and gas, or to certain classes of workers whose employment is based on such provisions as are in force in banking or commerce, or to agricultural casual workers or to apprentices, or to managerial personnel.

Another thing, finally, which prevents me from giving my approval to the instrument is the fact that sectors which have, in their collective bargaining, laid down objective rules to regulate dismissal—social and economic safeguards for the rights of the workers—cannot accept any other limitation which would necessitate a constant search for causes of dismissal and which would cause all sorts of complaints and appeals, although our arrangements are already extremely liberal. We cannot accept compensation above that for which provision is already made, for the protection allowed is already sufficiently just and liberal.

For the reasons I have summarised, I think you will understand why I must abstain from the vote on this whole instrument.

Interpretation from Spanish : Mr. ARACENA (Workers' adviser, Chile)—Few branches of the law have become more important in recent years than labour law. The nineteenth century was called the century of civil law but the present century is that of labour law. One should not forget that labour law applies to the whole population; the major part of the population of any territory consists of employers or employees. If we add to that consideration the industrial development of today, then it is clear that we must deal with the situation of the workers as a priority, for they are the weakest link in production.

Therefore, the Chilean workers whom I represent here are not satisfied by a long chalk with the Recommendation, which we think should have been a Convention. We doubt whether the Recommendation will receive from the States Members of the I.L.O. the approval which it needs in order to get good results.

The Recommendation should have great effect because termination of employment on the initiative of the employer is certainly a matter of great concern to all workers. In my opinion it should be recognised that the Committee has made a big effort to reach agreement on a sensible basis.

The instrument has two ideas which lead to confusion from the legal point of view; that in section II—Standards of General Application—Paragraph 3 (e), which implies that workers might complain in bad faith, and that in subparagraph (d) in which there is a reference to marital status.

In the civil legislation of most of the Latin American countries—in South America especially—this expression "marital status" means nothing at all. The Chilean Civil Code, for instance, which goes back to the French Civil Code speaks of the civil status but not of the marital status. In our view, as we said in the Committee, the Spanish text should refer to civil status and not to matrimonial status. That would avoid any confusion.

From the point of view of substance, in our opinion the instrument reflects a philosophy which is not contained in existing labour legislation, in the sense that this is a new legislation, autonomous, realistic, adapted to the varied economic conditions; it is not formalistic; it is simple and clear, and not too technical or rigid; it is public, it is universal, because it will bring the laws of many States into a satisfactory uniformity.

Although positive legislation in our country, through the Labour Code of 1931, has settled many of the points dealt with in this Recommendation and goes beyond the Recommendation itself, we shall vote in favour of the proposed instrument.

Mr. MISHIRO (Employers' delegate, Japan)—I must confess that when the Governing Body discussed the proposal that employment as one of the items for the agenda of the Conference I hesitated to give it priority over others, for at the time I sincerely doubted the possibility of attaining any satisfactory and practical instrument to deal with a problem of this kind, which is very complicated in principle and diverse in practice in the various countries of the world. As a matter of fact, the discussion on this instrument was very controversial throughout the two successive sessions of the Conference Committee concerned, last year and this year. However, I wish to congratulate the Chairman and all the members of the Committee on their successful achievement in drafting this Recommendation, which seems to me to be a commendable document as a whole for the stabilisation of the employer-worker relationship.

It is very easy for any delegate to vote in favour of any document without much reflection upon his national situation. We can do this in this atmosphere of friendship and internationalism. Unfortunately, however, I must say with regret that as an Employers' delegate from Japan representing industry in our country I find some points in this instrument which cannot have immediate acceptance given the existing situation in Japan, which is, I confess, still on the way to development, as is industry in other countries.

I do not think it is necessary to refer to all the points to which I object, but I would like to point to one which is very serious for Japanese industry—that is, Paragraph 16, subparagraphs (1) and (4). These subparagraphs provide for a kind of guarantee to protect re-engaged workers against adverse effects upon their wage rates as a result of the interruption of their employment. This guarantee may be satisfactory when applied to the wage system based upon job classification which is common in Europe and parts of North America. In my country, however, there is a long-established practice called the seniority wage system. This wage system guarantees the workers individual wage increases by giving much weight to the length of their service. We also have what we call a lifetime employment guarantee system in our industry. Generally speaking, therefore, the older workers enjoy
in our country would find it very difficult to
circumstances there is no doubt that industry
productivity or category of job. In these
high wages they received before the termination
apply immediately this guaranteed wage system
the higher wages irrespective of their merit,
employment.

There are a number of individual points on
which we are not in agreement and on which
we wish to announce our abstention.

As regards Paragraph 2, where we
think there is, from a legal point of view, a
rather unsatisfactory form of provision, and
where no regard is paid to a period of employ­
ment in the undertaking before the safeguard
comes into force. Also, we consider that
Paragraph 9 might have been better drawn
up, limiting it to the principle of income pro­
tection and leaving application in detail to
national law or practice. With the present
formulation, widely different systems can come
into force. In some circumstances employers
who pay high contributions to national social
insurance or unemployment insurance funds
may in addition have to pay further compen­
sation. The legal situation is very widely
divergent in different countries.

Lastly, as concerns Paragraph 18, which
refers to the question of scope, we think that
small undertakings should be excluded from
its scope.

These are the points of detail, but they are
not without importance. Nevertheless, we
shall vote in favour of the proposed Recom­
mendation as a whole. In voting in favour we
shall also be paying tribute to the excellent
co-operation which has prevailed between all
parties during the Committee's two years' work.

The PRESIDENT—I have no more speakers
on my list, and I call on the Chairman of the
Committee, Mr. Bland, who wishes to make a
few remarks.

Mr. BLAND (Government delegate, Australia ;
Chairman of the Committee on Termination of
Employment)—First of all, I would like, on
behalf of myself and those of my Vice-Chairman
and Officers who have come in for words of
praise this afternoon, to express our grateful
thanks. What I should like to say is that that
praise, such as it was, really ought to have
been directed to the Committee as a whole,
because we did a job of work entirely as a team.

I am somewhat puzzled. This is not an
opportunity for a full-scale reply by me to the
arguments that have been advanced this after­
noon. I noted that the contributions were
heavily dominated by representatives from the
Employers' side, and this must have given us
all some real hope that the outcome of this
discussion would be successful. I heard many
of these views expressed in the Committee,
but what puzzles me is that they seem to have
grown in importance. Here we are dealing with
a Recommendation, a guide. The docu­
ment that is before the meeting is in extremely
flexible terms. Indeed, it might almost in some
respects be described as the apotheosis of
flexibility. I should have thought—and I say
this with the greatest of respect—that a calm,
dispassionate examination of the text such as
has been possible, since it has been printed,
ought to have satisfied those who had any
doubts in the Committee stage that the text is,
despite the reservations that they may have,
fully supportable. I believe that we have
plotted a path through a new field. It was not
easy, there was a great deal of give and take.
Let me for a moment speak not as the Chairman
but as a delegate. The fact is that, having
plotted our path through this field, we are now
at a fence. I suggest that we ought not to
pause, that we should take the fence. I do
hope that the Committee's work will be
crowned with a favourable vote.

The PRESIDENT—I declare the general
discussion closed.

The first question is the adoption of the
report. Can I take it that the report as such
is adopted unanimously?

(The report is adopted.)

PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING
TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT AT THE
INITIATIVE OF THE EMPLOYER, SUBMITTED BY
THE COMMITTEE ON TERMINATION OF
EMPLOYMENT 1: ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We will now deal with the
Recommendation, taking it Paragraph by
Paragraph.
Are there any comments on the Preamble?

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. YLLANES
RAMOS (Employers' delegate, Mexico)—In
order to solve the problems raised mostly by
the Employers, I ask, under the Standing
Orders, that we take each of these Paragraphs
separately, with a vote by show of hands.

The PRESIDENT—If we take a vote on
each of the Paragraphs and subparagraphs, it
will mean that we will have to take some 38
votes, which will take about two hours. How­
ever, you have asked for it and it will be
done. Does your remark also refer to the
Preamble? It does.

1 See Appendix VII, p. 589.
We will vote by show of hands. First, the Preamble.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. The Preamble is adopted by 176 votes in favour to 0 against, with 2 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—We will now vote separately on each Paragraph and subparagraph.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 1 is adopted by 178 votes in favour to 0 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (1) of Paragraph 2 is adopted by 167 votes in favour to 1 against, with 7 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (2) of Paragraph 2 is adopted by 172 votes in favour to 0 against, with 6 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 3 is adopted by 161 votes in favour to 7 against, with 6 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 4 is adopted by 172 votes in favour to 5 against, with 7 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (1) of Paragraph 5 is adopted by 172 votes in favour to 2 against, with 9 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (2) of Paragraph 5 is adopted by 178 votes in favour to 2 against, with 7 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 6 is adopted by 174 votes in favour to 9 against, with 3 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (1) of Paragraph 7 is adopted by 178 votes in favour to 1 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (2) of Paragraph 7 is adopted by 174 votes in favour to 8 against, with 6 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (1) of Paragraph 8 is adopted by 180 votes in favour to 0 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (2) of Paragraph 8 is adopted by 180 votes in favour to 0 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (3) of Paragraph 9 is adopted by 175 votes in favour to 2 against, with 10 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (4) of Paragraph 9 is adopted by 177 votes in favour to 1 against, with 6 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (1) of Paragraph 10 is adopted by 170 votes in favour to 2 against, with 11 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (2) of Paragraph 10 is adopted by 169 votes in favour to 2 against, with 5 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (3) of Paragraph 10 is adopted by 174 votes in favour to 0 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (4) of Paragraph 11 is adopted by 179 votes in favour to 0 against, with 5 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (5) of Paragraph 11 is adopted by 176 votes in favour to 3 against, with 5 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (6) of Paragraph 11 is adopted by 180 votes in favour to 0 against, with 3 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 12 is adopted by 183 votes in favour to 0 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 13 is adopted by 171 votes in favour to 3 against, with 11 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 14 is adopted by 179 votes in favour to 0 against, with 5 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 15 is adopted by 178 votes in favour to 0 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Paragraph 16 is adopted by 174 votes in favour to 0 against, with 7 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (1) of Paragraph 17 is adopted by 180 votes in favour to 0 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (2) of Paragraph 17 is adopted by 180 votes in favour to 0 against, with 4 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (3) of Paragraph 17 is adopted by 179 votes in favour to 0 against, with 3 abstentions.)

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Subparagraph (4) of Paragraph 17 is adopted by 179 votes in favour to 0 against, with 3 abstentions.)
The PRESIDENT—Now I will put to the vote the whole text of the proposed Recommendation concerning termination of employment on the initiative of the employer. We shall vote by show of hands.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. The proposed Recommendation as a whole is adopted by 168 votes in favour to 12 against, with 9 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—The text will now, in accordance with article 40, paragraph 6, of the Standing Orders, be referred to the Conference Drafting Committee.

It now only remains for me, on behalf of the Conference, to express hearty thanks to the Chairman and the Reporter of this Committee for the work they have done. You have done very good work and we are all very much indebted to you.

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

The PRESIDENT—The second point on our agenda this afternoon is the conclusion of the discussion on the Director-General's Report. I call on Mr. Seidman, Workers' adviser, United States, who will speak instead of Mr. Faupl, Workers' delegate, United States.

Mr. SEIDMAN (Workers' adviser, United States)—Because it is necessary for Mr. Faupl, the United States Workers' delegate, to attend the meeting of the Selection Committee which is now taking place, he has asked me to read the statement he intended to present. I shall read it without change, exactly as he would have presented it.

First I want to take this opportunity to express to you, Mr. President, my personal appreciation—and I know I speak for other Officers of the Conference and indeed for all the delegates—of your willingness to accept the presidency of this Conference under such trying circumstances.

None of us could have foreseen when we met a few days ago the events which were to confront us. Certainly I (and I remind you that I am speaking on behalf of Mr. Faupl) had no idea when the Workers' members of the Conference conferred on me the high honour of designating me as their Vice-President of the Conference that I would be called upon to preside over the Conference under unprecedented circumstances. I should like, if I may, to repeat briefly some of the things I said at that time, in the light of all that has happened since then.

First and foremost, with every fibre of my being I abhor and detest racial discrimination in every form and wherever it may exist. During my entire adult life I have been associated with the American trade union movement, which is dedicated to the principle that human rights must be universal. We know that in our own country the fundamental right to equality of opportunity and freedom from racial discrimination and segregation has not yet been achieved. The American trade unions say: men must be free and equal everywhere; discrimination must be wiped out, whether its victims are Negroes in Alabama, Jews in Moscow or Africans in the so-called Republic of South Africa. Apartheid in South Africa is not only a crime against the Africans against whom it is directed, it is not only contrary to the fundamental principles of the I.L.O. and to the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations, it is an affront to all humanity which must be eliminated by every and any legal means available. And I say that as long as racial persecution is the avowed policy of the Government of South Africa that Government has no place either in this Organisation or in the United Nations. Therefore I support wholeheartedly the efforts which are being made in this Conference to utilise legal and constitutional means to exclude South Africa from the I.L.O., the United Nations and every other international organisation until it abandons its infamous apartheid policy.

In the United States we have made substantial progress towards wiping out racial inequality, but we recognise that much still remains to be done. That is why in our American trade unions white and Negro workers stand shoulder to shoulder in the continuing struggle—which we are winning every day—to remove from our land the injustice of racial discrimination and segregation. We are strengthened by the knowledge that in this struggle are engaged the overwhelming majority of the American people and the Government of our nation.

This Conference has demonstrated that the fundamental institutions of this Organisation cannot be taken for granted. They must be strengthened and they must be defended. For me the most important of these institutions is the tripartite structure of the I.L.O. Therefore I regret that the Director-General's Report does not give evidence of full appreciation of the role of tripartism in the I.L.O. What concerns me is that nowhere does the Report really discuss the tripartite idea itself. What are the strengths of tripartism in the I.L.O., and what are its weaknesses? What are the most effective forms of tripartite participation? How can the tripartite principle be applied in the newer fields of I.L.O. activity, such as technical assistance? What is the relationship of freedom of association for workers' and employers' organisations within the member countries to genuine tripartite representation in the I.L.O.? These are basic questions which must be considered if we wish to maintain a continuing and effective tripartite structure in the I.L.O.

The continuing role of employers' and workers' organisations in the I.L.O. is at stake in several important proposals in the Report.

Let me turn first to the proposals for dealing with industrial problems. On the basis of my own first-hand knowledge and experience I am firmly convinced that the participation in the Industrial Committees of representatives of workers' and employers' organisations with a direct knowledge of and interest in industrial problems has given a realistic direction to I.L.O. activity, which have been impossible without such grass-roots participation. Therefore I find it difficult to understand why, at this very time when rapid
technological change could render the Industrial Committees more useful than ever before. It is proposed that this essential I.L.O. activity should be pared down.

The Report also shows a lack of understanding of tripartism in its treatment of workers' education. This is a phase of the I.L.O.'s programme which the free trade unions first proposed and have subsequently vigorously supported. The function of this programme is fundamentally that of helping the trade unions to develop their own workers' education activities. The Report proposes that the I.L.O. should no longer "limit itself to merely supporting activities determined by other organisations". It is suggested that instead the I.L.O., without consulting the trade unions or co-operating with them, should attempt to "train" trade union leaders in their basic responsibilities.

I regard as highly unsound and dangerous the idea that somehow the I.L.O. can take over from the trade unions the fundamental control of workers' education. Certainly it is not the I.L.O.'s job to inculcate in trade unionists the ideas of its "experts" regarding such highly controversial questions as the trade union's role in society, the proper relationship between trade unions and the government, or the fundamental functions of the trade union itself.

The I.L.O. can make a significant contribution in the field of workers' education without straying beyond its legitimate function. The I.L.O. should not attempt to carry on workers' education programmes independent of the trade unions. Instead, it should work with and through free and independent trade unions, and with the maximum possible assistance from the international free trade union movement.

I stress that only free and independent trade unions can advance the workers' welfare. This principle has been set forth in many an important I.L.O. pronouncement. Unfortunately, however, not only do we still have the so-called trade unions in communist and other totalitarian countries completely tied to the ruling political group, but we also see increasing governmental domination and control of trade unions in some other countries.

I refuse to believe that the I.L.O. could not be more effective than it has been in bringing the governments of such countries to a better understanding of the need for free and democratic trade unions, independent of government or employer domination and control.

At last year's Conference I proposed that the I.L.O. establish a technical assistance programme in the field of human rights. Such a programme could point the way towards government encouragement to organisation of trade unions without attempts to control them. It could also give invaluable help in establishing and maintaining other basic rights such as freedom from forced labour.

The Report states that because human rights should inspire all the I.L.O.'s activities no specific programme is needed. I cannot accept this objection. Advancement of human rights by the I.L.O. must be given specific content and effective direction. Therefore, I urge again that the I.L.O. undertake as soon as possible the specific tasks of helping member countries to adopt law and practices which would assure full implementation of the fundamental principles of human rights which the I.L.O. has promulgated.

There are many other subjects in the Director-General's Report which struck me as highly significant. Let me briefly mention a few.

This Report should lay to rest once and for all the highly erroneous idea that the I.L.O.'s task in the field of standard-setting is over. The Report makes it clear how much still remains to be done in modernisation of old standards and development of new ones. I say with the Director-General, let us get on with this important job.

I agree with most of the Report's conclusions regarding the role and functions of the annual Conference. However, I do strongly object to the proposal for setting up a so-called independent judicial body, largely to replace the Credentials Committee elected by the delegates.

I deeply regret that the Report reflects an unrealistic view of the role of communist and other totalitarian countries in the Organisation. It may be that representatives of such countries and of the free democratic countries must sit side by side in the I.L.O., but that does not alter for a moment the vast chasm between oppression and tyranny in the communist world and freedom and human rights in the democratic countries. These fundamental differences cannot be wished away.

At its very beginning the Report implies that the countries of the Soviet bloc, after resuming I.L.O. membership in 1954, accepted the principle of the rule of law. It is asserted that, as a consequence, debate within the Organisation "is now focused more upon different approaches to the labour and social problems confronting the I.L.O. and less upon political or procedural issues of representation within the I.L.O."

Unfortunately, neither assertion is accurate. The Soviet bloc has not accepted the principle of the rule of law. Many delegates to this Conference know from their own bitter experience that these countries have done everything possible to frustrate the work of the Organisation. They have forced the I.L.O. to focus on all sorts of phoney political and procedural questions to the detriment of seeking solutions to the urgent issues genuinely within the I.L.O.'s field of competence.

When this Conference is over, the Governing Body, with the co-operation of the Director-General, will have the responsibility of analysing the many suggestions that will have been made, and of formulating specific recommendations for the consideration of next year's Conference. Whatever proposals for changes may be advanced, there must be no compromise with the basic principles of the I.L.O.

In the future, as in the past, it will be our job to defend and make secure the basic rights and the welfare of workers all over the world. Surely the I.L.O. could undertake no nobler task.

Mr. CHENG (Government delegate, China)—There comes a time in the life of any dynamic
organisation when it must take stock of the achievements or shortcomings of its past and project for the foreseeable future a programme of action in keeping with the spirit of the time without having to compromise beyond repair the fundamental objectives of the organisation.

The events which have taken place in this Organisation during the last two days, the bursting forth of new nations seeking to live in equality and dignity, the achievements in all fields of human endeavour, and the desire of all peoples, of whatever colour, race or creed, to have a just share of the fruits of production—all these have made an impact on the Organisation, and unless this Organisation can meet this challenge it will become weaker and not stronger.

It is in the context of these considerations that I wish to share my thoughts with my colleagues.

Even the strongest supporters of this Organisation cannot claim that the I.L.O. has always been in the forefront to promote and to defend the spirit and the letter of the Declaration of Philadelphia. True, vigorous voices were raised against the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, against forced labour practised in many countries, and against the denial in many countries of the right of freedom of association. Still the denial of human rights in greater or lesser degree continues in every country in our twentieth-century world. Man's inhumanity to man continues. Our consciences are disturbed that these abuses still continue and that so little has been done to eradicate them. It is easier to eradicate a disease of the body than it is to eradicate a disease of the mind.

I say all this because I feel that the I.L.O. should be in the forefront as an Organisation not only to promote but to defend human rights. In this basic undertaking all components of the I.L.O.—Governments, Employers, Workers and the Office—should join together to speak out forcefully and act vigorously against any abuse of human rights wherever it might be found to exist. The I.L.O. should not play a game of politics with human misery. It should be less realistic and more idealistic. Although the I.L.O. is a political organisation, it should strive to be more apolitical in its actions. I feel strongly that unless the I.L.O. can, from now on, re dedicate itself to its ideals, the body of the I.L.O. will have its shell, perhaps its brain, but no heart. It will exist, but it will not live.

This leads me to a few brief thoughts on the future work, programme and structure of the I.L.O.

I think we should, first of all, strengthen the implementation procedures of the I.L.O. Conventions. There should be more exposure to public knowledge of the violators of the provisions of the Conventions. The terms of reference of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations should be enlarged to include quasi-judicial functions, and its membership should be drawn from all the streams of judicial thought. The present system of rendering mild reprimands and sweeping unpleasant cases under the rug are not in keeping with the intent or the purpose when the Conventions were drawn up.

Regarding the Recommendations of the I.L.O., I believe that a system of periodic reporting of compliance or the difficulties encountered in cases of non-compliance with the Recommendations should be required of member States and these should be summarised and made available to member States. Allegations on violation of or non-compliance with the provisions of Conventions or Recommendations should be compiled and summarised and made available to member States, even if for confidential information only.

The three points which I have made regarding implementation of Conventions and Recommendations could go, I think, a long way to make the I.L.O. a much more dynamic and effective organisation. I hope my colleagues and especially the Office will give some consideration to these observations.

Regarding the work programme of the Organisation, emphasis should now be placed in an ever-increasing degree on assistance to the underdeveloped countries both in the social and economic fields. Here I would emphasise only two things. First, more funds and more suitable personnel must be found to meet the demands. In the latter case I suggest that suitable personnel can be found among the less developed countries. Secondly, aid rendered should meet the practical needs of the underdeveloped countries and meet basic requirements first. These two considerations are essential, I think, but so often in our enthusiasm we lose sight of them. I must also emphasise the imperative need to constantly focus our attention on the social consequences of economic aid.

I now turn to the structure of the I.L.O. itself. When I first came to be intimately concerned with the I.L.O. I was informed of the unique tripartite composition of the I.L.O. I must say that after a year's association with the workings of the I.L.O. I cannot ignore the Office as the fourth component. First, more funds and more suitable personnel must be found to meet the demands. In the latter case I suggest that suitable personnel can be found among the less developed countries. Secondly, aid rendered should meet the practical needs of the underdeveloped countries and meet basic requirements first. These two considerations are essential, I think, but so often in our enthusiasm we lose sight of them. I must also emphasise the imperative need to constantly focus our attention on the social consequences of economic aid.

As to the annual Conference, I believe that if we are to adhere to a three weeks' duration, in the light of the increasing membership and the complexity and multiplicity of matters it has to deal with, some modification in the Standing Orders appears to be necessary.

We are convinced that the enlargement and composition of the Governing Body will in the long run strengthen the Organisation. Here again the Standing Orders and the periodicity and duration of the meetings of the Governing Body and its Committees would need some adjustment. The relationship of the Conference to the Governing Body needs to be further examined. The membership of the Committees should be increased to reflect the
increase in the membership of the Governing Body.

We need also to give some serious thought to the strengthening of the regional offices and the role of regional conferences. It would appear to us that the desire for decentralisation of the structure and the activities of the I.L.O. has more urgency now than previously.

My delegation intends to participate fully in the examination of the report on the external survey of the I.L.O. Naturally we cannot state our position until the report is placed before the Governing Body. But I have exposed enough of my thoughts today to indicate our approach to the forthcoming report.

The I.L.O. is in the midst of another crisis in its history. It can weather this crisis if it does not abandon its basic principles. It can emerge stronger if it does not succumb to temporary adjustments for political expediency. First and foremost it must stand as the conscience of the working man everywhere. In this task my delegation and Government are loyal Member of the I.L.O. since 1919. We have supported the I.L.O. in its most difficult times. We do not intend to abandon it now.

Mr. SLATER (Government delegate, United Kingdom)—I should like first, Mr. President, both as a delegate and a personal friend to congratulate you on your election to office. At the same time, I think you will understand that, in saying this, my remarks are tinged with regret that the previous holder of your office found himself in difficult circumstances and had to resign.

I had the honour, on the first day, to speak in support of the candidature of Mr. Johnson and I am naturally sorry that he is not still in the Chair.

The Director-General’s Report deals with a variety of questions, including procedural ones. I should like to refer to one or two aspects not covered in the Report and in particular that of the use of the point of order procedure. To give substance to my remarks I should like to refer to the record of discussion for 12 June. You will remember that it was in the afternoon of 12 June that the Vice-President, as he said, found himself in difficult circumstances and placed himself entirely at the disposal of the Conference. A series of points of order was raised (under the provisions of the Standing Orders) on which no decisions were given as to whether they were or not in fact points of order. There are some ten columns of print of speeches of this kind and this means that for an hour or so it became quite impossible for a delegate to raise a real point of order. His name was put on a long list. Now this seems to me to be a more serious defect and it is something the Organisation will need to look at because this situation might recur again. In the circumstances as they were, many of us felt unable to take advantage of this point of order procedure and this meant that we could not express our views on the subject of apartheid. This could lead to misunderstanding of our attitude and this attitude must be made clear.

When the 1961 resolution came before this Conference the United Kingdom Government delegate made it abundantly clear that he deplored the policy of apartheid carried on by the South African Government and that his Government joined in the condemnation expressed by almost every other delegate at the Conference. Our view on this matter has not changed. In the United Nations, too, this has been made abundantly clear. In the Special Political Committee the United Kingdom Government representative said in 1962 that the policy of apartheid was repugnant to Her Majesty’s Government and that this had been made clear to the South African Government in Pretoria. He went on to say: “We cannot give up, we must and shall continue to appeal to the South African Government to modify its policies and to come into line with the attitude of all right-minded people in all countries.”

To revert to the procedural issue, I believe this long series of undecided points of order was a main contributory factor to our later troubles, leading to the withdrawal of certain delegations. Indeed it is probable that, but for this, we should still have had those delegations with us. Then we should all have been able to devote our attention to one of the main purposes of attendance at this Conference, namely to consider the important and far-reaching proposals contained in the Director-General’s Report.

If I may now turn to the substance of the Director-General’s Report, it is, of course, quite impracticable for the I.L.O. to embark on all the possible activities mentioned in that Report. As the Director-General says on page 31 of the Report “It would be quite unrealistic merely to attempt to add new activities unless there were also some agreement on what was less important, what could be dropped”. The Government representative from Finland, Miss Pohjala, and other speakers in the debate have expressed their agreement with this view. It is one which I also share. Quite clearly, there ought to be a review of what I might call the activities of secondary value and of activities which, although of value in the past, may have outlived their usefulness. This is a matter which will require careful study, and it would not be appropriate for me to suggest here and now a complete list of dispensable activities.

I would, however, like to say something about the future of Industria Committees. These are bodies in which the United Kingdom has always taken a close interest. Indeed, our eminent statesman and trade unionist, Ernest Bevin, had a great deal to do with the proposal in 1943 for the establishment of Industrial Committees as a regular part of the machinery of the I.L.O. We have always actively participated in their proceedings. None the less, we now think the time is ripe for a reappraisal of the purposes and functions of these Committees, and therefore we welcome the consideration which the Director-General gives to this matter in Chapter IX to his Report. In particular we are glad that he makes a reference on page 262 to the advisability of placing items of almost identical technical and social significance on the agenda of several Industrial Committees.”; and we
would agree that there seems little point in discussing such comprehensive questions within the framework of a single industry. Earlier in this discussion Mr. Bahaman and Mr. Manga-Mado, the Government representative for Malaya and the Government delegate for Cameroon, threw doubt on the usefulness of world-wide gatherings in Industrial Committees.

What seems to us as likely to be useful is to have meetings—sometimes confined to one industry, sometimes to several—in which the problems peculiar to these industries could be considered by tripartite bodies consisting of experts closely connected with the industries concerned. Such small meetings—and I underline small meetings—of experts might exceptionally be universal in character, but would more frequently concentrate on a region of the world where the problems to be encountered were likely to be much the same and where consequently there was a better chance of useful conclusions being reached. This would not exclude the possibility of associating with such regional activities the experience gained in the same industry by experts in industrialised countries—as is suggested on page 179 of the Report.

Something of this kind seems to us to offer more useful possibilities than the suggestion made in the Report that there might be ad hoc joint meetings of tripartite delegations from various Industrial Committees.

I would like now to consider briefly one of the suggestions made by the Director-General for reforms in the work of the Conference. As regards credentials procedure, the idea of an independent judicial body, noted on page 149 of the Report, seemed at first sight to be attractive. However, misgivings have been expressed by several very experienced delegates concerning the advantages in the establishment of a judicial body for this purpose. Clearly this subject needs further examination before the present arrangements are changed. Mr. Perera, the Employers' adviser from Malaya, made some useful suggestions in his speech, which I think might be followed up.

On pages 131 to 138 of his Report the Director-General has some interesting things to say about Conference committees and their relationship to this plenary session. I am not, I confess, at first sight, very optimistic about the Director-General's suggestion that the plenary session might sometimes be able to resolve sharp differences of opinion which have resulted in close voting in the technical committees. I should have thought that difficulties of this sort would be best disposed of by discussion, as at present, among the officers of the committee, and that if this fails some smaller outside body, such as the Officers of the Conference, might be brought into consultation.

In Chapter X of the Report the Director-General discusses the place of the I.L.O. in the United Nations family. There is a growing complexity in the range of work carried out by the various international organisations, and I welcome the Director-General's recognition of the increasing nature of close cooperation between the international agencies, and share his belief in the need to make the fullest use of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. This would help to avert the real danger that, in embarking on some of the activities which are mentioned in this Report, the work of other agencies might be duplicated.

This has been a long discussion and many valuable contributions have been made by representatives from all parts of the world. The Director-General will shortly be replying to the debate. Clearly, however, the Conference will have to decide how best to proceed with the detailed consideration of the Report. Other speakers, with whom I agree, have said that the best way to do this would be to refer the matter to the Governing Body, which is now more fully representative than ever before. The Governing Body might well wish to set up a committee which would submit proposals for further consideration. In drawing up these proposals we should want to ensure that the views of all interests were known, and in this Conference, unfortunately, we have been deprived of the advantage of views which otherwise we might have had. Since, therefore, not everybody has had an opportunity to take part in the present discussion, all Members of the Organisation could be given a further opportunity, perhaps by the issue of a questionnaire, of expressing their views. The Committee's proposals would be brought to the Governing Body, so that in due course the Conference could have a further discussion and reach conclusions on more specific proposals. In this way we should be able to make full use of the opportunity to make a worthwhile survey of the I.L.O.'s activities and to determine the best way of deploying its resources.

The President—In agreement with the Vice-Presidents and in accordance with article 14, paragraph 10, of the Standing Orders, the President has decided to permit a statement from the Confederation of Arab Trade Unions to be made in the plenary sitting. I call on Mr. Rageh, Confederation of Arab Trade Unions.

Mr. Rageh does not seem to be present in the hall. I call on Mr. Chernushchenko, Government delegate, Byelorussia.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. CHERNUSHCHENKO (Government delegate, Byelorussia)—The discussion on the Director-General's Report, which has lasted over the past two weeks, is drawing to a close, but this is only a formal termination of the discussion. We can clearly give no valid assessment of the results of the discussion from which more than one-third of the member States were absent—or rather, they were deprived of the possibility of participating in the long overdue discussion of changes in I.L.O. structure and programmes. Because of the intolerable disrespect shown by the South African Government, its reluctance to take any notice of decisions of the I.L.O. the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference has forfeited its representative nature. The continuation of its meetings is purely artificial. Neither now nor in the future can it be concealed that the I.L.O. has refused to keep up with the times and that in June
1963 it found itself in an impasse, a profound crisis. When the so-called “free” Employers abstain on the issue of disarmament, the credibility of a delegate from South Africa—that racist and fascist State—and then refer with regret to the fact that there is no representative of the African countries in the hall, it sounds like sheer hypocrisy. The speakers preceding me have attempted to put the blame for the situation on others. This is the logical continuation of the policy that has been obstinately followed by certain circles in the I.L.O. in the past few years, especially in the last few years. At the present time one must be completely blind and deaf not to realise that the programmes, and in particular the structure, of the I.L.O., are in blatant contradiction with reality.

In the world of today, with mankind achieving great feats in the social field and in science and technology, the I.L.O. has long given the impression of an old house, the inhabitants of which are trying obstinately to fence themselves off from life and, what is worse, attempting to turn the refuse of the past into a principle or even a virtue and to lead a considerable reduction in armaments that would mean a reduction in the appalling annual expenditure amounting to 25,000 million Swiss francs which was such a heavy burden to be shouldered everywhere by the taxpayer. It would result in a reduction of the taxes that hampered the activities of industrial entrepreneurs. It would mean the return of thousands of men to productive labour and an increase in consumption. It would also mean that more funds would be released for social expenditure, and it was what might be termed the budget of civilisation.

Those words were said by the first Director of the I.L.O., Mr. Albert Thomas, and are embodied in his Report to the International Labour Conference of 1932. These two statements, as you see, are separated by 30 years. But it is not only time which has caused this division. It is not only that the figures are not comparable—35,000 million Swiss francs and $120,000 million consumed by defence expenditure. There are many more differences in these statements.

The term “budget of civilisation” mentioned by Albert Thomas could truly be applied to those colossal sums which would be released if we had general and complete disarmament. Had these amounts been earmarked for productive purposes for 25 years all the wealth available to mankind would have been more than doubled; and the allocation of only one-fifth of the sums now spent for military purposes by governments belonging to military groups would make it possible completely to change the situation of the economically underdeveloped countries. It would enable the countries of Africa and Latin America, in the next 20 to 25 years, to achieve a level of industrial development equal to that now attained by the United Kingdom or France.

If Albert Thomas mentioned the return of thousands of men to productive labour, then how much more useful would be the contribution of those hundred million people engaged in military service or in agriculture, industry and transport for military purposes if their talents and efforts were devoted to peaceful constructive work.

Would it not be worth while for the I.L.O. to say its word in support of disarmament and the utilisation of money now spent on war for peaceful purposes; should it not co-operate with all its means and resources in reaching these high objectives? Whereas in 1932 Albert Thomas expressed the hope that the International Labour Conference would give effective assistance, in the Director-General’s Report in 1963 there is no kind of concrete proposal in this direction. Among the five
groups of problems facing the I.L.O., as mentioned by the Director-General, we do not see the main, the central, problem of today—disarmament—and the examination of its economic and social consequences.

Seeking to justify his—to say the least—passive attitude towards this question, the Director-General again and again repeats one thing, that the United Nations is the channel for negotiations on disarmament and related questions, whereas the I.L.O., he says, has to pursue the urgent social aims to which it is committed. But if you mention the I.L.O.'s urgent tasks, you face the question of peace and disarmament and the utilisation of money now spent on armaments for peaceful purposes also to be considered urgent? These problems have a cardinal, an essential importance, for all the international organisations, including the I.L.O., and should inspire its practical activities.

The Government delegation of the Byelorussian S.S.R. considers that the I.L.O. should deal with and contribute towards the complete liquidation of the remains of colonialism and its social and economic consequences. The I.L.O. must fight actively for the elimination of racial discrimination, for improved conditions of work and life of the workers, and for the defence and extension of the rights of the workers and of their trade union organisations.

When reviewing the structure and methods of the I.L.O. it is necessary to have regard to the need for equal possibilities and rights for States Members with different social and economic systems. It is necessary also to provide real and uniform possibilities of participation for the representatives of I.L.O. States Members in all its organs and in the International Labour Office. It is necessary further to bring about a complete democartisation of the I.L.O. having regard to the most progressive provisions which have already justified themselves in the work of the United Nations.

Let us not be told that the I.L.O. is outside politics. Those are mere words. Very often what goes on here is not merely politics but bad politics. An example is the present session. Is it not politics when some delegates use this platform for slander and insinuations about others countries? A blatant example of such politics came just now from Mr. Seidman, a representative of those who split the trade union organisations, who, either on his own initiative or on behalf of Mr. Faupl, spent his time slandering the socialist countries from this platform. No; the I.L.O. cannot forget politics, but its politics must be this: peace and co-operation with equal rights on behalf of the social and political progress of mankind.

We believe that this discussion is not closed. We believe that when our President’s hammer closes the sitting tonight it should strike again to call for fresh discussion in the near future. If the I.L.O. wishes to live it must find in itself the strength to break with the past.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. VÉGH-GARZÓN (Employers' delegate, Uruguay)—At this stage of the discussion very little can be added on the subjects with which the Director-General deals in his Report, namely the structure of the I.L.O. and the plan of action to be carried out in the future with a view to reaching its essential objectives. However, perhaps it will be appropriate to refer to the outstanding aspects of the criticisms made from this rostrum, such as the suggested reforms, from which I shall seek to draw general conclusions that I hope may be constructive.

We have heard interesting suggestions which are worthy of consideration by the Director-General and the Governing Body from delegates who really wish to see our Organisation adjusted to the changing conditions of the present-day world, and particularly to regional conditions. It has been rightly said that what was axiomatic and hence of incontestable value at the beginning of the I.L.O.'s life, when it had been established mainly for the industrialised countries of Europe, was possibly less so during the last decade and may be still less so in the epoch which is now beginning, an epoch in which we are entering. The awakening to independence of whole continents which contain great moral and material strength and rightly wish to make up lost time as regards social, political and economic development.

We have thus heard the voices of representatives of the areas described as underdeveloped, calling for greater attention to their own problems. Of course the conclusions of our Conference alone would not suffice to solve them, for the procedure is slow, and the application of our conclusions is even slower. Indeed, more energetic action is required, something more lively, so to speak more human. In this spirit we have been asked for regional conferences at shorter intervals, for at such meetings, thanks to their limited geographical scope, it is possible to deal in a more practical spirit with the particular problems of each region.

I endorse these ideas without reservation, provided, however, that the conclusions, studies and all other products of the regional meetings are channelled towards execution by a rapid and effective procedure, either within the present structure of the I.L.O. or in some other form which could be studied when the revision of the Constitution is being discussed. I regret to state that we can remember initiatives, proposals, etc., of very great interest for the countries convened to a regional conference, which were forgotten or enclosed in beautiful files and circulated within such narrow limits as to have no practical use.

As examples I may quote the excellent studies and conclusions of the Sixth Conference of American States Member of the I.L.O. at Havana in 1956 regarding productivity and its consequences on economic development. I was present at that conference and can assure you that the conclusions, which were voted unanimously by the three groups represented at the Conference, contained some very sensible provisions, for instance on the debated question of the participation of workers, employers and consumers in the benefits of increased productivity. Well, in my opinion, these conclusions were not used as much as they might have been, mainly owing to the purely advisory character of the regional
conferences, the member States concerned not being obliged to implement their conclusions.

The good work which the I.L.O. has been doing in recent years in various Latin American countries—establishment of the field offices, provision of technical and financial assistance for development (which we in Uruguay are now enjoying)—would have been very much facilitated if all the countries of the continent had recognised and accepted the Havana conclusions in good time.

It has been suggested also, and we should like to endorse this, that the technical assistance being given by the I.L.O., with much efficiency, but on too small a scale, to the underdeveloped countries of America, Africa and Asia should be intensified. We know that this is not for lack of good will and skill, but because the assistance has to be kept within the budgetary amounts available, but I should like to express our hope that the big international financial institutions, such as the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and others will be generous to us, thus taking the opportunity which the I.L.O. offers them of good investments for their funds.

However, there is one aspect of this technical assistance question which, as I have already said from this platform, is of concern to us and at the risk of boring you I would like to repeat it once more. I refer to the choice of the experts who, through the I.L.O., are to render this assistance. Such selection should be free of any political strings, as the Director-General said to the Conference last year. However, as you are aware, the communist countries insist on offering their personnel for this technical assistance and we have listened to very generous statements this year from these communist countries who have offered us their experience in vocational training, particularly of specialists in various occupations.

We Latin American countries, wishing to retain our present freedom, view with some apprehension the path which might be thrown open to communist penetration in our countries through so-called technical assistance, if the Director-General were to lower his guard and accede to the claims of these countries which want to send us their experts without putting them through the selection procedure which is normally applied for I.L.O. recruitment. We feel very closely the fate of our Cuban brothers who, in order to get their oil refineries in operation again, started by accepting technical assistance from the Russians. The latter now have not only the refineries but the whole country as well. You are also aware of the position of the African countries which were recently liberated and have had to close their doors and in some cases even to dismiss experts who had agreed to go there, theoretically to provide technical assistance but in reality to play the part of Trojan horses moving into those countries with purely political objectives.

We do not want the same thing to happen to us and, therefore, we put our confidence in I.L.O. recruitment standards which, we are glad to say, are not accepted by the countries which seek to promote chaos and social disorder under the guise of technical cooperation.

On another, perhaps less immediate but certainly more essential, aspect of our preoccupation for the future of the I.L.O. I should like to say a few words. For there is a moral crisis which, if it cannot be overcome, may threaten the success of our dearest hopes and the achievement of our finest plans. I refer to something which is becoming a regular feature at our Conferences, namely manoeuvres to oblige us to give up a good part of our time to discussing proposals and listening to speeches devoid of any connection with the work of the I.L.O. which is indeed—what is most often opposed to the truth as we know it.

Thus it is precisely the representatives of the countries where there is not the most elementary freedom of association who have the nerve to lecture from this platform on that essential element of relations between workers, employers and governments, that foundation of our political and economic structure. And, on colonialism, we have to listen to big speeches from representatives of the only colonial empire still existing in the world, and indeed continuing to extend its frontiers by conquest or peaceful penetration.

And, finally, on segregation, which has taken up so many hours during the present Conference, we see how advantage is taken of this excuse by representatives of nations which keep in existence, only a few kilometres from Geneva, an example of the most brutal segregation, not of people of various races or religions, but of members of particular families: parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, are subjected to the most odious persecution or even put to death if they seek to escape from this segregation. I refer to the Wall of Berlin.

I think that something must be done to prevent such situations from recurring at our Conferences, impeding our work and preventing acceptance of our conclusions, Conventions and Recommendations. I know it is difficult, and perhaps impossible, at a meeting of nations in their great majority free and democratic, to find means of restricting the activity of those who come here, not to work or to produce, but to brake political propaganda in their own selfish interest. An important step will have been taken with the amendment of the Standing Orders as regards the procedure for submission of resolutions which was endorsed by the Conference only this morning, after it had been adopted by the Standing Orders Committee. But we are confident that other methods will at last be found of obtaining the ideal to which we all aspire, namely survival of the I.L.O. and through it achievement of its plans for greater social well-being; and I should like to close by wishing these plans every possible success.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. CARBONELL HORRUTTNER (Workers' delegate, Cuba)—At last I am able to come forward as representative of the workers' centre of revolutionary Cuba to speak from this platform on some of the points raised in the Director-
General's Report to this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference.

It is true that no one stopped me from coming here before. However, what did happen was that I had to rewrite my speech several times. I wanted first of all to greet the distinguished Government delegate of Nigeria, Mr. Johnson, on his unanimous election as President of the Conference, not only in recognition of his personal merits but also because this was the first occasion on which the Conference has elected a representative of Africa. However, Mr. Johnson had to withdraw because of the intolerable presence of the representatives of South Africa. I also wanted to greet the new member States, such as Uganda, Burundi and Rwanda, but the delegations from those countries had also been obliged to withdraw for the same reason. Then I wanted to pay tribute to our brothers from Algeria who, after a cruel struggle, having written heroic pages of history, have won their liberty. But those delegates too have now left the Conference for the same reason.

I still have the satisfaction of greeting the delegates from Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, if they are still here, and it is also a pleasure for me that it should be Mr. Dreyer, who has been conducting the proceedings with his familiar skill, who is now giving me the floor.

Nevertheless, despite all these difficulties, at least we have expelled from the Conference one of the gentlemen from South Africa—the so-called Workers' delegate. However, no doubt everybody here understands that the man we have expelled is not the one most responsible for the policy we condemn. We have not yet eliminated the Employer, representing those who use the whip to extract the maximum output from our Negro brothers, subjected to cruel conditions of work on the farms and in the mines. Nor, worst of all, have we got rid of the official representative of this tyranny which uses all possible means to persecute, imprison and murder the South African people and then has the nerve to seek to justify these crimes before the world by legalistic arguments.

As regards the Report itself, I shall first allude to a matter dealt with in the second part—namely, the relations between the Conference and the Governing Body. The recent elections to the latter body show the need for fundamental changes in the structure of the I.L.O. We must all understand that the present world is nothing like that of 1919. Today the peoples of a third of the globe, amounting to more than 1,000 million people, have adopted a new social system which seeks to liquidate the exploitation of man by man.

Furthermore, in the most highly developed capitalist countries today there is a proletariat which is playing a more and more important part in the struggle for better conditions of life. Colonialism is being struck down in its last lairs, and dozens of Latin American, Asian and African countries are entering the world of free peoples and strengthening their independence. For all these reasons it is out of date to maintain a structure which no longer fully corresponds, nor can correspond, to the mighty changes occurring in the world. Not to understand this would be to imitate the ostrich.

If we analyse the present composition of the Workers' group in the Governing Body we see that there is not a single representative of unions affiliated to the W.F.T.U., although that organisation includes the great majority of the proletariat of the world. Instead the unions affiliated to a single organisation have a privileged position in that group. Nor are the trade unions of Latin America, Asia and Africa represented in proportion to their strength.

At the same time we support the suggestion apparently put forward in the Government group by Mali, in the name of all the African countries, that a Conference committee should be established to ensure continuity in the work of the Conference; and we consider that the proposed membership of that committee, including Cuba and Brazil, is appropriate.

The Director-General tells us that an income policy conceived in the light of social objectives should aim, among other things, at the provision of social services and essential collective facilities; and he regards social security as an important element in income distribution.

The workers' centre of revolutionary Cuba, through workers' meetings in all the workplaces of the country, attended by over 75 per cent. of all personnel, has discussed and approved the draft legislation placed before it by the revolutionary Government, and this has now become the current Social Security Act No. 1100, which consolidates all the social insurance and retirement funds, protects all workers against the contingencies of occupational and non-occupational accidents, maternity, old age, invalidity and death and provides for allowances and pensions at an appropriate level.

More than 500,000 agricultural workers and 100,000 public employees who previously had no protection are protected under this new Act, which came into force on 1 May 1963.

The solution of labour problems is in the hands of the workers, who are empowered to solve any dispute in complaints committees made up of employers' and workers' representatives. The members are elected at meetings held in each workplace and attended by management.

As a result of the armed struggle by the glorious rebel army under its commandant Fidel Castro Ruz, with the support of the revolutionary Government, in close cooperation with the workers' centre and the trade unions, has started what we call minimum technical courses, in which thousands of workers take part, and also workers' promotion
courses attended by over 300,000 workers. Recently the workers' centre and the Ministry of Education arranged an educational test aimed at raising the educational level of the workers and developing their aptitudes to the utmost. So far, 709,711 workers have voluntarily taken this test, not counting those who attend the workers' promotion schools or have been through school as far as the sixth standard.

In socialist Cuba freedom of association has become a reality. Racial discrimination has been abolished in all its forms, not only by statute but because its elimination is part of the principles of our revolution. In our country today it is quite impossible to see the hateful spectacle of our Negro brothers pursued by policemen, beaten, assaulted and murdered, hunted by trained dogs, prevented from eating in public establishments, going to school or university, walking in parks, travelling in buses, working under equal conditions or exercising their civic rights.

Yet these criminal acts, as damnable as apartheid in South Africa, are occurring today while this very session of the Conference is going on, and particularly most brutally in Birmingham in the United States. Through me, the working class of Cuba expresses its boundless solidarity with its brothers, the Negro workers.

We agree with the Director-General in his preoccupation for world peace, because peace must indeed be the target for all the activities of workers throughout the world.

As our Prime Minister, Dr. Fidel Castro Ruz, has stated, Cuba is for peace, for peaceful coexistence between nations of different social systems, for general and complete disarmament, and for the elimination of colonialism and neocolonialism; it is against imperialist oppression which last October brought mankind to the brink of a thermonuclear war at the time of the Caribbean crisis, which led to Cuba's famous contribution expressed in the "Five Points" that it placed before the United Nations and world opinion.

Acts such as the criminal blockade of Cuba by the imperialists, the breaking of trade agreements, the exertion of diplomatic pressures, which disrupt a country's economic and political relations with third parties, the boycotting of ships putting into Cuban ports, the prevention of the transit of passengers and the encouragement and organisation of armed aggression against Cuba, do not contribute to peace but to war and the division of mankind. If we are really all concerned to maintain peace, these acts deserve condemnation by the Conference.

Finally, in the name of the Cuban working class, veterans of many a battle, I reaffirm our determination to march forward flying our flag of battle and building the first socialist society of the Americas. I reassert our solidarity with our brothers of Puerto Rico, Alabama, South Africa, Mozambique, Angola, and other brother workers of Latin America who struggle against the oppression of governments which are the servants of imperialism. Forward in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. Forward, so that the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea may take their place in the International Labour Organisation! Forward, Cuban workers, Cuban people, in the struggle for the dignity of the workers of the world! Forward, for the Five Points of Fidel Castro! Forward, for the peace of the world!

Permit me to close with the slogan which is not only that of all Cuban workers, but which rises from the throats of thousands and thousands of workers struggling against oppression in the world, the slogan of socialist Cuba: "Fatherland or death, onwards to victory!"

*Interpretation from Russian: Mrs. Tzaroukova (Employers' delegate, Bulgaria)*

—I have come for the first time to this International Labour Conference with a sincere wish to make every effort, on behalf of the Bulgarian employers, to contribute towards the great tasks which the Conference has before it.

Unfortunately, the events that have taken place here have underscored a profound political and organisational crisis in the I.L.O. We have witnessed a mass walk-out from the plenary session of representatives of nearly all the developing countries. Therefore, the question raised by the Soviet delegation is fully justified. Is there any point in continuing the work of the Conference in such conditions, or would it not be wiser to postpone the Conference?

In his Report, the Director-General devotes considerable space to the struggle against discrimination in employment and labour relations. He condemns this manifestation in all its forms, and calls upon the Members of the I.L.O. to participate actively in this struggle. Naturally racial discrimination is in complete contradiction with the Declaration of Philadelphia and the Constitution of the I.L.O. Therefore, it looked as though we would all be unanimous, but when we really had to do things in practice and show our attitude towards discrimination it turned out that the leadership of the I.L.O. preferred to hide behind legal phrases in the Constitution, thereby insulting a whole continent. This occurrence will remain an eternal stain on the I.L.O.'s history.

We have heard from this platform an appeal against the remnants of colonialism, the apartheid policy and discrimination in all forms. At the same time, the South African Republic is carrying on the policy of apartheid. In the report of the subcommittee of the United Nations, document No. A-4978 of 27 September 1961, we have the facts about the terrible situation of the indigenous populations in this country and other colonial areas such as Angola and Mozambique. The mass use of forced labour, murder and oppression against the indigenous population is a day-to-day occurrence. The African people are condemned to death. I must protest against the presence of the representatives of such countries at our Conference.

But this is not the only form of discrimination against the African Continent. In the Director-General's Report a great deal of
space is given to questions concerning the developing countries, but nothing is said about the unfair terms of trade between the imperialist countries and the countries of Africa. As a result of this discrimination, the developing countries in one year lost $3,000 million, not including unsold goods. Merely in the three years following the setting up of the Common Market, the share of the developing countries fell from 38 per cent. in 1957 to 33.5 per cent. in 1960. For the developing countries this represents a loss of $1,200 million, which is twice the amount of financial assistance which these six West European countries gave to the developing countries during this period.

In this connection, we may quote from a leading French colonial official, Mousa, who in his book "Economic Prospects of Franco-African Union" wrote: "In connection with assistance given to the Eden factories in Cameroon by the French monopoly 'Pechinée,' this is not a problem of Cameroon solved by 'Pechinée,' but a problem of 'Pechinée's' solved by Cameroon."

Allow me to state that the discrimination is not only against the African delegates; discrimination is constantly exercised against us Employers from the socialist countries. The most unwarranted and illogical arguments are used against us. I shall not repeat what has been said previously by my colleagues representing socialist Employers.

In the People's Republic of Bulgaria, we have a new type of employer, the socialist employer, who deals with affairs common to all employers: he plans production, deals with supplies and sales, introduces new techniques and technology, organises labour and financial matters, constantly tries to increase the profitability of his undertaking and to improve the welfare of the workers, and signs labour contracts with the workers, and so on. Of course our employer does not rob the workers, nor does he grab the lion's share of the profits. But this does not entitle anyone to think he is not a fully-fledged employer. Or must we think that the only employers considered as such at the I.L.O. are the exploiters who secure their notional well-being out of the pockets of the workers?

Another interesting point: not only the representatives of the employers of socialist countries are not recognised and do not participate in the leading organs of the I.L.O., but even the representatives of the workers from these countries are not represented. It would seem that we have neither employers nor workers. In such circumstances, who creates the enormous wealth of socialist society? Who produces the wonderful spaceships in which the Soviet people are conquering space for the benefit of all mankind? Our countries have a wonderful working class which, together with the members of the co-operatives and the working intelligentsia, has in a historically short time accomplished miracles in all branches of development. For example, in Bulgaria before the war the agriculture and capitalism we were behind the economic development of other European countries. Now our total output has increased by 12 times. We have created new industries chemical, engineering, iron and steel, and so forth. We have increased the production of electric power by 17 times and we have gone well beyond our southern neighbours, Turkey and Greece together, although and population five times more than that of Bulgaria. In a relatively short time my country, which was an agrarian appendage of West European monopolies, has been transformed into an industrial and agrarian country.

We understood that without trained and skilled labour we could not solve the problem of industrialisation of our country. From the very beginning we concentrated on training our own national personnel, and the results have been encouraging. A few facts: in proportion to total population, our country exceeds the rest of the world in the number of people who have completed secondary school, and we have more students than in certain Western countries (for example Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany). We now have more doctors per head of population than in the United Kingdom, France and the United States, for instance. We have one doctor for 712 people; in England they have one for 1,007 people, and in France one for 930 people and in the United States one for 790 people.

There, in a few words, we have a picture of our country and our employers and we see no reason why our workers and employers should be deprived of their rights to contribute positively towards the development of our Organisation and the carrying out of its basic aims and tasks. One of the main tasks is to strengthen world peace. We are still confronted with the nightmare of thermonuclear war, referred to by many delegates from this platform.

We are well aware that only a group of capitalists manufacturing arms are interested in the arms race and in maintaining war hysteria.

The producers of the wealth of mankind, be they capitalist or socialist, are interested in utilising technical progress for peaceful purposes, which will increase the profits of the undertaking itself and also provide colossal possibilities for raising the living standards of thousands of millions of workers. Our united efforts must close the road to militarism and exorcise the evil spectre of thermonuclear war.

The time has passed when the burden of war lay mainly on the shoulders of the working class and the employers could retire to a safe place and await the right moment to do more business and take in ever greater profits. This time is finished. In modern circumstances, with modern war techniques, nobody will remain unaffected. Whole regions will be destroyed, millions of human lives will be taken and centuries-old cultures will be destroyed. The time is ripe for the I.L.O. to approach this problem in all seriousness. The fight against the danger of a new war cannot be led by declarations and resolutions alone. The I.L.O. must direct its standard-setting activities and concrete measures towards limiting the production of conventional arms and prohibiting the testing and production of thermonuclear weapons. They are wrong to think that such activities are outside the I.L.O.'s sphere of competence. By virtue of its Constitution the
I.L.O. must defend the interests of the workers of all countries, and the maintenance of the worker's life is the main task that the I.L.O. must take upon itself. Therefore how powerless the structure of our Organisation is to translate into reality the ideals proclaimed in its Constitution. It is manifest that definite steps have to be taken for changing the structure, make-up and working methods and to create conditions for a further democratisation and better representation of all Members in the Organisation and also for the membership of the Chinese People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, and others. They are worthy defenders of peace and are trying with might and main to fight against colonialism and discrimination in all forms. They are indeed fulfilling the tasks of the I.L.O. as opposed to those representatives who carry out apartheid and colonialistic policies, for whom there is no place in the I.L.O., but who, alas, are still unlawfully among us here.

Lastly, we must change those provisions in the Constitution that define the rights of the Conference in order that it may become the real supreme body of the I.L.O. above all the other organs.

I should like to declare that if we can gear the work of the Organisation to the needs of our times then the I.L.O. will become a genuinely powerful factor in the struggle for peace, in the struggle against colonialism and discrimination and in protecting the interests of the millions of workers throughout the world.

Interpretation from Spanish : Mr. GACIO FUERTE (Employers' delegate, Cuba)—First of all, in reply to the direct statement made by the Employers' delegate of Uruguay, I shall simply say that I do not accept the adjective of "brother" on the part of exploiters. We are brothers of the people. I need say no more. History will correct the rest.

This is the second year in succession that I have come to speak for the Cuban employers at this Conference. Before I touch on the main points in the Report of the Director-General, I should like to say that we are voting in favour of the reports submitted by the various committees, but on the understanding that this co-operation of ours does not prevent us from feeling great concern at the fact that it would be more appropriate and just if all the decisions of the Conference were approved by every one of the national delegations. It is a well-known fact that one-third of the States Members of the Organisation are not present. Therefore, we wish to reiterate yet once more our solidarity with our sister countries of Africa which have withdrawn from the Conference, in their struggle against apartheid, which is the most monstrous form of racial discrimination.

Here I should like to reply to a certain allusion made by a delegate of the capitalistic Employers at the fifth session. The delegate regarded the vote against colonialism and as the capricious attack on my delegation last year. Those who were present at that time will recall the event. That vote showed clearly that the Conference accepted the legitimacy of our credentials as legitimate representatives of the Cuban employers.

First of all, while it is true that I am—as he said—"the last communist Employer whose credentials were attacked" this is a purely temporary state of affairs. New countries will be sending socialist employers to this Conference, although I hope that they will not have their credentials attacked. Socialism is spreading throughout the world and other peoples are choosing this way as the best one for their rapid development. It is becoming a cliché to repeat that the weight of socialist economy in the balance of world economy is becoming constantly greater, but apparently this statement must be repeated in the hope that some people will finally understand it. And if this is so, why not admit the historic truth that there are two kinds of employers in the world today, capitalist employers and socialist employers, and that in accordance with the Constitution of the I.L.O. both must have equal rights in all the activities of this Conference.

The delegate to whom I referred, one of the capitalist employers of a Latin American country, declared that socialist employers are not independent, that they come with instructions from their governments. He should understand that this business of independence is something which must be handled with kid gloves. It is true that the industry which we manage is part of the whole socialist economy of our country; it is true that our economy is governed by an annual plan which aims at the accelerated and harmonious development of our fatherland, to enhance the welfare of the people, to improve their health and to bring their culture into full bloom. It is also an undeniable fact that this plan which governs the national economy is worked out and applied by our Revolutionary Government in the name of the whole population. And it is obvious that we socialist employers are inspired by a desire not for lucre but for the national progress and happiness of our people.

All of this is true and I believe that in stating these truths I am not telling the Conference anything new.

But of course, within the plan of national economy we socialist employers have our duties and specific functions, and therefore we feel that we must share with full rights in all the work of the I.L.O.

But when I hear certain capitalist employers talk about their vaunted independence of their governments I cannot refrain from thinking of the anachronism of this claim. Those who use these words seem to be living in a period of the most naïve liberalism of the nineteenth century. Who today can believe in those siren songs?

I also wonder who is able to discern within the imperialist countries and those others dependent upon them this independence as between financial capital and the government, the difference between boards of management of the monopolies and the executive in certain countries? Have not we already heard too much complacency and with a plethora of symbolism what is good for General Motors is good for a certain empire? What sort of independence is this?
The delegate of the capitalist employers who referred to me does not have to look very far to find the truth of this statement. Let him cast his eyes on Latin America, to which both he and I belong. Has he not realised yet that there are monopolies which set up and overthrow governments at their whim? Or is he perhaps cast his eyes on Latin America, to which both referred to me does not have to look very far.

There are monopolies which set up and overthrow the continent unconnected with the disquieting political machinations which every year give rise to various "pronunciamientos" and "counter-pronunciamientos" of a military nature?

The discrimination practised against socialist employers is unacceptable in the light of the goals of the I.L.O. This year for the second time we have had to call upon the Appeals Board, because the Employers' group denied us the right to share as voting members in the work of the Committees. How long is this discrimination going to continue?

This aggressive attack on the principles of equality which are basic to the I.L.O. is intolerable and is an obstacle to the proper work of the Conference. We believe that the Appeals Board procedure, although it has alleviated the obvious injustice committed against the socialist employers, does not provide a solution to the problem, since we enter the Committees when the discussions have already reached an advanced stage.

A just cause for concern brought out in the Report of the Director-General is the economic development of the countries with low average incomes.

On coming into power the Revolutionary Government of Cuba found itself faced with a country having a single-crop economy, with large land holdings in the hands of monopolies. The Government immediately decided to change all this, and in reply to the policy of aggression and threats from imperialist powers it nationalised the monopolistic foreign-held interests and those of the latter's traditional ally, the bourgeoisie of Cuba.

As a result of the socialisation of our economy, we have secured an over-all increase which, between 1958 and 1963, exceeded 30 per cent. This represents an annual rate of increase of 7 per cent., if allowance is made for national consumption and depreciation. At the beginning of 1963 we entered the stage of planned, harmonious and proportional development of the Cuban economy within a long-term plan lasting until 1965. This plan will lay down the basis for the transformation of our country from a predominantly agricultural economy into one with a mixed economy. Our basic objective, with a view to economic development is to secure an increase in agricultural production, to develop the national food production and to build up stocks for export which will enable us to import more.

We are also laying down the foundations for industrialisation, which will take on an accelerating pace from the five-year plan 1966-70.

The development of our planned economy calls for large numbers of trained personnel, and the socialist countries are giving us a great deal of help along these lines. At the same time the general reform of education, incorporating theory and practice, and linking education to work by the creation of school workshops, and doing away with the traditional contempt for manual labour inherent in the capitalist system, has converted our schools into sources of manpower suitable to the industrial development at which Cuba is aiming for the 1970s. The training of manpower is a joint endeavour for the Revolutionary Government, the working class and all the factors of production.

The social and economic transformation which has taken place in our country, with the triumph of the Revolution and with the assumption of power by the working class, has opened a new era in labour policy which, from that time onward, has been progressively applied with the participation of the workers, who are at the same time the legislators and beneficiaries of this policy. This system is a great improvement on the usual system of evolving labour policy which, as the Director-General points out in his Report, is always the result of an agreement or a compromise between two opposing parties.

The protection of labour has ceased to denote a mere compilation of clauses included in labour legislation and labour agreements, and has come to be a fundamental concern of a society which considers man as the main factor of production.

The Committees of this Conference have been examining the subjects of the termination of employment on the initiative of the employer and benefits in the case of employment accidents and occupational diseases.

The Cuban Revolution has some experience to offer in this connection since job security has been guaranteed by the Labour Justice Administration Law, promulgated by the Revolutionary Government, and which includes in its scope public employees and agricultural workers. Similarly, a worker may be transferred only in the case of an imperative requirement of production and only with the consent of the worker, and in no case can his wages be affected.

The new Social Security Law promulgated by the Revolutionary Government extends maternity benefits, and provides employment injury, occupational diseases, invalidity, retirement, age and death benefits to all workers. It also provides sickness and accident insurance for all workers.

We may say that the new Social Security Law, since it sets up a unified system and covers all the workers of the country, since it covers all the possible hazards to which a worker is exposed and since all workers are equally entitled to its benefits, meets the requirements for optimum social security legislation, namely uniformity, universality, comprehensiveness and equality.

In his Report the Director-General recognises the fact that historical events have necessarily had an influence on the I.L.O., not only in respect of the number of States Members but also in respect of the composition of the Organisaton, since today not only the capitalist countries are Members but also those of the socialist camp and many newly incorporated countries of Asia and Africa.

My delegation feels that if the I.L.O. is to carry out its task successfully and to reach its
recommendations at the next session of the position as the supreme authority of the Organisation. The speeches made by the various delegations on the Report of the Director-General should be collated by a body set up within the Conference to study the proposals made and to make the necessary recommendations at the next session of the Conference.

My delegation believes that the I.L.O. can no longer remain a mere spectator of world events and that it is its duty to bend every effort, along with other organisations, to see to it that decisive steps are taken to protect the interests and the safety of all of humanity by fighting for peace. This is a battle involving all the peoples represented in this Organisation.

Our country is fighting for peace. The most striking example of this was given when our Prime Minister, Dr. Fidel Castro, issued his Five Point Plan at the crucial moments of the so-called Caribbean crisis—a crisis provoked by the absurd attitude of the most powerful imperialist of all time, turned against our little country of 7 million inhabitants. This crisis could have erupted in a thermo-nuclear war which would have meant the death of hundreds of millions of persons. Our people, as Fidel Castro said when he received the Lenin Prize for the strengthening of peace, on freeing itself from imperialist domination and by its example blazing a trail for the other sister countries of Latin America, has made a great contribution to peace.

We, for our part, say here before all the delegates present at this Conference that the Cuban people will, as they have up to now, continue to fight for peace and disarmament, chiefly because we need them to build a socialist society which frees man from all exploitation.

The PRESIDENT—I declare closed the discussion on the Director-General's Report.

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE VALIDITY OF THE CALCULATION OF THE QUORUM

The PRESIDENT—Before adjourning the meeting I feel it necessary to make a statement.

In the statement that he made to the Conference this morning the Government delegate of Poland formulated certain allegations concerning the procedure followed by the Conference since the departure of the African delegations. In particular he stated that decisions which had been taken since this departure had been adopted with the assistance of an artificially created majority. As President of the Conference it is my duty—and I think I have always abided by it—to see that the rules which govern our work are strictly applied.

If the Government delegate of Poland was referring to the vote which took place last Thursday on the resolution concerning the adoption of the budget, I can only confirm what I said at that time, namely that the resolution was adopted by 184 votes in favour, 0 against, and 8 abstentions. The quorum required by article 20 of the Standing Orders was substantially exceeded. I personally made certain of this at that time, in consultation with the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, who was acting on behalf of the members of that Committee.

You will recall that the Government delegate of Rumania asked me at that time for the basis on which the names of the African States had not been called during the vote on the budget. I replied to him that the African States had declared that they were not taking part in the work of the Conference. I specified that the information received by the Secretary-General in this connection included official statements made to him by representatives of the delegations concerned who called upon him on their behalf, statements made on behalf of certain delegates concerned in the debates in the plenary sittings and public statements made on the premises of the Conference through facilities made available for the purpose by the Secretary-General and in the presence of his representatives. Indeed, public declarations have been made by or in the name of a number of delegations, recording their decision not to take any further part in the work of the session.

These public declarations removed any remaining doubts concerning the necessity of taking account of the situation in the calculation of the quorum in accordance with article 20 of the Standing Orders. It would, in effect, defeat the very purpose of the quorum if persons who made public statements that they were no longer taking part in the Conference, and who in addition were in fact absent from the Conference, were nevertheless considered as present for the purposes of this calculation. It would only be by means of such reasoning that an artificially created majority could be spoken of.

(The Conference adjourned at 8.15 p.m.)
COMMUNICATION TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE RESULTS OF THE ELECTIONS TO THE ASIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT—the first item on the agenda for today is the communication to the Conference of the results of the elections to the Asian Advisory Committee. I will ask the Clerk of the Conference to read these.

The CLERK OF THE CONFERENCE—The results of the elections to the Asian Advisory Committee are as follows:

The Employers' Electoral College has elected Mr. Greve (Ceylon) as third Employers' member of the Committee.

The Employers' Electoral College has also elected Mr. Ferrier (Australia) and Mr. Tran-Van-Lôc (Viet-Nam) as substitute members of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT—the Conference will note these results.

TENTH REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE: SUBMISSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—we will now turn to the second item on our agenda for today, the tenth report of the Selection Committee. I ask Mr. Weaver, the Chairman, to submit the report.

Mr. WEAVER (Government delegate, United States; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—I have the honour to submit to the Conference the tenth report of the Selection Committee, which has already been circulated to delegates.

In this report the Selection Committee recommends that the Conference amend the Standing Orders of the Conference to provide for an alteration in the size of the Selection Committee to correspond with the recent change in the size of the Governing Body. It is proposed that the amendment be made at the present session to avoid any difficulty in the matter at the opening of the next session of the Conference.

Before concluding this tenth report, which may well be the last report of the Selection Committee, I would like to express to the Conference my gratitude for the support, efficiency and devotion of the members of the Selection Committee. It was at times a difficult task that the Committee had before it but I can report to the Conference that it discharged its duty with great efficiency and devotion to the ideals of the I.L.O. I would therefore ask the Conference to adopt this report.

The PRESIDENT—are there any comments on the tenth report of the Selection Committee? If not, can I take it that the report is adopted by the Conference? Its adoption also includes the proposed amendments in article 4, paragraph 1, and article 25, paragraph 5, of the Standing Orders of the Conference. May I take it that the report is adopted by the Conference?

(The report is adopted.)

The PRESIDENT—May I be permitted on behalf of the Conference, as this tenth report of the Selection Committee will perhaps be the last one from that Committee, to express to the Chairman our deep gratitude for having submitted the Committee's reports to us in such a clear manner. We are very grateful to you, Mr. Weaver, for that.

May I only add that if the Selection Committee should come and submit an eleventh report, I would not repeat my words of thanks. Thank you very much, Mr. Weaver.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HYGIENE IN SHOPS AND OFFICES: SUBMISSION, DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—we now turn to our third point on the agenda for today, the report of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices.

May I ask the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Gurinovich, and the Reporter, Mr. Uytdenhoef, to come to the platform.

I call on the Reporter, Mr. Uytdenhoef, to submit the report.

Interpretation from French: Mr. UYTDENHOEF (Government adviser, Belgium; Reporter of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices)—I have the honour to present to you the report of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices, which deals with the sixth item on

1 See Appendix XI, p. 635.
2 See Appendix I, p. 465.
the agenda of the Conference. The complete text of this report has already been circulated to delegates.

The decision to put this question on the agenda of the present session of the Conference was taken by the Governing Body at its 150th Session, held in 1961. In its Report VI (1) the Office has briefly sketched out reasons which led to this decision, and it shows that many years ago attention had been drawn to the question of ensuring suitable conditions of occupational hygiene in shops and offices. From 1935 onwards the I.L.O. Correspondence Committee on Industrial Hygiene which, two years before, had approved standards of hygiene to be applied to all commercial and industrial undertakings, stated in a resolution that it was very greatly interested in the conditions of labour in offices.

In 1948 the Tripartite Technical Conference on Safety in Factories, which had just worked out a Model Code of Safety Regulations for Governments and Industry, expressed the wish to see a model code of a similar type prepared for commercial establishments. In 1952 the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers unanimously adopted four resolutions concerning different aspects of the question of hygiene in shops and offices. In 1959, at its 43rd Session, the Conference adopted the Conclusions of the Committee on Problems of Non-Manual Workers recommending the Governing Body to consider the possibility of placing the question on the agenda of a forthcoming session of the Conference. The same year the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers adopted a resolution supporting this recommendation and requesting the Governing Body to consider it as soon as possible.

After examining the question, on which a great deal of complex information was available reflecting the evolution of working conditions in the occupational sectors concerned over the past few decades, the Governing Body decided to place it on the agenda of the present session of the Conference, as has been said earlier.

On the basis of replies to a questionnaire addressed to governments, contained in Report VI (1), the Office prepared the Proposed Conclusions which can be found in Chapter II of Report VI (2).

The Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices, which had the duty to take a decision on these Proposed Conclusions, first opened a general discussion on the question so as to work out the different aspects. Attention was drawn to the growing importance attached, as a result of technical evolution, to the occupational sectors for which the proposed instruments are designed. Thus, it was considered that this question was of particular interest and that the adoption by the Conference of one or more instruments in this field would certainly contribute to a very appreciable extent to improving conditions of hygiene in these sectors.

It was stressed, furthermore, that, as well as the satisfaction that this would bring to the workers concerned, the improvement of these conditions could not but contribute at the same time to an increase in productivity and national income.

However, certain members stated that, while the timeliness of adopting such instruments for shops and offices was indisputable, one should nevertheless envisage the possibility of having similar instruments for other occupational sectors, such as agriculture and industry, where there are certainly important hygiene problems to be dealt with. These members considered it was necessary, from a logical point of view, to undertake as soon as possible a study of provisions which expressly make these other sectors subject to instruments as complete as those covering shops and offices. They suggested drawing the attention of the Governing Body to the value of drafting such projects.

Returning to the question proper, certain members stressed the necessity of defining in a Recommendation a set of measures which should be used as a guide in this field for all countries, but above all for developing countries, whatever their stage of development may be. This would go both for urban and for rural areas. Other members, much fewer in number, expressed the view that the Committee should concentrate on a detailed Convention. This way of seeing the matter came up against a great deal of opposition; the majority, however, seemed to be in favour of a detailed Recommendation and a Convention which would contain only general principles, in order that we might obtain as many ratifications as possible. This latter trend was to be confirmed later.

By common accord between the Government, Employers' and Workers' members, it was decided to discuss, one by one, all the Points of the Proposed Conclusions prepared by the Office, as contained in Chapter II of Report VI (2), beginning with Point 3, which is the first of the proposed Provisions for Inclusion in a Recommendation, the Employers' members having given the assurance that, after examining Points 3 to 65, they would not oppose consideration of the adoption of a proposed Convention which would simply cover general principles such as are to be found in Points 66 to 83 of the Proposed Conclusions.

As a result of this general debate, many members stressed that the text proposed by the Office constituted a set of provisions which were very well presented and were reasonable as to their substance. The work later carried out confirmed this view. The principles which were at the base of these provisions have raised only very few differences of view. The many amendments introduced by different members bear witness only to the very great interest which the Committee has in the question. The great majority of those amendments refer to points of detail which their authors wished to have made more clear or, on the contrary, which they wished to have deleted. Furthermore, many of the amendments, I might say, were rejected as withdrawn.

In the course of examination of the different Paragraphs of the proposed Recommendation, the Committee wished to define, first of all, and as clearly as possible, the field of application
and scope of the instrument. Considering the limited scope of the question on the agenda, they took the view that it was not suitable to apply the instrument to all parts of all the staff of industrial establishments having a commercial or trade department, but only to that department and to the offices of the establishment.

Certain provisions in the draft were of particular interest to the Committee.

The section on lighting gave rise to a great deal of discussion. A debate took place on the question of the advantages of natural light and the inconveniences resulting from a tendency, which can be seen more and more in the field of construction, to erect buildings in which the premises are insufficiently provided with, or even completely deprived of, natural light. Those in favour of this trend consider that there is nothing, either from the medical or technical point of view, against replacing daylight by appropriate artificial light. The Workers' members and most of the Government members considered that, if this new concept in the field of construction and of lighting was spreading, it was nevertheless the expression of a very regrettable evolution. These members stressed the advantages of natural light both from the psychological and physiological points of view. Therefore, the provision to be found in the text presented by the Office which stressed the superior qualities of natural light was maintained.

Examination of the sections relative to noise and vibration and to excessive pace of work led the Workers' members to present an amendment for the insertion of provisions in the instrument regarding rest rooms. A majority of members having considered that such provisions were in the field of labour hygiene, the Committee unanimously agreed to the insertion in the instrument of provisions such as are contained in the Welfare Facilities Recommendation, 1956.

Two Workers' members presented amendments, one an amendment envisaging the obligation to ensure emergency exits in case of fire, and the other an amendment to introduce into the instrument a point providing for protection against dangerous machinery. These two amendments led to an exchange of views as a result of which the great majority of members considered that, because it had been decided that the instrument would only deal with measures of hygiene, it was not suitable to include measures of safety. However, certain members were of opinion that measures of protection against fire were concerned with hygiene, in particular because they sheltered the staff from panic and the results which might arise from it. The first of these amendments, therefore, was adopted and it was decided to introduce into the instrument a provision stipulating that measures should be taken to provide emergency exits in case of fire.

Another amendment to which I must draw attention was for an addition to the text requiring the competent authority to establish minimum standards of efficiency for the different means of individual protection.

Furthermore, the Committee generally accepted, in their spirit and very often in their actual text, the provisions relative to the proposed Recommendation formulated by the Office. The complements or modifications which it considered should be introduced here and there were mainly questions of detail or of secondary importance.

As regards the proposed Convention, the Workers from the beginning of the work of the Committee had shown their preference for a Convention containing some of the provisions contained in the proposed Recommendation. However, the Employers' members considered that a Recommendation by itself would be sufficient. Nevertheless, they did not oppose the examination of a proposed Convention which would simply state general principles in this field. As far as the Government members were concerned, they put forward varying views on this subject.

After due reflection, it appeared to the majority of the members of the Committee that it would be best to accept a compromise solution which would permit us to arrive at a text which dealt only with a certain number of questions of major importance so that it might be possible to ask a large number of governments to adopt the instrument in order to introduce legislation in this field in which legislation is often lacking.

In the light of all this, agreement was reached on the text submitted by the Office, of which only Point 66 defining the scope of the instrument was amended. In fact, as drafted, that Point allowed the competent authority not to apply the instrument to a number of establishments, it being left to the competent authority to decide on the exact scope of the limitation. The Committee decided unanimously to amend this Point so as to stress the exceptional character of the exclusions that governments might wish to make. At this time the Committee decided also that governments should not be allowed latitude to apply only certain parts of the instrument to all establishments concerned.

It should be pointed out that in the course of the examination of Points 66 to 83 certain Government members stated that on certain points the provisions perhaps did not accord sufficiently with their own situation and asked to be given the opportunity of making reservations regarding their position. These reservations were perfectly natural since this was only the first reading. Governments will of course have all the time needed to point out their possible difficulties before the second reading.

Finally, the Committee adopted the Conclusions proposed by the Office referring to a proposed Convention and a proposed Recommendation not only in their spirit, but also in their actual text, since these drafts in fact constitute the Conclusions.

In presenting these Conclusions in the form of the drafts in question, the Office enabled the Committee to succeed in preparing documents which will greatly facilitate the discussions which will take place in the course of the second reading with a view to the adoption of final texts.

Before the Committee broke up it thanked its Chairman most warmly for the ability, impartiality, competence and good humour with which he carried out his task—qualities which
contributed greatly towards thecordial atmosphere which existed throughout the discussions. It also expressed its gratitude to the Office and congratulated it on its remarkable work, which is already proving to have been most useful. The Committee thanked, too, the representative of the Director-General, the expert of the Office and the secretariat, who spared neither time nor effort in providing information to the members, easing the task of the Reporter and leading their work to a successful conclusion.

The PRESIDENT—The general discussion is now open.

Mr. FITZPATRICK (Workers’ delegate, Ireland; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices)—On behalf of the Workers’ group I should like to join the Reporter in his rapidly paid compliments towards the end of his report. I think that these were all well deserved—to the Chairman of our Committee, to the Office staff and to the Employers’ Vice-Chairman, for the efficient work they performed on behalf of the Committee. I would also like to compliment the Reporter himself, the Drafting Committee and indeed all the members of the full Committee, for the businesslike manner in which they tackled their task and the very happy atmosphere in which they brought it to a conclusion. It is a fact that in many countries today shop and office employees have begun to fall behind those in industry in these general working conditions. Therefore it was timely that the I.L.O. responded to representations made in this connection, and moved towards the establishment of better standards for these workers. Of course, there are a great number of people in these categories throughout the world who even at the moment enjoy conditions comparable to or perhaps better than those envisaged in the documents before you, but it is important that the remainder, who represent the vast majority, should have the hope of attaining similarly good standards. The greatest assurance that they may do so in the not-too-distant future would be the adoption here of the proposed instruments we are now considering.

So far as the proposed Recommendation is concerned, the Workers are reasonably satisfied. In addition to the relatively favourable text prepared by the Office they succeeded in the course of discussion in securing certain desirable amendments. On the other hand, they found acceptance of a Convention a far more difficult job. The Workers felt that such an instrument, to be really effective, would require to be more broadly based than the Office draft, and they made strong and persistent efforts to achieve such a result. However, the Employers’ group was determined that if there was to be any Convention it should only express very general principles, and this view appeared to be shared by many Governments.

In the face of these facts, the Workers eventually decided that although the principles to be embodied were far too general, they seemed to form the only basis on which substantial agreement could be achieved. Believing that a Convention to supplement the Recommendation was vital, and noting the link now contained in Point 69 (b), they opted for the Office text, with one amendment included in Point 68.

Already there seems to be a little misunderstanding on one point in the latter connection. This relates to exceptions. The question has been posed as to whether this refers to clauses in the Convention or merely to the establishments mentioned. After the representative of the Legal Adviser had been consulted by the Committee there was general agreement that the provision concerned establishments and not clauses of the Convention.

I hope that the excellent spirit displayed by all sides during the Committee stage will be reflected here in the general assembly, and that you will adopt the report so that we may go on to adopt these important instruments at the 48th Session.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. VÉGH-GARZÓN (Employers’ delegate, Uruguay; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices)—In the name of the Employers’ group of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices I should like to state that, as we said earlier in the Committee, we shall vote in favour of the report submitted by the Committee and of the proposals for a draft Recommendation and a draft Convention attached to it, with a view to a second discussion at next year’s session of the Conference. These texts were prepared, as the two preceding speakers have indicated, in an atmosphere of understanding and co-operation—and I should like to pay tribute to this and express gratitude for the help given to the Committee and the excellent work done by the Chairman of the Committee; the Reporter, the Belgian Government member; and the Vice-Chairman of the Workers’ group, Mr. Fitzpatrick. These draft texts as a whole deserve our approval. However, we would like to utter the following warning.

We have no comments to make regarding the draft Convention because, as Mr. Fitzpatrick pointed out a moment ago, the text was worked out by common agreement with a view to establishing general conclusions such as those suggested by our group from the outset. But in approving the draft proposals for a Recommendation, we wish to reserve our right to put forward, at the discussion next year, a few amendments to certain clauses which we think contain defects; they are far too detailed, and therefore present a danger because it would be difficult to apply them properly; they might be in contradiction with various countries’ laws, which might prevent their proper application. Moreover, there are other clauses which we feel do not take into consideration modern techniques which are available in modern buildings for providing comfortable workplaces for workers, although they may well not agree with certain provisions contained in the Recommendation submitted to this assembly.

Subject to these reservations, I would like to state that the Employers’ group of that Committee endorses here its earlier statement.
of approval of the draft Recommendation and Convention.

Interpretation from Russian: Mrs. SOPTA-LIEVA (Workers' adviser, U.S.S.R.)—We have before the Conference the report on the work of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices. The Soviet Workers' delegation considers that discussion of these problems at the International Labour Conference is very timely. The delegation is agreed that the proposed amendments and conclusions are of great importance, since the working conditions of workers in shops and offices require closer attention. The need for more realistic and flexibly worded provisions is also stressed. It might be necessary to delete certain indefinite and conditional terms which free States from the obligation to provide certain provisions. The adoption by States of effective measures directed towards further improving working conditions of workers in shops, restaurants and offices is increasing every year. Therefore, the urgency of this question is also increasing.

As can be seen from the report presented to you, the Committee has carried out positive work in preparing proposals concerning the character and content of future international instruments on hygiene in shops and offices. As a result, the Proposed Conclusions now include a new section on rest rooms for workers. There are also provisions concerning methods of removing dust, harmful gases and other forms of air pollution from working premises. In particular, it is forbidden to have sales counters in the open air during the cold times of the year, unless workers are provided with adequate means of warming themselves; it is stated that breaks or a shorter working day must be instituted in the case of work in particularly high or low temperatures. It is proposed that the competent authorities should work out minimum standards for special clothing and means of individual protection for workers engaged in certain operations.

The majority of these amendments were put forward and adopted at the initiative of the Workers' group, which has carried out its work in a spirit of mutual co-operation and understanding.

At the same time, there were a number of serious shortcomings in the Committee's work. The full Committee was only able to work during the first few days, which has meant that the views of many representatives of African countries could not be reflected in the document.

In conclusion, it was proposed that we should draft a Convention containing general principles only and no concrete obligations. In our view, a Convention of this type with no concrete obligations would not contribute to the adoption by States of effective measures in the field of hygiene in shops and offices. The document contains certain indefinite and conditional terms which free States from the necessity to fulfil the obligations they have adopted. For instance, Point 75 says that premises should have adequate and suitable lighting. It does not say, however, whether this provision means all the premises or working places so that working operations can be suitably carried out. The right is given to States to exclude any provision from the Convention, thus severely limiting the field of application of the document. We hope that at the second discussion these excessively flexible provisions will be replaced by more concrete and more realistic ones.

As a result of the discussion on the Proposed Conclusions for inclusion in the Recommendation, which the I.L.O. submitted, in spite of the objections of all the Workers' group, a number of important provisions have been deleted referring to the necessity for the competent authorities to establish standards for lighting, ventilation and volume, and area of workplaces, and also the compensation and bonuses which should be given to workers who are working in unhealthy or difficult conditions. This reduces the value and efficiency of the documents.

We consider that experience acquired in different countries in the field of hygiene should be more fully reflected in this instrument. As a representative of the workers of the Soviet Union, I should like to say that in our country we have a wide range of hygiene and safety provisions directed towards further improving working conditions and removing factors which might lead to occupational injury and industrial disease. Every year substantial funds are provided by the State for this purpose. Soviet legislation lays down the basic hygiene requirements for shops, restaurants and offices. Shops, restaurants and cafes must have hot and cold water, central heating, drains, good lighting and ventilation, and also washrooms, showers and other sanitary installations. They are also required to provide special rest rooms and canteens, and, where more than 100 women workers are employed, personal hygiene rooms and nursing premises.

The State lays down official standards for lighting, ventilation and temperatures in accordance with the conditions of operation, and several research institutes study such aspects also. Action against occupational injury includes provision of longer holidays or a shorter working day in industries where harmful substances are used.

Trade unions take an active part in improving conditions of work. They study labour conditions of workers, they conclude collective agreements on labour protection and, together with the economic authorities, ensure their implementation. Supervision of application of legislation is carried out by a large number of social, health and labour inspectors and committees. The construction and entry into use of new shops and restaurants is subject to permanent government and trade union supervision.

Considerable work is done as regards the instruction in health standards for workers. In many cities of our country there are special houses devoted to health education where systematic tuition in safety and hygiene methods is given. We, therefore, hope that the objections of all the Workers' group, a number of important provisions have been deleted referring to the necessity for the competent authorities to establish standards for lighting, ventilation and volume, and area of workplaces, and also the compensation and bonuses which should be given to workers who are working in unhealthy or difficult conditions. This reduces the value and efficiency of the documents.

We express the hope that, in considering this
problem at the next session, the International Labour Conference will take fuller and better account of the views of the delegations of the African countries and will improve the tenor and scope of the documents.

Taking this into account, the U.S.S.R. delegation will vote in favour of the report submitted by the Committee and also in favour of the resolution.

Mr. SMART (Government adviser, United Kingdom)—I should like to refer briefly to something which was mentioned in the excellent and very comprehensive report of our Reporter. The Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices had a long and exhaustive discussion on the provisions of the proposed Recommendation, which was undoubtedly very useful. But unfortunately the Committee’s timetable did not permit any discussion in detail of the provisions of the proposed Convention.

Now a number of Government representatives, including myself, withdrew the amendments we had put down to the proposed Convention in order to help the Committee to finish its work on time. I wish to make it clear that the fact that we withdrew these amendments does not mean that we are able to accept the Conclusions without reservation. On the contrary, there are a number of points of substance which it was not possible to discuss this year and which we think it is imperative should be discussed at a later stage in the preparation of the instrument. I would refer in particular to the question of government powers to exempt classes of premises from individual provisions of the Convention. My Government believes that this question must be given very careful and fuller examination if an effective instrument is to be drawn up.

In making these observations I wish to stress that I have no complaint with the way in which the Committee conducted its business. On the contrary, the Chairman, the Reporter and the members as a whole deserve high tribute for their work on a long and inevitably complex task.

As this is only the first stage my Government is going to support the adoption of the report and its Conclusions, but at the same time I think it is essential to put on record that a number of important questions have still to be considered.

The PRESIDENT—I have no more speakers on my list, and the general discussion is finished.

I will now put before the Conference the adoption of the report. Can I take it that the report is adopted unanimously by the Conference?

(The report is adopted.)

Proposed Conclusions Submitted by the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices 1: Adoption

The PRESIDENT—I will now put before the Conference for decision the Proposed Conclusions. If no one objects, I would put the whole of the text of the Proposed Conclusions to the Conference. No one objects to that? Can I take it that the whole text of the Proposed Conclusions is adopted by the Conference unanimously?

(The Proposed Conclusions are adopted.)

Resolution Concerning the Placing on the Agenda of the Next Ordinary Session of the Conference of the Question of Hygiene in Commerce and Offices, Submitted by the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices 1: Adoption

The PRESIDENT—I will now put to the Conference the resolution concerning the placing on the agenda of the next session of the Conference of the question of hygiene in commerce and offices. Can I take it that this resolution is adopted unanimously by the Conference?

(The resolution is adopted.)

The PRESIDENT—I would like to associate myself with the members of the Committee who have already expressed thanks to the Chairman of the Committee and to the Reporter for the fine work they have done in the Committee. It has made it easy for us to deal with this question very quickly and I think we must, all of us, be grateful. Thank you so much.

Final Record Vote on the Convention Concerning the Guarding of Machinery 2

The PRESIDENT—We will now proceed to take the final record votes on the Convention concerning the guarding of machinery and on the Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery. The vote will first be taken on the Convention concerning the guarding of machinery.

(A record vote is taken.)

The PRESIDENT—The result of the record vote on the Convention concerning the guarding of machinery is as follows: 201 votes in favour, 0 votes against, with 1 abstention. The Convention is therefore adopted.

Final Record Vote on the Recommendation Concerning the Guarding of Machinery 3

The PRESIDENT—We shall now take a record vote on the Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery.

(A record vote is taken.)

---

1 See Appendix VIII, p. 606.
2 See p. 307 and Appendix XIV, p. 642.
3 The detailed results of the vote will be found on pp. 408-409.
4 See p. 308 and Appendix XIV, p. 652.
5 The detailed results of the vote will be found on pp. 410-411.
The President—The result of the record vote on the Recommendation concerning the guarding of machinery is as follows: 204 votes in favour, 0 against, with 1 abstention. The Recommendation has therefore been adopted.

Report of the Committee on Social Security: Submission and Discussion

The President—we will now proceed to deal with the report of the Committee on Social Security. I will ask Mr. Torres Cereceda, the Chairman of the Committee, and the Reporter, Mr. Juhl-Christensen, to come to the platform.

I call on Mr. Juhl-Christensen, to submit the report to the Conference.

Mr. Juhl-Christensen (Government Adviser, Denmark; Reporter of the Committee on Social Security)—I have the honour to present the report of the Committee on Social Security on benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases. The text has already been circulated.

May I first give a short historical introduction to this subject. Since its inception the I.L.O. has been concerned with the adequate protection of workers in case of loss of earnings or need for medical care due to an accident or disease resulting from employment, and in the pre-war period the Conference approved international standards in this field. These standards were embodied in the Workmen’s Compensation (Agriculture) Convention, 1921, the Workmen’s Compensation (Accidents) Convention, 1925, the Workmen’s Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention, 1925, and the Workmen’s Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention (Revised), 1934, and in three Recommendations concerning workmen’s compensation. In 1943, in Philadelphia, the Conference adopted Recommendations setting forth guiding principles for medical care and income security in a number of contingencies, including contingencies due to injuries or diseases resulting from employment.

In 1952 the Conference adopted the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention (No. 102). Convention No. 102 included among the branches of social security a branch dealing with industrial accidents and occupational diseases. In 1959 the I.L.O. Committee of Social Security Experts, which advises the Governing Body on social security programmes, was asked to consider the pre-war Conventions, with particular reference to Convention No. 102. It found that the pre-war Conventions no longer corresponded to the evolution of the concept of social security. It therefore recommended remodelling to bring them into line with new conditions and to adapt them for use by countries at various stages of economic and social development. These recommendations in this respect were reaffirmed by the Committee at a subsequent session in 1962.

As a first step towards the implementation of these recommendations the Governing Body placed the question of benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases on the agenda of the present session. The Committee on Social Security set up by the Conference to consider this item of its agenda took as a basis for its work the comprehensive report prepared by the Office, and examined the conclusions formulated in it.

The first point to be settled by the Committee on Social Security was the form of the proposed instruments. Opinion was divided on this question along the lines shown in paragraphs 10 to 18 of the report. The Workers’ members and some of the Government members stated that only an instrument in the form of a Convention could revise existing Conventions, and expressed the view that only a Convention could be expected to exert the pressure that would procure national action on a wide scale. The Employers’ members proposed that the Committee should concentrate all its efforts on the drafting of a truly comprehensive and progressive Recommendation which could offer States at all stages of development appropriate guidance. The Committee concluded that there should be two instruments in this field—a Convention dealing with basic principles, which should be drafted with a reasonable degree of flexibility so as to meet a wide range of situations, supplemented by a Recommendation providing higher standards.

The Proposed Conclusions adopted by the Committee, which you will find in the report, differ in certain respects from the Proposed Conclusions in the Office text. The most substantial of the changes concerns the scope of persons to be protected and the contingencies to be covered. The Committee agreed that in principle the proposed Convention should apply to all employed persons. Nevertheless, specified exceptions were permitted, and provision was made to allow developing countries to avail themselves of certain temporary exceptions in the application of the provisions concerning the persons to be protected. The Committee also concluded that ratification of the proposed Convention should cover simultaneously both specified contingencies due to industrial accidents and specified contingencies due to occupational diseases. Certain temporary exceptions as regards its application to occupational diseases were provided for developing countries. The arguments put forward in the debate on these points are dealt with in paragraphs 19 to 51 of the report.

The Proposed Conclusions adopted by the Committee on the benefits to be provided follow closely the corresponding provisions in Convention No. 102. The methods of measuring the benefits are identical with the analogous provisions of Convention No. 102. The rates of benefits set forth in the Proposed Conclusions for temporary or initial incapacity for work and continuing total loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty are identical with the corresponding rates fixed in Convention No. 102. However, the Proposed Conclusions adopted by the Committee fix the rate of benefit in case of the death of the breadwinner at 50 per cent.—that is, 10 per cent. higher than required by Convention No. 102. The debate on the nature of the benefits is summarised in paragraphs 52 to 80 of the report.

1 See Appendix IX, p. 613.
The Committee set up a subcommittee to examine a list of occupational diseases appended to the Office text. The subcommittee elaborated a new list and made a number of suggestions, including the suggestion that the Governing Body should examine the possibility of convening a meeting of experts on occupational diseases, whose conclusions would be useful for a second discussion of this question. The comments made in the Committee on the report of the subcommittee are summarised in paragraphs 82 to 84 of the report of the Committee.

As stated in paragraph 81 of the report of the Committee, some amendments were submitted to Points 36 to 57 of the Conclusions proposed by the Office. However, at the suggestion of the Employers' and Workers' members, the Committee did not consider it possible to examine these amendments in detail at this stage owing to lack of time. It therefore adopted the points unanimously.

Lastly, the report was adopted unanimously by the Committee, and I submit it to the Conference for approval.

In the discussion of benefits the Committee stressed the importance of measures to prevent industrial accidents and occupational diseases, but opinion differed as to whether the instruments dealing with benefits should also contain provisions concerning prevention. The Committee adopted unanimously the text of a resolution which has likewise been circulated and in which the Conference would request the Governing Body to examine the possibility of putting the question of prevention on the agenda of a future session of the Conference. I hope that the Conference will give favourable consideration to this proposal.

On behalf of the Committee I wish to draw attention to the second resolution, which recommends putting the question of benefits in case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases on the agenda of next year's Ordinary Session of the Conference.

Finally, on behalf of the Committee, I wish to express to the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen and to the Chairman of the subcommittee appreciation of the excellent manner in which the meetings of the Committee were conducted and full expression of all opinions allowed. We dealt with very complicated technical questions in the Committee, and I should like at the same time to express, on behalf of the Committee, sincere thanks to the representative of the Director-General and the other members of the secretariat for their valuable assistance.

The PRESIDENT—The general discussion is now open.

Mr. DOHERTY (Employers' adviser, United States; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Social Security)—I appear before you as the Employers' Vice-Chairman and as the spokesman for most of the Employers, at least on the technical Committee. I wish, on behalf of the Employers, to pay a humble and sincere tribute to Mr. Torres Cereceda for the fair, impartial and completely objective manner in which he conducted the meeting at all times. As Employers, we applaud Mr. Juhl-Christensen on an exemplary report, a report which embodies the true and accurate picture of what took place during the deliberations of the Committee, again in a completely objective and unvarnished fashion.

With regard to the report signed by Mr. Juhl-Christensen and Mr. Torres Cereceda, the Employers would accept and adopt that report as it stands.

I wish to devote my time to explaining to you and putting on the record the Employers' positions with regard to the Conclusions, which in effect are divided into two categories: firstly, that pertaining to the nature of the document, the Convention, and secondly that pertaining to the Recommendation.

I request, as the spokesman of the Employers, that we divide the vote into those two categories, because frankly the Employers as a basic group are substantially, considerably, and in some instances violently, opposed to the document that embraces the Convention. We shall vote against that portion. Most of us will vote in favour of the Recommendation.

For the record, therefore, I would like to paint for you what I think is a fairly clear picture, without going into substantial details, of the reasons why the Employers fundamentally as a body regard the proposed Convention—the material dealing with Points 1 to 41 inclusive—as an unsatisfactory basis for further consideration.

We started with an Office text which, in our opinion, was essentially sound in its approach. We emasculated that text. Reference has been made by our Reporter to Convention No. 102. It is a fact that we included everything that is in Convention No. 102 but we went, like astronauts, way beyond anything in Convention No. 102 and ended up with a document which in my opinion and the opinion of the Employers, could not be ratified by more than a handful, if that, of I.L.O. Members. We have repeatedly said in our deliberations that this document, by its very nature, being a comprehensive detailed approach to a complicated problem—the problem of covering benefits for workers in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases—must of necessity be sound and progressive; but at the same time it must be sufficiently flexible to make it a document workable by the great cross-section of our membership.

In the first instance we believed, and we still believe, that a Recommendation could have been achieved which would have given to the nations of the world a better approach whereby they could develop more progressively their own legislation in this area. In our opinion, this lacks flexibility to such a degree that it is unworkable.

There are many other objections. As was explained to you, and as you read here in the document, we now give coverage to all employees of every nation, including apprentices, including agricultural workers, including seafarers, including seamen—in other words, we have covered the waterfront. It is true that there are exceptions, but these are in a sense almost a joke for many nations. You may permit exceptions to the all-embracing 100 per cent. coverage of employees for such people as casual workers, cottage industry workers, and so forth, as long as the combined composite
exceptions do not exceed 10 per cent. of the total work force. Well, in many countries this is almost ludicrous. There are newly developing nations of the world which actually do not know what their full population is. They certainly do not know what their total work force is. Even in many of the advanced countries we do not have sufficient statistical census facts covering all categories of casual and other types of work to know whether or not we would comply with the 10 per cent. rule. It is an unworkable approach to the question. The Employers sought to get a greater degree of flexibility.

It is true that in this document we make certain temporary exceptions for “Members whose economic and medical facilities are insufficiently developed”, but the lack of flexibility even in these exceptions stands out glaringly. Let us take a simple example. In providing for benefits—as this is the basic emphasis and sole objective really of the document—we have in the Convention, cover the essential minimum standards that should be achieved by a ratifying Member with regard to medical benefits, which all of us recognise are an essential part of any workers’ compensation or coverage of occupational disease legislation. Yet, in the under-developed countries which may make certain temporary exceptions, we even include the fact that they must, if they ratify this, provide domiciliary care by a doctor for any individual worker who may be injured. This could even include a farm worker 300 miles away. There are countries where there is a lamentable lack of medical services—a lack which is being overcome, but which will nevertheless take time.

Yet, in our very connotations of Point 2 of the Proposed Conclusions, we designate not newly developing countries but members whose economic and medical facilities are insufficiently developed. It seems ludicrous to us that, if their medical facilities are insufficiently developed, they can give domiciliary medical care by a doctor to an individual worker who may be injured many miles away.

There are many other points. In our opinion, it is highly questionable whether many of the other benefits provided for here, including cash payments and a multitude of other benefits, are compatible with the economic capacity of many of the nations which comprise the International Labour Organisation. As Employers, we have repeatedly stressed the fact that there is a clear need for adequate coverage of workers against industrial accidents and against occupational diseases. We subscribe completely to the fact that every nation should develop effective laws within these areas. This is one of the oldest areas of social security legislation that has existed. Yet we recognise also that any developments in this area, or in other phases of social security, must be developments which are compatible with the economic capacity of a country, and also compatible with the administrative competency that has developed in that country. The underdeveloped countries, if they were rationalised and functionally speaking did not have to adopt all the points of a Convention we must consider even the most minor points because not even 98 per cent. or 99.3 per cent. of the points but 100 per cent. of the points of a Convention must be ratifiable by a nation and that nation must be capable of putting it into effect. I honestly question whether there is really any Member in the hall that could put 100 per cent. of even the minute points of this document into effect.

Our Reporter has mentioned the inclusion of an item which requires (requires, I said) that a signatory member shall provide accident prevention. We contend that this does not properly belong in a document dealing with benefits, and it seems to us that it is almost ludicrous to set up a requirement that you must have accident prevention and have no standards as to what should be done. In this sense it is an ill-conceived and ill-drawn document.

I think by these general remarks I have indicated the reason in general why the Employers honestly and sincerely cannot vote for the proposed Convention. We will vote—most of us, certainly—in favour of the Recommendation.

Some persons have said to me “what difference does it make whether you are for or against or abstain, because this is just the first reading?” To me this is a most hideous piece of hypocrisy. There is one document in front of us; this is the only document we can evaluate. If we cannot put our signatures to it in terms of next year’s reading we will vote against the Convention (Points 1 to 41 of the Proposed Conclusions) in protest against the unsatisfactory document. I urge governments not to take the shallow attitude of “what difference does it make?” I think that it is most important that this body, if it recognises that it is not a good document, should have and develop a sufficient voice of protest against it, so that this protest may have some bearing on next year, when I hope we may develop a document that may have legitimate application to the problems of the Members of the I.L.O.

Interpretation from German: Mr. WEISSNERBEG (Workers’ adviser, Austria ; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Social Security)—It is a great honour for me to be able to speak to you as Workers’ spokesman in the Committee on Social Security and to put forward certain comments on the Committee’s report on benefits in case of employment accident and occupational diseases.

Firstly, I must thank the Office for its preparatory work and for its support in our discussions. It has contributed to giving us a basis for discussion which centred on the really basic issues so that we were able to take a decision on them. The Conclusions prepared by the Office and presented to us were also maintained by the Committee in its decisions,
and the Workers' group has also been able to win over the majority of the Committee on some of the most important points, and also, on the other hand, been able to avoid a worsening of the text. Obviously, what we mean by improvement or worsening is a relative worsening of the text. Obviously, what we also, on the other hand, been able to avoid a some of the most important points, and has

The preceding speaker for the Employers' group, Mr. Doherty, who has spoken just

The I.L.O. Committee of Social Security Experts put forward similar recommendations and the point was made to us that the existing Conventions were no longer in line with the development of standards of benefits now expected in social security. None of them, for instance, contained standards on the level of benefits which should apply in the case of employment accidents. We said that it was a civilised State has the duty to maintain a proper system of benefits in case of employment accidents. We said that it was just not good enough to pay-liable-service to this concept but that we should really act on the practical level. The first thing we asked our­selves was how we could best attain our aim.

On the basis of the great majority of the answers received to its questionnaire, the Office proposed a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation. With a desire for flexi­bility—and sometimes you say flexibility when you want to oppose social progress—but with this desire in mind, some people wished to have only a Recommendation. In other words, the Employers' group, which make this proposal at the beginning of our work, made it at a time when we did not know what were we going to have a Convention or a Recommendation. Now we have heard the last speaker we have perhaps a better and clearer idea of the situa­tion.

We heard him say that the Employers will vote against the draft Convention. As far as the Office is concerned, as we can see from the answers received from the governments in response to the questionnaire, the Office had succeeded in a new international instru­ment. The Committee took all these consider­ations into account, and the Conclusions you have before you include proposals on the necessity for revising the pre-war Conventions. The intention is to revise them and bring them up to date, and simplify them. All this would contribute towards increasing the possibilities for ratification.

I have one further comment to make on this point. Up to now the most noble task the I.L.O. has had to fulfil in the field of social security has been to take the initiative. I wonder what we could do that would be better than to adopt a Convention in this field, particularly if one thinks of our obligations towards the survivors of the victims of an occupational disease or of employment acci­dents.

Convention 102 we already have, but as far as that Convention is concerned—and you all know this—all we have is minimum standards and we consider that, having adopted that Convention some years ago, we should now take a few further steps forward, and in the new Convention we should provide for more far-reaching standards, standards of wider application.

I think Mr. Doherty was not quite right in claiming that we have acted like space tra­vellers who have aimed at goals far too far away. I might point out that all astronauts have so far returned to earth safe and sound, and I think that in our work we, too, have never left reality behind us. On the contrary our constant desire was to take into account all the obligations which we must have, as representatives of civilised States. An over­whelming majority of governments voted in favour and spoke in favour of a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation. We must ask all these Government members not to change their views and to recommend all States to implement systems of social security and put them into effect where they do not yet exist, in order to promote the cause of social progress.

In considering the scope of the Convention we thought first of all that the ratification could be accompanied by a declaration stating that, for example, maritime fishing and agri­culture were excluded; but I do not think there should be any legal discrimination made against certain groups of workers. Therefore, although this provision existed originally, we were able to delete it.

In the same way it was thought that occupa­tional diseases could be excluded, but we also succeeded in avoiding this omission. The possibility must be given to developing coun­tries to adapt their systems stage by stage, and you will find in the Conclusions a certain number of elements which will allow developing countries to progress in that manner. However, I should like to add that these paragraphs were adopted almost without change from the Office text, which served as a basis for the Committee's discussions.

Also we spent a great deal of time considering the explanations given by the governments when answering the questionnaire, and we
based our views on what we could consider as representative answers.

In the Committee our aim was to take into account the necessity for a certain amount of flexibility, but we did not accept that the exceptions provided for in the case of developing countries should also be allowed when it came to the scope of the Convention. My country, for instance, is one of those countries which have a system of employment injury compensation, but we have had bitter experience as a result of the exceptions which have been provided for in the system. We feel that the advanced countries should spare the developing countries the experiences they themselves suffered by their mistakes. We must not allow these countries to make the same mistakes.

Summing up, the result was that in the voting in the Committee the great majority of the developing countries said they did not need any exceptions, and they supported the Workers' views. Unfortunately we were unable to attain all our aims. We thought, for instance, that the definition of employment accidents could have been better covered. We also wished to fix a minimum percentage for incapacity for work. Unfortunately, we were not supported by the majority of the Committee, but we hope that next year it will be possible for us to come back to the discussion on these difficult points.

However, in general we are of the opinion that the Committee performed its work well, and that we have a very good basis for discussion next year. This result is due above all to the impartiality of the Chairman of our Committee, Mr. Torres Cerceda, to the Reporter, Mr. Juhl-Christensen, to the Vice-Chairman of the Subcommittee, Mrs. Netter, and also to all the members of the Committee who showed such much comprehension and understanding of our problems.

Before concluding, I should once again like to make another appeal to you: confirm our work by your decisions. I know that there will be a further discussion on the Convention next year, but do not forget that this is a first reading, a first examination of the text. I am not convinced that we can foresee what will happen next year, from the first reading this year. The governments have a great deal of time to allow them to prepare for next year's deliberations, and to put their viewpoints forward at our meeting next year. Once again I should like to ask you not to forget that the Conclusions which are presented to you now will, when adopted as a Convention, allow us to make a great step forward in the field of social security.

Interpretation from German: Mr. TOPALOVICH (Government adviser, Hungary)—The Hungarian delegation feels that the grant of benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases is well justified. It is becoming increasingly important because of increased automation and the increased use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Dangers to the workers are therefore increased. That is why my Government has welcomed the initiative of the Governing Body in placing the subject on the agenda of the Conference.

When we discussed this instrument my Government considered the following questions to be of basic importance: (1) the form of the instrument; (2) its scope; (3) the persons covered; (4) the basic idea that benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases are inseparable from each other; and (5) that the specific conditions of the developing countries should be taken into account.

My Government felt that we should adopt two instruments: first, a Convention which would lay down basic principles in this field of social security; and, secondly, with a view to the application of these principles in countries with differing economic systems, a Recommendation which would be sufficiently flexible and would lay down guiding lines for future development in this field, thus facilitating application of the Convention.

As regards the scope of the Convention my Government feels that its provisions should be applicable to all economic fields, in particular agriculture.

As regards the persons to be covered by the instrument, my Government feels that all workers must benefit by its provisions.

My Government also feels that benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases are inseparable from each other, and that when governments ratify the Convention they must ratify it in respect of occupational diseases as well as employment accidents.

The Hungarian Government is well aware that the application of the instrument may give rise to some difficulties in the developing countries and is of the opinion that we should provide for exceptions in particular cases.

The Conclusions of the Committee, which contain provisions to cover all these points, and which in our view are sufficiently flexible, could make it possible to apply the instrument in countries with different economic systems. However, it is to be regretted that the African countries could not participate in the elaboration of these Conclusions, for reasons well known to all of us. During the discussions and the adoption of the principles our African friends were still present, and the great majority of those countries spoke in favour of them. The Conclusions will provide us with a good working basis for the second discussion next year.

For these reasons the Hungarian Government delegates will vote in favour of the report of the Committee and in favour of the resolutions. Of course that does not mean that the Hungarian Government will not have technical amendments to submit next year.

Finally, I should like from this rostrum, on behalf of the Government delegates of Hungary, to thank the Chairman of our Committee, the two Vice-Chairmen, the Reporter and the officials of the International Labour Office, who all made such valuable contributions to the success of our work.

Mr. ANANDAN (Workers' adviser, India)—I have come here as the representative of the workers of India. I would not have come to the rostrum at all if I had not seen in the document before us, in paragraph 81, Points 36 to 57, that the concluding sentence says that
"... the Committee did not consider it possible to examine these amendments in detail at this stage, owing to lack of time. It therefore adopted unanimously Points 36 to 57." It is my humble submission that in this report the secretariat of the Office has with great deliberation, thought, labour and analysis given Point 36 very much emphasis, and not any other Point. Point 36 of the official draft is so well worded that if a worker is hurt by his own fault, his own folly or negligence (I am a workers' representative myself) at his employment, due to intoxication or to a criminal offence, the suspension of the benefits is to be considered to such extent as may be prescribed. Also the Office text provides that the family of the worker must be maintained, but where the worker commits an error voluntarily the worker has to be penalised. The I.L.O. has been functioning for many years, improving the material standard of the workers. Nobody can say a word against it. It is a universal truth that the material standard of the working class has been improved. The ambition of those great men who gave us the Constitution of the I.L.O., with the Preamble, was to achieve lasting peace through social justice. Here we are after 43 years, having improved the material standard of the working class, and yet we have not achieved lasting peace.

Here is the point which I think the Office, the secretariat, should see: that if a worker errs he should be rectified. If the worker is rectified, naturally, the society to which that worker belongs is also rectified. If the society is good, social justice is easily achieved. Here is the point.

This Point was amended frequently in the Workers' and Employers' groups. But I who represent India can tell you that prohibition is the point. Some speakers have spoken of developing countries, underdeveloped countries or countries to be developed, saying that it would be impossible for them to implement such a Convention, that there should be flexibility and that it should not be accepted as a Convention and so on. But a worker is a human being whether he is American, Australian or Russian, in a developing, highly advanced or underdeveloped country. If he loses a finger or a toe he is maimed, and the physical suffering is the same; but the amount of compensation may differ from country to country. It may be 200 francs here; in my country it may be 25 rupees. It depends upon the capacity of the country to which the man belongs and not upon whether it is underdeveloped or developed.

Therefore, I humbly request that we should try to create a moral atmosphere among the working classes. A tripartite meeting such as this is held nowhere else. Here we have representatives from all countries and the majority of countries are here. If a decision is taken, and we sincerely and honestly try to implement it, we will create a very good moral climate and through that we could give everlasting peace to humanity.

Mr. CALDWELL (Government adviser, United Kingdom)—As a Government member of the Social Security Committee I should like to endorse everything that has been said in tribute to the office-holders on the Committee and to the invaluable help we had throughout the proceedings from the secretariat, and to the general spirit in which the Committee did its work.

I think that anyone reading this report will be struck by the contrast between the expressions of general principle in the introductory paragraphs and the Committee's detailed proposals for a new Convention in the later paragraphs. At the outset the Committee appeared to be in general agreement with the recommendation of the I.L.O. Committee of Social Security Experts that any new instrument should avoid detailed provisions which would tend to render it rigid and to constitute obstacles to wide ratification, and that any new Convention should be confined to setting forth broad principles and general solutions.

In the event, the Committee appears to my Government very largely to have failed to carry out this intention. Recommendations of the Committee of Experts aimed specifically at achieving flexibility have been rejected. I might refer in particular to the point mentioned by the Workers' Vice-President, the proposal that exclusion of agricultural workers and seamen from ratification should be permitted, and also the proposal that the Convention should allow occupational diseases to be excluded from ratification. These were both proposals made by the Committee of Experts who considered this question.

In consequence of these and other changes the proposed Convention has now probably become quite impossible for most developing countries to ratify. Moreover, it now contains so many detailed and stringent requirements that even some of the most advanced countries with very high benefit rates will be unable to subscribe to it. I could instance here the deletion of the proposal to permit countries not to pay benefits in the first two or three days of incapacity, dealt with in paragraph 61 of the report.

I will also draw attention to Point 35 of the Conclusions, dealt with in paragraph 80 of the report, which requires countries to adjust their benefit rates whenever there are substantial changes in the cost of living or the general level of wages. The effect of this is that a country which has ratified the Convention with its
benefit rates, let us say, at 110 per cent. in terms of the previous Point 33—which is approximately the present position of the United Kingdom—if it allows those rates to fall to, say, 100 per cent. it will be in breach of the Convention although the standard provided for in the Convention is only 50 per cent.

While on this point I think I should draw attention to a rather misleading reference to Convention 102 in paragraph 80 of the Committee's report. Convention 102 merely requires countries to review their rates of benefit when there have been substantial changes in the cost of living. This Point requires them to adjust their rates of benefit; and there is a world of difference. Therefore the implication that Convention 102 in some way supports this is distinctly misleading. Provisions of this kind are obviously suitable for a Recommendation but they seem to us to be quite out of place in a Convention which is binding both in spirit and in letter on the countries which have ratified it.

A Convention in anything like this form will therefore defeat its own object, as it will be ratified by, at most, only a very small handful of member countries. Even those countries whose law at present fits in with the Convention will hesitate to tie their hands so tightly in respect of future developments in their social security schemes.

My Government, therefore, while still supporting in principle the proposal that there should be a new Convention, would wish to urge that much greater attention should be paid to the need for flexibility and that all matters which are not clearly concerned with general principle should be excluded from the Convention and dealt with in the Recommendation.

For this reason, in the vote on the proposal for the new Convention my Government intends to abstain.

Mr. HUQ (Government adviser, Pakistan)— It is not my intention to oppose the adoption of this report but, before my Government can make a final decision, such a Convention can be ratified and that such a Convention can be supported in the existing circumstances of our country, it is necessary that there should be a few revisions, especially since this is the first reading of this instrument, so that next year, when the second reading is given, these observations may be of some use.

My Government has indicated, long before this Committee was in session, that we are in favour of a Convention to be supplemented by a Recommendation on this matter of benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases, the reason being, as has been said at this rostrum as well as in the Committee meetings, the need for flexibility. It has been accepted generally that such an instrument, which the I.L.O. is going to adopt, has to be flexible on various grounds. The I.L.O. caters for all its member countries and these member countries are at various stages of economic development. Their resources are varied and there is need for different kinds of treatment of a particular matter. This being so, the principle of flexibility has been a corner-stone and has to be a corner-stone, as a rigid standard cannot be maintained by all the member countries, even if it could be passed at some stage by the I.L.O.

The I.L.O. works through moral pressure and it is necessary therefore, in order that it can exert this pressure successfully and to the extent of our desires, that we should be on solid ground.

I come from a country where the principle of social justice is built in and is an article of faith. My Government believes in the achievement of social security measures in the countries. The Reporter has very successfully set out the need for such flexibility in the Preamble. But, as has been said, it is necessary to examine how far, if matters of detail were included in the actual Convention, and if it were ratified in good faith by the member countries in different stages of economic and social progress—how far it could be implemented 100 per cent. in a realistic way. We agree that this is desirable. We agree that more than this is desirable. But how far, at this stage, is it realistic for some countries? It may be realistic for other countries, but there are many countries which, because of lack of development, even development in the field of social security, must be given a take-off stage and that take-off stage must be practical.

I believe that, perhaps, a day will come when this Convention will also become outmoded and there will be a need for a fresh Convention, giving more benefits and making it more rigid. As I said, it is not my intention to oppose social security, because that is an article of faith in my country, but to make the matter a practical one. And, without burdening you with details, I will take, for example, the inclusion of agricultural workers in countries which are primarily agricultural, where the agricultural system, the land distribution system, is such that employment conditions do not exist in the same manner in which they exist in other countries. I would ask, is it possible to give to the agricultural workers in those countries the same benefits as are given to industrial workers in such a Convention? It is not a question of discrimination, as has been said, but it is a question of realistic approach to a problem.

The benefit system is a chain system in a country. It is not an end in itself, nor can it be administered by itself; all the sectors of the economy of a country are intimately related with such a measure of social security. It requires a comprehensive system of insurance companies, it requires availability of medical facilities, it requires a good transport system, it requires an administrative organisation not only administratively but financially capable of handling a benefit made available to its agricultural workers.

I come from a country where there are also seafarers, fishermen, who have their own conditions of employment which are different from those of other workers, and some special treatment may be needed for them.

The need for such flexibility was recognised but, in the process of the Committee's work, which I repeat has been truly reflected in this report, by virtue of the usual support from various groups, the ultimate draft we have at this stage—and here I associate myself with
the previous speaker from the United Kingdom—has become such that a developing country might have to think twice before ratifying the instrument in good faith. It is not that we do not want to ratify it, but please give us a take-off stage; because we believe in social security, we want to go ahead with our social security measures. Because we believe in this we have had for a considerable time in our country legislation concerning such things as workmen’s compensation. Therefore the principle exists, and we want to develop it; we want to develop it under the auspices and with the patronage of the I.L.O.

It has been said that the developing countries should not commit the same mistakes as have been committed by other countries which are well ahead as regards these beneficial measures. That is perhaps a sound view but, to speak realistically, even to commit a mistake you need resources, you need certain economic and administrative facilities; certain things must be changed. In this connection I have given you the example of the inclusion of agricultural workers in this instrument. It is therefore with a view to strengthening the moral pressure of an organisation such as the I.L.O., it is with a view to ensuring maximum ratification by member countries in good faith, and it is with a view to seeing that the working-class population can actually start off with social security measures and that these can be developed in those countries where they have not yet been adequately developed, that I again advocate more flexibility in the Convention.

Before I conclude I want to associate the Government delegation of my country with the tribute paid by previous speakers to the Chairman of the Committee on Social Security; to Mrs. Nettet, to the Reporter, Mr. Juhl-Christensen; and to all the other members of the Committee and the secretariat of the I.L.O. for the valuable work done. We only hope that when we go on to the second reading of these very valuable instruments we shall do it in such a way, inspired by the I.L.O., that it will be beneficial to the many millions of people who look forward to such social security measures.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. LANTSEV (Government adviser, U.S.S.R.)—I should like to dwell on a few questions which have been touched upon here by the representative of the Employers’ group in our Committee, and I would like to express my disagreement with his assessment of this document. There was lively participation in the work of the Committee by a large group composed of 141 representatives of the various countries, both developing and industrialised. I am afraid I cannot agree with the assessment that has been made from this rostrum and I object categorically to what has been said about some of the provisions adopted at the suggestion of the Workers’ and Workers’ Employers’ group made their views known was that of having a Convention combined with a Recommendation. That could not weaken it,

It has been stated by the Employers’ group that the text was weakened because it was decided that this international instrument should have the form of a Convention combined with a Recommendation. Everybody knows that a Convention is a much better instrument for defending the interests of the workers, while a Recommendation is a weak instrument which does not protect their interests so well. Did we weaken the international instrument by deciding that we would adopt a Convention? We cannot agree with this argument. On the contrary, its value and scope were increased. There have been international Conventions in this field in 1925, 1934 and 1952. They were Conventions, and in a desire to adopt broader measures and ensure ratification we decided to add a Recommendation combined with a Convention. That could not weaken it, because the preceding instruments were Conventions. I think everybody must agree on this point that the Office text was not weakened thereby.

The second point objected to by the Employers from certain countries was that the text of the Convention lays down that these provisions should be applied to all workers, thus excluding discrimination against certain occupations. Is that funny? Is that a joke? I think it is a very serious decision when an international instrument contains a provision stating that all workers are equal; they are equal in adversity, they are equal as regards employment accidents, they are equal when the head of the family dies. Is that ludicrous, as Mr. Doherty stated? I do not think it is at all funny: I think it is a serious and proper decision.

The third very important question of principle objected to by the Employers was the exclusion of the possibility for individual countries to except occupational diseases. What difference does it make for a worker if he dies from an occupational injury or from an occupational disease poisoning his body
and destroying him gradually? I say there is no difference. Any objective observer will say that there is no difference in the social consequences of accidents or diseases incurred at work, and I think it is a serious mistake to say that there is a difference between these two and that the text of the Convention should provide the different governments with an opportunity of excluding occupational diseases from this Convention.

If we believe in the Constitution, we must not be misled and say that this instrument should be made more flexible. This word "flexibility" which we keep hearing has quite a different meaning for me. It now seems to be given quite a different meaning from that laid down in the dictionary, because "flexibility", when used by an employer, means a rejection of all guarantees to the worker. I do not think we should hide behind words and just say that the document should be made more flexible, because this sort of flexibility means depriving the worker of all guarantees.

As regards the developing countries, some Points were adopted, as you know, in the absence of a large number of African countries and other countries which are now in the course of economic development. Therefore, it would seem to be necessary that these Points, on second reading at the Conference, should be considered with the assistance of those very countries which are now developing and which are, unfortunately, absent from the Conference. I hope that future consideration of the instrument concerning benefits in case of employment accidents and occupational diseases in the Committee on Social Security will be in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution, and that we shall not agree to change the text as suggested by the representative of the Employers' group.

On behalf of our Government, I should like to say that the Government of the U.S.S.R. will vote in favour of the text submitted by the Committee on Social Security.

(The Conference adjourned at 1 p.m.)
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1 See p. 398.
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STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE REGARDING RESOLUTIONS MOVED UNDER THE URGENCY PROCEDURE

The PRESIDENT—I have the following statement to make to the Conference.

The Officers of the Conference have considered, in accordance with article 17, paragraph 2, of the Standing Orders, two further resolutions submitted to them under that paragraph.

One of these was a resolution submitted by Mr. Perera, Employers' adviser, Malaya; Mr. Greve, Employers' delegate, Ceylon; Mr. Wajid Ali, Employers' delegate, Pakistan; Mr. Theoharides, Employers' delegate, Cyprus; Mr. Bekti, Employers' delegate, Indonesia; Mr. Tata, Employers' delegate, India; Mr. Verschueren, Employers' delegate, Belgium; Mr. Fennema, Employers' delegate, Netherlands; Mr. Aparicio Valdez, Employers' delegate, Peru; and Mr. Montt Balmaceda, Employers' delegate, Chile, inviting the Governing Body to place on the agenda of the 48th Session of the Conference an item relating to the revision of the Constitution and of the Standing Orders which will enable the Conference either to suspend from attendance for a specified period or, through its credentials procedure, to refuse to admit a delegation nominated by any member State whose national policies are incompatible with the fundamental principles on which the International Labour Organisation is based.

The other resolution is submitted by Mr. Collison, Workers' delegate, United Kingdom, Mr. Kaplansky, Workers' adviser, Canada, and Mr. Mori, Workers' delegate, Switzerland, emphasising the abhorrence of the Conference of the apartheid policy and its conviction that no country which is responsible for such a policy should continue to participate in the I.L.O. and its organs, and requesting the Governing Body to take every possible action to carry out the mandate of the 1961 resolution.

Two meetings of the Officers have been held to consider the question. At the second meeting, held on 25 June, the President and the Employers' and Workers' Vice-Presidents approved the moving of these resolutions. As the Government Vice-President withheld his concurrence the resolutions cannot be considered under article 17 of the Standing Orders, that is to say these resolutions are not before the Conference and cannot be discussed here.

Mr. PERERA (Employers' adviser, Malaya) —As one of the authors of the resolution which has now been declared irreceivable, may I say firstly that we, the authors of that resolution, are not surprised. We have had at this Conference an exhibition of hypocrisy which is unparalleled. We have had gentlemen standing on this rostrum championing the cause of the Africans, but when it comes to definitive action a representative of that bloc has prevented this Conference from taking such action. It is unnecessary to say more.

We have talked, and a lot of people have talked, from this rostrum about principles, about basic ideals, basic fundamentals, but as I had occasion to remark on Saturday, they are not prepared to face up to the responsibilities. All I need say at this stage is that the Employers concerned will present this resolution at the meeting of the Governing Body to be held on Friday.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY: DISCUSSION (concl.) AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We will now continue the general discussion of the report on social security.

Interpretation from French: Mr. LIDBOM (Government adviser, Sweden)—I have listened with great interest and much attention to the previous speakers in the general discussion. In reply to Mr. Doherty, I should like to say first that my Government is in favour of a Convention. We feel it would be a good thing to have two instruments with regard to employment accidents and occupational diseases—in other words, a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation.

With regard to the substance of these instruments, I should like to say immediately that I agree with those who are sceptical with regard to the substance of the Conclusions reached by the Committee on Social Security and published with its report. Like Mr. Caldwell of the United Kingdom, I feel there is a contradiction between the principles stated at the beginning of the report and the conclusions which the
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Committee has drawn in relation to the various issues submitted to it. According to the principles recognised by the Committee itself a Convention should be drawn up which is flexible, which does not go into detail and which is so drafted that each ratifying country would be free to choose the systems and methods appropriate to its own conditions.

Now, in fact, the Committee has adopted a series of Conclusions which could hardly be less flexible: very often these Conclusions relate to technical details and express a preference for some particular method. Many of them could constitute an embarrassment not only to developing countries but also to some countries which are in the vanguard of social progress.

As far as Sweden is concerned, I have no hesitation in saying here that our social security scheme is among the most effective and generous in the world, with a very extensive scope and very generous benefits. However, on reading this report, I have found that on certain points the Committee has arrived at Conclusions which, if reproduced in a Convention, would constitute an obstacle to ratification by Sweden. On other points, the Committee has arrived at Conclusions which do not bother us for the moment but which are not, in our opinion, in accordance with the probable course of social development.

To give you just one example, the Committee considered that any widow whose husband has been the victim of an employment accident should be given a pension for the rest of her life, even if the accident occurs immediately after the marriage, even if the widow is young and has no children of her own, even if she has received an education which enables her to take a well-paid job. My Government doubts whether social progress really calls for such a rigid provision. That is just one example.

Since we are against many aspects of the substance of the Conclusions, you might think that we should logically vote this afternoon against the report and against the Conclusions which go with it. That, in our opinion, would not be a logical course. As already pointed out by a number of speakers, this is only a first discussion and we think that we need some doubt whether social progress really calls for such a rigid provision. That is just one example.

To avoid any misunderstanding, I would merely add that we regard ourselves as perfectly free to reopen next year any issue mentioned in the report.

Mr. MEHTA (Government delegate, India) — I must apologise for becoming a daily infliction, but when you have a small delegation like ours you attempt to achieve the impossible, namely to be present in more than one place at the same time. This will explain my presence at the rostrum today again to speak on the report of the Committee on Social Security. It was an important Committee, although it adopted, relating to two instruments, a Convention and a Recommendation, are far-reaching.

Very early in our discussions we realised that security was essential, not only for the growth of man but also for the development of an organised society. People are not real people until they are in personal and responsible relation with one another. Let me explain what I mean. A quick look at the two instruments and the report on the discussions will show that the objectives that we had in view are comprehensive. They can be divided into four parts: first, to foster and maintain the essential feature of life, namely the family; secondly, to develop a healthy and fruitful association between families, namely the community; thirdly, to develop a full life for the individual, avoiding the sharp contrast between work and leisure; fourthly, to cushion the effects of industrialisation and, in particular, of any rapid change.

The eventualities against which the Committee sought to provide protection range from minor injuries and illness to death. They include even a morbid condition of mind resulting in incapacity for work, accidents, diseases — occupational and otherwise — and so on, and cover persons employed in both the public and the private sectors, self-employed persons, persons whose employment is of a casual nature and members of the employer's family living in his house, in respect of their work for him.

As prevention is better than cure, the Committee took account of this copy-book maxim also and provided for various preventive steps to be taken. So much on the credit side, and there is a lot of it.

Turning now to the debit side, I would refer to Point 2 of the Office text of the proposed Conclusions (Report VII (2)) providing for the exclusion of agricultural workers and seafarers and sea fishermen; this has been deleted. In doing so the Committee did not realise that in a number of developing countries where, due to excessive pressure of population on land, leading to large-scale disguised unemployment, it is even difficult to define and categorise agricultural workers, let alone have definite terms of employment for them. The Committee also decided to ignore the special conditions of employment of seafarers and sea fishermen. By deleting Point 3 of the Office text the Committee deprived the developing countries of the little elbow-room allowed to them to move towards the goal of the proposed Convention. These exceptions, I would reiterate, are absolutely essential if the Convention is to be taken into account.

Moreover, having regard to our existing legislation and the obstacles to adopting more far-reaching legislation in the near future, we would have liked the exclusion of self-employed persons (Point 6) from the scope of the Convention and also the exclusion of the provision (Point 26) for supplementary benefits to a beneficiary needing the constant assistance of another person.

For the same reasons, and on wider and important economic grounds, we are also against Point 34, which targets benefit to the cost-of-living index or the general level of earnings. It is now a commonplace in the science of economics that in the early
stages of development, due to numerous bottle-necks, the rise in productivity is not in proportion to the rise in investment, demand, prices and, therefore, cost of living and in such a situation any “escalator” clause in wage agreements tagging remuneration and benefits to the cost-of-living index would saddle the economy with runaway inflation. That would be a disaster for the economy in the process of development and a catastrophe for the workers who are among the fixed-income groups.

I am stating with a sense of regret that the Committee, by excluding all exceptions which take into consideration the special conditions in developing countries and by including provisions which our legislation does not provide for, has made it difficult for us to adopt the Convention.

The amendment of Point 9 of the Office text, providing for the maximum coverage of 50 per cent. of all employees in industrial workplaces employing more than 20 persons, has put us in a more difficult position. The points that I have mentioned give rise to a fundamental question: what is the value and sanctity of Conventions? I think such an idealistic treatment of Conventions militates against their sanctity and usefulness and makes their future bleak. The Committee, in working out such a Convention, should therefore realise that it is not doing an exercise in writing a Utopia of the late twentieth century and that practicability and feasibility are the main criteria.

Finally I should like to qualify my pessimism by saying that the present discussion by the Committee was the first discussion of the subject. One realises that when a case is first stated it is generally overstated. We therefore hope that, having stated our case—and overstated it—we will give a sober reconsideration to the subject and find it advisable to climb down from our previous position in respect of a number of points, particularly those mentioned by me in this intervention.

**Interpretation from Spanish**: Mr. ZÚÑIGA GARZÓN (Workers’ delegate, Ecuador)—I would ask you to forgive me if I express any strange ideas on this important subject, ideas which stem from the cultural insufficiency of an Ecuadorian worker, and his lack of experience of discussions of this kind, because this is the first time that I have taken part in a meeting of the International Labour Organisation.

I would like to express my very favourable view of the work of the Committee on Social Security. I recognise the problems and the differences of opinion which arose in the Committee as regards this seventh item on the agenda of the present meeting. Under the three groups—Governments’, Employers’ and Workers’ representatives—on their successful attempt to discuss at a high level a question which is interesting not merely in a theoretical sense but because it is closely related to the rights and material aspirations of men and women who have no other means of subsistence than to sell their labour. Essentially in his passage through life man is still only a commodified commodity and is bought and sold. He changes his energy for money which pays for his subsistence.

Many years ago man understood that it was necessary to provide some kind of social security, but hitherto this aspiration has remained largely unfulfilled in most parts of the world. It was during the Second World War that great hopes were raised that after the war the worker would be free from poverty, sickness and the fear of unemployment or accident. We all thought in those days of providing some new form of social security, and in 1944 the 26th Session of the International Labour Conference in Philadelphia, which was important from every point of view, laid the foundations which still serve the world today as regards social security.

Our trade unions sought to defend and improve social security. They accepted the ideas of the I.L.O., and the W.F.T.U. in March 1953 called its great conference on social insurance when conclusions were reached which were the expression of the deepest aspirations of the workers.

The I.L.O. and the trade unions—these two international forces are united in a single objective, and much of that is reflected in the report which we are now discussing. To speak of employment accident and occupational disease benefits as matters of urgent importance is to speak of a vital need for the workers, for millions of men and women, old and young, of all ideological tendencies, all political creeds and all religions. We believe that social security is above all a right which must be guaranteed by law. It must provide universal coverage for the needs of the workers. Therefore we support entirely, without reservation, the text of the report and the Proposed Conclusions. I would merely like to remind you of the idea underlying this future Convention. Social security must always be based on recognition of a fundamental social right ensured by law to every human being living from his labour or unable, temporarily or permanently, to work, as well as to the members of his family. As regards the extent of the sectors to be covered and the scope as regards benefits, we
believe that social security must meet all social risks including occupational diseases, maternity, invalidity, old age, employment accidents, total or partial unemployment and death; and that it must in general provide for assistance to all children so that their education may be ensured. It must also guarantee to the workers holidays with pay and family allowances. In all these cases social security must, by means of cash benefits, provide a satisfactory standard of living for all the working population.

That is the character and content of the Convention, reflecting the ideological essence of the Convention. We know now who sympathise with the aspirations of the workers, and I am sorry to say that the Employers of the capitalist world have already announced that they will vote against this Convention. I am sorry, indeed, to have to say that governments from the so-called Christian Western democracies, representative democracy as it is also called, have decided they will vote against a Convention of that character and having such important social objectives.

On the other hand, we have observed that delegates of the socialist countries, where there is no economic exploitation of man by man, have announced that they will vote in favour of the Convention in the light of their new conception of the world.

We shall not fail to inform our peoples who is with us and who is against us. I cannot speak at great length on technical matters. I have no thoughts to express on them. I merely feel something which corresponds to our real national situation. In our countries when a worker suffers an accident, although there is statutory provision for employment accident insurance, he dies or is disabled: he does not receive any social insurance benefit. Many of the industries owned by capitalists who style themselves Christian and representative democrats, and there are a lot of them, are the first to refuse this social security which is the dearest aspiration of the workers under this economy of free enterprise and free competition.

Therefore, in the name of the workers of Ecuador, I earnestly appeal to employers and governments to drop for a moment their technocratic considerations reflecting a decadent civilisation. I would urge them to leave their mechanical ideologies. Let them drop their useless ideas of flexibility which is merely the immoral expression of an ideology of exploitation. Let them listen to the call of the peoples, of the workers, who ask that the I.L.O. should remain true to its humanitarian approach, that it should establish or promote anything which will be conducive to the development of the peoples and to a new conception and a new system of social insurance. For those workers' children, who receive nothing from social security, for those widows who know nothing but poverty and abandonment, for the workers who have given their all to construct society, I ask that, without political discrimination, all should vote in favour of this text, this Convention, which may be the last effort of the which, in its essence, has great merits and will add to the universal influence of the I.L.O. In doing that, in voting for the proposed Conclusions with a view to adoption of a Convention and Recommendation at the next session, we shall show who is for and who is against the peoples and workers of the world. That is the appeal that I make to you in support of the adoption of a Convention and Recommendation.

**Interpretation from Spanish:** Mr. GONZÁLEZ QUIRÓS (Government delegate, Costa Rica)—I am a man of few words and I shall therefore not tire you with a long speech. I shall not refer to things that have already been said or analyse in detail the document before you submitted by the Committee on Social Security.

I came to this platform to express the views of the Government of Costa Rica with regard to the subject under discussion. Allow me to illustrate what I am going to say by citing a phrase which is frequently in the mouths of Costa Rican economists; whenever an economist in my country wants to oppose or to object to some feature of social progress, or the implementation of some social programme, he tells us that you cannot make chocolate without cocoa. We who think differently and who fully respect the views of others, have added a social concept: that, while it is true that you cannot make chocolate without cocoa, it is even more true that you have to plant the cocoa first. In our country we recognise that economic and social development must proceed side by side. This parallel advance enables our nation to reduce the poverty of the people and to ensure better distribution of wealth.

Because that is our view and because, in practice, this view has given good results, the Government of Costa Rica will give its support to the report of the Committee on Social Security and it will do so not only because this is its view but because, with regard to employment injuries, it is now promoting the establishment of a social security board for Central America and Panama, because the five Central American countries and Panama—which is perhaps not geographically a Central American country but is still a sister nation—these six countries are concerned to ensure that the workers of our respective countries will have decent conditions, in order that our countries, as I said in the Social Security Committee, may cease to be poor.

**Interpretation from Spanish**: Mr. VALDIVIA (Workers' adviser, Chile)—As Workers' delegate of Chile and a member of the Committee which studied the proposed instruments on benefits in case of employment accident and occupational disease, I must express the profound satisfaction which I felt at the intelligent, harmonious and cordial atmosphere which prevailed in the discussions between the representatives of the three groups which made up the Committee. I represent the workers of my country—a free country, inspired by deep democratic beliefs, where collective bargaining is carried on in an atmosphere of complete liberty and independence. Therefore it will always be a matter of satisfaction to the workers of my country that international negotiations which, in its spirit: the Chairman of the Committee, our compatriot, Mr. Torres Cereceda, contributed very much to this spirit in the Committee.
We are proud to note also that as regards this subject Chilean legislation contains provisions which are more advanced than many of those set out in the Committee's report. This has not prevented out striving in the Committee to secure better benefits for the workers of our own and other countries, particularly since in this instrument there is no exclusion of agricultural workers and seamen.

Therefore the Chilean Workers' delegation supports and will vote in favour of the Conclusions of the Committee as contained in its report, which meet the aspirations of the workers of the world.

The PRESIDENT—I have no more speakers on my list, but Mr. Weissenberg, Workers' adviser, Austria, who acted as a Vice-Chairman of the Committee, has asked my permission to speak a second time on this report. As a rare exception I will permit him to do this—on one condition, that his remarks do not take more than three minutes.

Interpretation from German: Mr. WEISSENBerg (Workers' adviser, Austria; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Social Security)—Thank you for this great honour, and I shall not take up even three minutes. From the discussion I have the impression that there is some misunderstanding regarding the text of the Convention, and in particular the Pakistan and Greek Government representatives have made comments which oblige me to reply. If you will look at Points 8 and 12 of the Conclusions you will have a clearer picture as regards the exclusion of agricultural workers and will get a different idea from that which seems to follow from the speeches made. It is correct that agriculture, in principle, may be excluded, since Points 8 and 12 afford developing countries the possibility of excluding any category of employees, other than those engaged in an industrial undertaking, from benefit in respect of accidents of occupational diseases. But this exception is only temporary. To sum up, the developing countries, if they wish, may at first apply the Convention to agriculture. This clarification is important because it may affect the position of those countries as regards the Conclusions as a whole.

The PRESIDENT—We now have to take a decision on the report. Can I take it that the report as such is adopted unanimously?

(The report is adopted.)

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS WITH A VIEW TO THE ADOPTION OF A CONVENTION AND A SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATION, SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY 1: ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We will now deal with the Proposed Conclusions and will vote by show of hands.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Point 1 is adopted by 128 votes in favour to 25 against, with 21 abstentions.)

1 See Appendix IX, p. 621.

The PRESIDENT—I will now put before the Conference the all the conclusions in Section II, Convention; that is, Points 2 to 41 inclusive, and also the Appendix, which is part of Section II, which deals with the proposed Convention.

Mr. Doherty, Employers' adviser, United States, has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. DOHERTY (Employers' adviser, United States; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Social Security)—I believe that the material in Section II, namely Points 2 to 41 inclusive, deals with the body of the proposed Convention itself. The Subcommittee report is a separate and distinct document, and as Employers' Vice-Chairman I humbly submit that there should be two separate votes on this. The Convention itself embodies Points 2 to 41, and is a separate thing entirely from the Subcommittee report on occupational diseases.

The PRESIDENT—But in Point 11 of this Section it says, " Any such list should comprise at least the diseases enumerated in the Appendix to the Convention and any general definition shall be broad enough to cover all these diseases ". That means that the Appendix is part of Section II, Convention. I am not putting to the vote the report of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Social Security.

I will repeat once again that we are putting to the vote Section II, Convention. That covers Points 2 to 41 inclusive of the Conclusions and the Appendix with the list of occupational diseases. In Point 11 there is a reference to this Appendix, and therefore it will have to be covered by this vote. I hope there is no doubt now about what we are going to vote on.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Points 2 to 41 and the Appendix are adopted by 120 votes in favour to 29 against, with 26 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—We will now take Section III, Recommendation, that is to say Points 42 to 56.

(A vote is taken by show of hands. Points 42 to 56 are adopted by 158 votes in favour to 0 against, with 21 abstentions.)

The PRESIDENT—If there are no further observations, I shall declare the Proposed Conclusions as a whole adopted.

(The Proposed Conclusions as a whole are adopted.)

RESOLUTION CONCERNING PREVENTION OF INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS AND OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES, SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY 1: ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We will now turn to the resolution concerning prevention of industrial accidents and occupational diseases. Can I take it that this resolution is adopted unanimously?

(The resolution is adopted.)

1 See Appendix IX, p. 628 and Appendix XIII, p. 638.
RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE PLACING ON THE AGENDA OF THE NEXT ORDINARY SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE QUESTION OF BENEFITS IN THE CASE OF INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS AND OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES, SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY: ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We now turn to the resolution concerning the placing on the agenda of the next Ordinary Session of the Conference of the question of benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases. Can I take it that this resolution is adopted unanimously by the Conference?

(The resolution is adopted.)

The PRESIDENT—I would like to associate myself, on behalf of the Conference, with the thanks that have already been expressed by several speakers. We thank the Chairman of the Committee and the Reporter of the Committee for the work they have done and the results they have presented to us today. I think we all understand that it has not always been an easy task, and we appreciate the work they have done.

FINAL REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE: SUBMISSION AND NOTING

The PRESIDENT—We will now turn to the next point on the agenda of today—the final report of the Credentials Committee. I would ask the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, Mr. Barboza-Carneiro, to be so kind as to submit the report.

Interpretation from French: Mr. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO (Government delegate, Brazil; Chairman of the Credentials Committee)—I have the honour to submit to the Conference the final report of the Credentials Committee, which has already been circulated. It contains the following: the decisions of the Committee on the objections to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Pakistan, to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Uruguay, to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Burundi, to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Morocco; the Committee's general observations on incomplete delegations and regarding the complete absence of certain member States; and indications on the principles followed by the Committee in examining objections to credentials.

In its report the Committee notes the presence of a number of incomplete delegations and the entire absence of delegations from some member States. The Committee thereby draws the attention of the Conference to the fact that these practices are contrary to the obligations assumed by member States under the Constitution. The Committee also thought it proper to restate the principles to be followed when objections to credentials are examined. These principles stem from article 3, paragraph 5, of the Constitution, which requires member States to nominate non-Government delegates and advisers chosen in agreement with the industrial organisations, if such organisations exist, which are most representative of employers or workpeople, as the case may be, in their respective countries.

The Committee's decisions were all unanimous and the Conference is therefore called upon only to take note of this report.

The PRESIDENT—As the report of the Credentials Committee is unanimous the Conference will take note of it.

(The report is noted.)

The PRESIDENT—I see from the heading of this report that it is the final report of the Credentials Committee and this means that we shall not have the pleasure of seeing Mr. Barboza-Carneiro on the rostrum submitting any more reports from the Credentials Committee. I would like, on behalf of the Conference, to take this opportunity of expressing to Mr. Barboza-Carneiro, as Chairman of the Credentials Committee, and to the other two members of the Credentials Committee, our very warm thanks. We know that membership of the Credentials Committee is not always easy; it can be very difficult. But we have got the impression from the reports that have been submitted to us from the Credentials Committee that the Chairman and the other two members of this Credentials Committee have worked in such a way that it has made it as easy as possible for the Conference to take decisions on the questions contained in the Credentials Committee's reports. Therefore, we are very grateful to you, Mr. Barboza-Carneiro, and to the other two members of the Credentials Committee for the work you have performed for us.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE APPLICATION OF CONVENTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: SUBMISSION AND DISCUSSION

The PRESIDENT—We will now turn to the last point on the agenda for today: the report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. I would ask Mr. Lagergren, Government adviser, Sweden, who has acted as Vice-Chairman and Acting Reporter of this Committee, to be so kind as to come to the rostrum and submit the report.

Mr. LAGERGREN (Government adviser, Sweden; Vice-Chairman and Acting Reporter of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations)—Once again the Conference has before it for discussion and approval the report of its Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. The text has been distributed to delegates and I hope that, despite the great length of this report, they will have had an opportunity to study it so as to acquaint themselves with the progress made in implementing the decisions of earlier sessions of the Conference. The bulk of this report is taken up by its appendices, which set out in detail the information received
from over 50 governments on the steps they have taken or intend to take in pursuance of their obligations under the I.L.O. Constitution and under ratified Conventions. These appendices also indicate the discussions which took place in a number of cases as regards difficulties encountered in giving effect to these obligations. It is the Committee's hope, as expressed in its report, that its deliberations will have contributed towards overcoming these difficulties.

In the course of the general discussion all members agreed that the machinery set up to supervise implementation should operate with a maximum of efficiency. Certain members considered that it would be useful for this purpose to define more precisely the approach and procedure to be followed by the Committee of Experts. Most other members, however, did not agree on the need to establish any formal rules of this kind. During this general discussion the Committee gave special attention to the conclusions reached by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations as regards two important questions.

The first question concerns the possibilities open to the supervisory bodies of this Organisation to satisfy themselves that ratified standards are implemented not only in law but also in practice. The report now before you endorses the principles enunciated by the Committee of Experts in order to ensure the incorporation in internal law of standards contained in ratified Conventions. As set out in paragraph 5 of the report, these principles stress the need for the adoption of special measures so as to bring national legislation formally into harmony with the ratified Convention in all cases and to avoid any uncertainty on the part of those concerned with labour legislation.

The report also stresses the importance of labour inspection as a means of promoting practical application. It agrees with the Committee of Experts that observations made by employers' and workers' organisations on the fulfilment of the provisions of ratified Conventions in their countries can be of real value in the work of supervision.

The report before you also deals with the conclusions reached by the Committee of Experts regarding the effect given to the whole Convention and Recommendation concerning discrimination in employment and occupation. This survey, as well as the discussion on it in the Conference Committee, covered the situations and existing practices in the sphere of discrimination.

The Committee hopes that a review of the ratification position next year will show substantial progress, and that all governments will supply detailed information in future on the factual situations and existing practices in the sphere of discrimination.

I trust that in submitting this report the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations has made a contribution to the present session of the Conference and has laid the foundations for future progress in the implementation of international labour standards, which remain the backbone of the Organisation's activities.

The PRESIDENT—The general discussion on the report is now open.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (Government adviser, United States)—It is a source of particular gratification for me to have the opportunity and privilege of appearing before this 47th Session of the International Labour Conference and to speak in support of the report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

First, may I say just a few personal words about this historic Organisation. My Government's association with the I.L.O. began 30 years ago when my father, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as President of the United States, directed the then Secretary of Labor—the first woman to hold a cabinet post—Miss Frances Perkins, to take the steps necessary to ensure full participation of the United States in the work of the I.L.O. Upon the death of my father, my mother, Eleanor Roosevelt, served for six years as Chairman of the United Nations Commission for Human Rights, resulting in the Covenant of Human Rights, which implemented the Universal Declaration on this subject adopted in 1948. This serves, and will continue to serve, I believe, as one of the basic guidelines in the work of this important body. I believe, therefore, you will understand why this report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations has my particular interest and support.

I have read the report of the Committee of Experts; I have followed the work of this Conference Committee through the provisional minutes, and I have studied the report which has just been presented. In doing so, I am struck again, as I have been in the past at previous conferences, by the dedication, the integrity and the craftsmanship of the international civil servants constituting the Conference's secretariat. I would like to add my tribute to them and to acknowledge their indispensable part in the presentation of this excellent report for our approval.
It is also a heart-warming fact that the conclusions in the Experts' report, with the exception of that portion dealing with Convention No. 87, were arrived at unanimously by the Committee of Experts, who represent every political division of opinion that may exist within this Conference. It is rare indeed that in matters so fundamental as those with which the report is concerned a unanimity of basic principle can be and has been so well achieved.

The Committee itself, however, has noted some differences of opinion amongst its members. Paragraph 9 deals particularly with the suggestion of the minority of the Conference members that the work of the Experts should be governed by precise, arbitrary and formal rules. I would like to add my voice, however, to the majority view, expressed in paragraph 10, that there has rarely been a body of human beings charged with the responsibilities of a quasi-judicial decision who have exercised their duties in a more impartial, more objective manner, and with a wholly successful effort to rise above normal biases to achieve integrity of performance rarely equalled. The imposition of arbitrary rules could only serve to degrade such a body and to hamstring its functions.

I would be opposed to such censorship, and in this connection I am struck particularly by the comments of Mr. Igbo, the Government member from Nigeria, who also clearly indicates that the Experts already possess precise terms of reference, as indicated in paragraph 6 of their general report.

Paragraph 41 and the succeeding paragraphs 43 and 44 deal with a subject matter which is particularly close to my heart and to the responsibilities with which I have been entrusted in the Congress of the United States. I am there the Chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor, with particular responsibility in the field of discrimination in employment, both as it affects employers, unions and workers.

In paragraph 43 it is stated that certain members expressed the view that the Experts were not sufficiently objective in their treatment of the situation in the United States. One positive conclusion to be drawn from this report is that discrimination, in one form or another, is unfortunately to be found in every country of the world, no matter how high its ideals or how perfect its constitutional and legislative protections. Had the members mentioned in paragraph 43 devoted comparable efforts in the Conference Committee—and you will note from what I have said that they were encouraged to do so— to explaining how the problems of discrimination existing in their countries are dealt with, this report would be of more value, even though it might be longer.

The Chairman of my delegation, Assistant Secretary of Labor George Weaver, has already documented the nature of our free society, our strength and resolve to meet problems openly and our willingness to furnish full information to the Experts. He has already catalogued the steps that have been taken to erase the stain of discrimination from all walks of American life. To his well-documented recital there has since been added the message of the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, to the Congress, formulating a specific programme for considered action. The Congress has now begun the democratic procedures of translating this programme into statutory form. That there will be resistance to its enactment, as there is resistance to almost every advance in the social and economic fields of man's relationships, is obvious and evident. That this resistance will be overcome is also evident, as was indicated when the President said: "I am promised action. The Congress stay in session this year until it has enacted the most responsible, reasonable, and urgently needed solutions to this problem, solutions which would be acceptable to all fair-minded men."

This programme to which he referred has, of course, been well publicised and I shall not take up your time in repeating it here.

The Subcommittee to which I referred, and of which I have the privilege of being Chairman, approved last week a Bill that would establish federal standards of fair employment practices in a manner that would drive directly to the heart of discrimination in employment and occupation and guarantee the possibility for promotion to the highest posts.

My Subcommittee is proceeding at this very moment to expand the already existing manpower development and training programme and the increased work-study programme which trains young people and adults alike, that they may be equipped to develop their talents to the fullest degree. And this must be so, in order to provide them with the assurance that the only criterion of achievement will be their ability to do the job, and that the factors of race, religion or nationality will have been removed for ever. These are all matters which are well covered in paragraphs 47, 50 and 51 of the report, which makes the report indeed so timely in my own country and my own Subcommittee.

It is good, then, that this year—not next year or in years to come, but this year—we shall in the United States achieve the setting aside of sectional and political ties. We shall do it, as President Kennedy so well put it, "not merely for reasons of economic efficiency or world diplomacy or domestic tranquillity", but because "above all it is right", and justice requires us to ensure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity.

If I may return briefly to paragraph 43, on which some members expressed some concern regarding the objective treatment of the situation in the United States, may I be the first to acknowledge that the ways of democracy are sometimes somewhat slower than the methods practised by other governmental ideologies. Democracy must educate and be completely certain of its grounds before it writes fundamental changes into the laws that govern its people. It can afford few mistakes, and then only minor ones. There will be natural disagreement as to whether in our times urgent problems can be handled in a democratic fashion, but my people and my Government continue to subscribe to the feeling that they can and must.

May I point out that it has not been the misfortune of my country to find itself fighting
on both sides in the same war. May I point out that it has not been necessary in America to renounce the actions and philosophy of one of its great heroes of the past—yes, indeed, almost without honour or justification.

But do not misunderstand me, there are in democracies also times for action and I assure you that I shall, individually and as a member of the Congress of the United States, urge my Government and my colleagues, first, in the light of paragraphs 53, 54 and 55 of this report, to ratify the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958. At the same time I shall urge the necessity of finding and taking practical steps—yes, the leadership—which will not only condemn the worst form of discrimination, apartheid, but make its elimination a prerequisite for any nation that wishes to participate in consultations of its fellow members of the world family. I shall do this not for political reasons but because, as in the implementation of my country's national policy, the time has come to do what is right, just because it is right.

Lastly, in order that it may be doubly clear to all the world, let me emphasise that the departure of the African States from the deliberations of this 47th Session has not meant and does not mean that those nations are not still a vital and essential part of the total membership of the International Labour Organisation. We who remain have a heavy responsibility not only for our own people here represented but also for those who are temporarily absent.

I speak for the entire United States Government delegation when I say that favourable action in the adoption of this report will be one more indication that we have discharged our trust in a manner beyond reproach in this important area. It will help assure that the principles and purposes which first attracted our participation on the road to peace and development, remain a Member of this Organisation.

I venture to hope that despite the veto of the Vice-President of this Conference, the Government delegate of Ukraine, every effort will be made to ensure that the proposal contained in the resolution submitted by Mr. Bouladoux, Workers' delegate, France, will be very rapidly adopted. As you know, it provides for an amendment of the Constitution with a view to allowing the temporary or permanent exclusion of such a State from the membership of the I.L.O.

The PRESIDENT—I must ask you to keep to the report before you and not to discuss other matters.

Interpretation from French: Mr. ALDERS—However, we must not forget other kinds of discrimination, and we lay stress, inter alia, on the discrimination affecting women, on the often subtle and indirect discrimination on a political, social or religious basis, and on the inequalities and preferences as between various categories of the population. We regret that the reports from governments were not very explicit with regard to the various kinds of discrimination, and we ask that not only should non-discriminatory legislation be promulgated everywhere but that there should also be a positive policy to establish and practise equality of opportunity and treatment of all sections of the community.

We once again considered another aspect of human rights, namely freedom of association. In the absence of new information from governments which could disprove the conclusions reached by the Committee in previous years, the Committee did not repeat its previous discussion. This should in no way be taken to mean that the majority of workers no longer
insist on the world-wide application of the principles embodied in the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948, and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949. On the contrary, this majority hopes that the I.L.O. will use every means, including those advocated by the Director-General in his Report to the Conference, to ensure that ultimately all workers may enjoy genuine freedom of association.

The case again laid stress on the need for a labour inspection service with independent, qualified and sufficiently numerous staff, with the necessary powers to ensure that the law will be translated into practice. This is an essential aspect of the application of I.L.O. instruments. It will enable us to safeguard the independence of the trade union movement while respecting the fundamental principle of the tripartite structure of the I.L.O.

The Workers' Committee has emphasised on several occasions its attachment to the tripartite principle, as you can see from reading our report. In particular, we expressed our regret at the fact that too few observations from employers' and workers' organisations had been communicated with the reports of governments. We suspect that governments have not paid sufficient attention to this constitutional obligation, and we urge them to bear this obligation in mind. We also fear, especially after the increase in the number of States Members of the I.L.O., that many trade unions are ignorant of the existence of provisions in this respect. I must therefore reiterate the request of our group with regard to assistance from the International Labour Office. We should be very grateful to the Workers' Relations Division if it would inform the trade unions of all countries of their rights and obligations with regard to information and reports to be submitted by their respective governments on the effect given to I.L.O. standards.

I have three more observations I should like to make before concluding. Firstly, in connection with article 35 of the Constitution, the attitude of the Workers' group is well known. The Workers' group calls on the Governing Body to take positive action without further delay. Secondly, with regard to certain criticisms that have been levelled against the Committee of Experts the great majority of the Workers' group to impose rigid rules upon them. Thirdly, the Employers' members of the Conference Committee, as stated in paragraph 12 of the report, have suggested that Conventions which have proved a failure should be eliminated from the International Labour Code. This is what the Director-General's Report refers to as "deadwood".

We know very well that nothing will be done along these lines without the assistance of the tripartite organs of the I.L.O., but I should like to emphasise, in my personal capacity if necessary, that we cannot agree with all the proposals which the Director-General has made in this connection, without first looking very closely into them, since, in our opinion, a Convention adopted by the Conference has an intrinsic value even if it has not received all the ratifications that were hoped for. Although continuous formulation of the International Labour Code does not lie within the competence of our Committee, we cannot remain unmove by an attempt to diminish the standard-setting task of the I.L.O.; nor can we accept without protest any insinuation concerning the superiority of Recommendations over Conventions.

I shall not dwell any further on this capital question, because it is not supposed to be under discussion at the moment and I would need to devote a whole speech to it.

I am glad to have been permitted to speak in the name of the Workers' group of the Committee.

Mr. FÉCHETTE (Employers' adviser, Canada)—It is difficult for anyone to assimilate quickly the voluminous report which has been submitted by the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. We hope that member States will study it carefully because it sheds a great deal of light on the nature of the constitutional obligations which they have voluntarily accepted by their membership in the I.L.O. and by their ratification of instruments forming part of the International Labour Code. I should just like to comment on one or two matters which, in my view, have particular significance.

You will see, and you have heard, that certain members have proposed the imposition of a new set of rules to govern the composition and organisation of the Committee of Experts, whose annual studies form the foundation of the work of the Conference Committee. Acceptance of this proposal would, I submit, imply three things: that the Conference is distrustful of the objectivity of the Committee of Experts and of its competence to examine and evaluate evidence; that the Committee's work is unorganised; and that the Experts do not take account of what is said in the Conference Committee. All of these premises are false.

The Committee of Experts is, of course, not infallible but, like the individuals who compose it, it has proven its competence, its impartial judicial character and its objectivity. It has established an effective modus operandi which, on its two-yearly system of examination, supervises the application of individual ratifications totalling nearly 2,800. And it does modify its work and extend its studies in the light of needs revealed by the Conference Committee.

This whole controversy hinges around the contention of certain countries that I.L.O. standards should be interpreted in different ways depending upon the economic and social structure of the countries concerned. This idea of a double standard was rejected by your Committee, which refuses to condone discriminatory principles. The time to take into account the differences of social
and economic systems and practices is when standards are being formulated and not when they are subsequently interpreted.

This year the Committee of Experts has devoted special attention to the means available for gauging the practical application of Conventions, apart from purely legal compliance. With the tripartite co-operation of member States and observance of the principles set forth, there is useful scope here for improving the effectiveness of supervision of social standards.

The experience of the Conference Committee shows that there is a continuing improvement in the understanding of Members' obligations, under article 19 of the Constitution, to submit to their competent legislative authorities the instruments adopted by the Conference. I suggest that there is a parallel obligation for governments to examine existing legislation and to submit, at the same time that ratification is being considered, a clear picture of what new legislation and other measures must be undertaken if the instruments are to be applied. Workers' and employers' organisations should be consulted. Ratification should then be decided on the basis of whether or not these measures are acceptable. It seems to me that if this principle were followed in all cases, the work of the Committee of Experts and of the Conference Committee would be greatly simplified.

It must be apparent to everyone that the number of ratifications registered by the various member States is by no means an index of their relative social standards. A great deal could be said on this subject, but surely one of the main reasons for non-ratification by member States which take their obligations seriously is the existence of critical imperfections in the instruments themselves.

If the continuation of standard-setting activity in the Organisation is to achieve its potential, it is up to succeeding sessions of the Conference to produce instruments which are capable of practical application having in mind the varying economic and social capabilities of member States.

It would also be appropriate to weed out those instruments which have proved a failure and to give further thought to the desirability of revising parts of the existing Code. This is not within the competence of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, but the experience of the Committee should serve to illuminate the need.

Be that as it may, the means of supervising social standards exists and, within the bounds of member States' co-operation, it works well.

Interpretation from French: Mr. MARTUCCI (Workers' adviser, Italy)—I should like to draw your attention to paragraph 52 of the report. This paragraph raises the question of discrimination in the light of nationality, which is not covered by Convention No. 111: that deals in particular with discrimination based on race, colour, sex, religion, politics or social status. Convention No. 102, which entered into force in 1960, deals with national extraction, but the Committee of Experts considered that this did not extend to distinctions based on nationality. The Committee of Experts in its report recalled Paragraph 8 of Recommendation No. 111, which stresses the need to have regard to the provisions of Convention No. 97 and Recommendation No. 86 in regard to equality of treatment of migrant workers. However, the Committee, having devoted particular attention to Convention No. 111, was not able to examine forms of discrimination relating to nationality which are covered by other Conventions and Recommendations.

I would refer particularly to the following Conventions: the Maintenance of Migrant Workers' Pension Rights Convention, 1935 (No. 48), which has eight ratifications, the Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97), which has 19 ratifications, the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102) (Part XII), which has 15 ratifications, and the Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962 (No. 118), which has two ratifications.

I should like to draw your attention to the importance of discrimination against workers on the grounds of nationality. At this session the Conference has had to deal particularly with racial discrimination. That was proper, but we should remember that, in a changing society, persistence of discrimination based on nationality should not be permissible, leading as it may to situations similar to those occurring through racial discrimination. We must combat all kinds of discrimination; that is to say, we must combat the very principle of discrimination, without restriction or reservation.

In the past few years many countries have attained independence and consequently the problem of nationality has arisen with increased force. Legislation protecting national interests has been adopted and these laws, one must say with all sincerity, provide for very grave restrictions on the rights of migrant workers. This is due to the fact that there is not yet, on the whole, any clear consciousness of the very positive function of migrant workers in modern society. They are considered as tolerated guests; it is forgotten that, making enormous sacrifices of a moral and material character they contribute considerably to the economic and social progress of the countries which use their services. If efficiency and skill are equal, foreign workers should receive the same treatment as national workers. This is a problem not only of social justice but also of fundamental human rights.

I should like to call the attention of the Conference to the following proposals. First of all, it is necessary that all countries, and particularly those which use foreign labour, should ratify and apply the Conventions and Recommendations relating to the rights of migrant workers. Secondly, it is necessary for the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations to make a thorough examination of discrimination on grounds of nationality. Thirdly, the I.L.O. should prepare a charter for migrant workers which would bring together the provisions on this subject in the various international instruments, with a view to the protection and equality of treatment of migrant workers. In making these proposals I hope I am interpreting the feelings of most of the Conference.
Mr. ABID ALI (Workers’ delegate, India)—In connection with the report which is under discussion I would like to emphasise the need for educational propaganda in the language and of the standard understood by the workers concerned. Reference has been made to this earlier but my feeling is that sufficient consideration has not been given to this particular item.

The next suggestion I wish to make is that the I.L.O. should undertake on-the-spot study. At present we have much correspondence and discussion, but the true position as regards possibilities and difficulties is not really appreciated because no study has been made of the standard which is necessary for effective implementation; there has been no proper appraisal of the real position. If studies were undertaken the discussion which takes place here year after year with regard to some of the items which come up repeatedly would perhaps be of more benefit to all concerned.

I suggest that exaggerated claims as regards application and implementation by some countries, and it is not possible here to know the true position. For instance, a particular country may have ratified a Convention with regard to mines although it does not possess a single mine, or about workers on plantations although it has no plantations at all. There have been several instances of this kind, and my request is that this item too should have some consideration so that exaggerated claims about ratification may be minimised.

I would like to tell you very briefly about what we do in India. Once or twice a year we have a meeting. The most senior officer of the Ministry of Labour presides over a tripartite conference to which senior representatives of the employers’ and workers’ organisations are invited for the purpose of surveying the position with regard to the implementation, ratification, and so on, of these Conventions and Recommendations. There the real position is discussed, difficulties are explained and the workers’ requirements are emphasised. After matters have been properly studied and discussed decisions are reached, and fortunately in this particular tripartite meeting in India unanimous decisions are reached, so that the I.L.O. is not very much troubled so far as India is concerned. I have explained this so that my friends in other countries may adopt this procedure and the three parties meeting together, understanding each other’s requirements and difficulties, will be able to solve their problems more amicably, and the discussions we have here from time to time will be considerably shortened.

Mr. SEIDMAN (Workers’ adviser, United States)—No phase of the activity of the I.L.O. is more important than the annual study by the Committee of Experts and the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations of the manner in which member States are conforming to the standards established by the I.L.O. in the various Conventions and Recommendations. These standards are important in and of themselves because they establish a point of reference, an objective, not only for governments but for trade union organisations too. But their greatest significance is the way in which they are applied in legislation and administrative rules and in day-to-day practice in member countries.

All the Conventions and Recommendations are important, although some have greater significance than others. But none is of greater importance than those which seek to establish, maintain and protect the human rights of workers. I want to discuss human rights instruments in two important fields: freedom of association and discrimination.

The report of the Committee of Experts year after year reveals that some countries which have ratified 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) are in flagrant violation of their obligations. Chief among the offenders are the Communist countries. Since they have shown no disposition whatsoever to meet these obligations, both the Committee of Experts and the Conference Committee this year have merely summarised their past findings. Thus, in its report, the Committee of Experts says with respect to Convention No. 87: “no new element has been adduced which would invalidate the conclusions reached by the Committee in previous years, i.e. that the legislation of the U.S.S.R. contains a number of provisions which are or are liable to be contrary to the rights and guarantees laid down in the Convention.”

It is important to recall what were those conclusions reached in earlier years by the Committee of Experts. In their 1962 report the Experts stated the following conclusions— and incidentally they constituted a repetition of still earlier findings.

In paragraph 15 they said that articles 152 and 153 of the Soviet Labour Code “place restriction on the right of organisations to draw up their constitutions and rules in freedom, to organise their administration and activities, and to formulate their programmes”, and are therefore “incompatible with . . . the Convention”.

In paragraph 16 they said that these same articles of the Soviet Labour Code “have the effect of prohibiting the establishment of federations or confederations outside the existing trade union movement.”

In paragraph 22 they said that the Order of 15 May 1935 of the Soviet Government, which is still in effect, gives the Government the power to refuse to permit any unauthorised trade union meeting.

In paragraph 26 they said that article 126 of the Soviet Constitution “appears to prohibit members of trade unions and their leaders from belonging to any other political party”—is, than the Communist Party—“and also to place all organisation of workers under the direction of this party”. The Committee asks if it is not illegal for any group of workers to establish a trade union independent of the party.

In paragraph 29 they said that article 137 of the Soviet Penal Code would subject to penalties “any worker or group of workers who might wish to organise outside the existing trade union movement” or “in the event of
a strike decided upon contrary to the opinion of the trade union leaders."

We have heard from this rostrum in the past and from the two Communist members of the Committee of Experts that the Experts are not objective because they seek to apply the same standards to communist and non-communist countries. I can think of no more valid and eloquent answers than two statements made by the Committee of Experts.

In their 1962 report, paragraph 14, they said—and they were repeating what they had said a year earlier—"when a unified trade union movement results solely from the will of the workers, this situation does not require to be sanctioned by legal texts, the existence of which might give the impression that the unified trade union movement is merely the result of existing legislation or is kept in force only through such legislation." This year, as well as in 1962, the Committee stated, "while noting the various political, economic and social conditions in different countries, it"—that is the Committee of Experts—"is not called upon to express any view concerning the systems of different countries but simply to examine, from a purely legal point of view, to what extent the countries which have ratified Conventions give effect to the obligations which derive therefrom." And in this year's report the Experts go on to say, "The Committee considers that it would be acting in violation of its mandate if it did not point out that States which have ratified Convention No. 87 must grant to workers and employers the rights and guarantees laid down in the Convention."

The Committee of Experts has no double standard, and the American labour movement has no double standard. We are aware, and deeply regret, that it is not only in the Communist countries that the rights of workers to freedom of association is being denied, and where governmental authorities have taken over control and domination of the trade union movements. This is a trend which must be reversed. The I.L.O. has a tremendous responsibility to do everything possible to make effective the right of workers everywhere to freedom of association.

As a recent statement of the executive council of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. made clear, we in the American trade union movement do not believe that our particular trade union structure should be, or even could be, exported to other countries. The American trade union movement do not believe that the workers have the right to organise and maintain their own trade unions free of governmental domination or control. I turn now to the question of discrimination. Congressman Roosevelt has already told you about the problems we face in the United States and the progress we are making towards eliminating discrimination against minorities, and especially Negroes, in our country. We do not hide our problems; we recognise them, and we seek to solve them.

The trade union movement in the United States stands in the forefront of those who are seeking to establish equality of opportunity for all Americans, Negro and White alike. For more than 20 years, we have sought federal legislation to prohibit racial discrimination in employment which Congressman Roosevelt told you about a few minutes ago. Now we are confident that this legislation is in sight. We have used every power at our command to root out the last vestiges of racial discrimination or segregation in our own ranks.

The President of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., George Meany, who has been in attendance at this Conference, said just a few days ago, "None of us can be or will be satisfied until discrimination is eliminated in its entirety." In this resolve, we in the American trade union movement are united, and we know we will succeed.

But there are countries which, while they maintain discrimination within their own borders, brazenly deny it exists. These same countries hypocritically assume the most righteous pose in denouncing discrimination in other countries. Once again, it is the Communist countries which apply the double standard.

The whole world now knows about the resurgence of antisemitism in the U.S.S.R., where there is a conscious and determined policy of holding up Jews to public opprobrium and denying Jews both the opportunity for cultural and religious expression and equal opportunity for education and employment. Discrimination against Jews in education and employment stems from the internal passport which is obligatory for all Soviet citizens 16 years of age or over, except for residents of some rural areas.

Ethnic extraction or so-called "nationality" is one of the items of information on the passport. All persons of Jewish parentage must identify themselves as Jews on the passport. They must do so whether or not they speak or understand Yiddish, and whether or not they practise the Jewish religion. This passport must be shown to a prospective employer before a Soviet citizen can be hired.

The Jew is a second-class citizen in the Soviet Union. Unlike all other so-called nationalities in the U.S.S.R., the Soviet Jew is nowhere considered indigenous. This is true even though Jews have lived in Russia for more than a thousand years. In all regions, the preference in education and employment is given to the local nationality, which never includes the Jews. Thus the Jew in the Soviet Union has second status everywhere.

The Soviet Jews are considered as a national entity only when it is to their disadvantage. When they seek to pursue the Jewish culture or religion—even in such a simple and harmless thing as bakeries being permitted to prepare unleavened bread for the Passover—then they are considered assimilated, although when they seek employment they are marked as Jews. Yet a decent policy would require just the reverse. People ought to have the right freely to express themselves as individuals or groups in cultural or religious matters, but for educational and employment opportunities they should be treated as individuals, not as members of any nationality, racial, religious or ethnic group.

Everyone knows that antisemitism has existed in Russia for many years, both before and after the revolution. Thus, even if the Soviet Government did not itself foster a policy of antisemitism, the long tradition of anti-
semitism would be enough reason not to require people to identify themselves as Jews for purposes of obtaining employment.

The fact is that the listing of ethnic extraction or documents required for employment is in itself incompatible with the principle of non-discrimination in employment and occupation.

The forced identification of Jews in such passports is an open invitation to discrimination against Jews and therefore in violation of both the spirit and the letter of Convention No. 111 on discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

Interpretation from French : Mr. BOULADOUX (Workers' delegate, France)—I should like to draw the attention of the Conference to a question on which there have been interesting discussions within the Committee and which is mentioned at several points of the report, particularly in Part III.

The question is whether a government which has ratified a Convention can, at its own will, release itself from the obligation to ratify the Convention in whole or in part for reasons connected in particular with the economic situation.

I should like to stress the dangers of such a tendency and I should like to say that we ourselves cannot agree with it. We cannot accept the argument of a certain government which, in the course of the discussion on the Director-General's Report, sent a representative to this rostrum to say that the basic Conventions of the I.L.O. were inapplicable in his country although it had ratified them.

Of course, I am in favour of a sound policy of regional devolution, but I feel this should not lead to social regression; quite the reverse. The adjustment of standards which is suggested to us by certain governments would lead to that outcome, all the more surely because in many cases these governments, although they have ratified Convention No. 87, try by every means to eliminate all free, independent and democratic organisations of workers, whatever their ideology, if such organisations very legitimately, without indulging in rabble-rousing and in a constructive spirit, want to defend and represent the vital interests of the workers, whatever the economic situation, in accordance with the spirit and letter of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98.

What we regard as serious in the light of the discussions of the Committee over the last few years is that we are not faced with acts which are merely a matter of the reluctance of certain governments, but we are faced with an erroneous view of freedom of association and the trade union movement, in contradiction with the Conventions I have just mentioned. Some, particularly in countries in course of development which are faced with genuine difficulties in developing their economies, no longer want to recognise the traditional role of a free trade union movement in putting forward claims and representations. They are therefore trying by every means to integrate the trade union movement and to make it a mere auxiliary of economic development; and if the movement refuses to be integrated they try to break it either by imprisoning its leaders or by abolishing the movement. A reading of the reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association of the Governing Body provides striking examples of this practice. One of them shows us a government which adds to its complaints against a trade union organisation which defends the interests of its members the complaint that it is affiliated to an international organisation. In other words, not only does the government fail to recognise the true role that should be played by trade unions; it also fails to carry out the tradition of international solidarity of the labour movement. If I may digress a little here I would add that the international trade union movement has given every form of support to the legitimate aspirations of colonial peoples to independence in accordance with the principles of the I.L.O., and has done so with a sincere desire to promote human brotherhood by true human equality in law and in fact. It did not do this so that the oppressed should be victims to new forms of oppression. Freedom of association is recognised by our Conventions and is an integral part of political freedom.

We have all struggled for the political freedom of the colonial peoples; but it must be known also that we will continue to struggle for freedom of association and that, having stayed at the side of those who are fighting for political freedom, we will continue to fight alongside them for freedom of association. The Committee was right to emphasise in paragraph 5 of its report that "there must be application not only in law but also in fact". This is an excellent statement of views, like the whole report which is before us, but it seems to me it would have been a good idea to lay greater emphasis on the serious dangers that lie in a deformation of the fundamental notion of freedom of association for this Organisation and for its tripartite composition.

There can be no doubt that great vigilance, together with new and effective methods of work, are essential to safeguard the spirit and existence of the I.L.O.

Interpretation from Russian : Mr. IVANOV (Government adviser, U.S.S.R.)—Now as never before we must give consideration to the organisation and functioning of the supervisory machinery as regards the application of Conventions. The system of supervision is now passing through a difficult period. On the one hand, there has been an increase in the scope of the work of the supervisory bodies, and the actual substance of their activities has become more complex. This is due to the increased membership of the I.L.O. and to the participation in its work of countries with totally opposed economic systems as well as of the young countries from Africa and Asia. On the other hand, the system of supervision and the methods of work of the supervisory machinery unfortunately remain as they were in 1946 and 1947. If in some bodies of the Organisation some changes have been made and in view to adjusting the Organisation to new conditions and if these conditions are to some extent taken into account in drafting Conventions and Recommendations, yet as regards the super-
visory machinery nothing has changed. It is becoming more and more apparent that the present system of supervision of application is ill-adjusted to the new conditions.

The Standing Orders of the Conference concerning the terms of reference of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (article 7) have become obsolete. The work of the Committee has gone beyond these terms, and the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations has shown itself in the changed circumstances to be without the basic principles that would enable a proper approach to be made to a solution of the most important problems.

I shall quote a few examples because some representatives here have said that in putting forward our proposal we are not taking an objective stand and seem to be needlessly suspicious of the work of the Committee. We feel that the Committee of Experts has not pursued definite principles and that this has been reflected in its work. My first example: in recent years the Committee of Experts has devoted part of its report to its conclusions concerning the application of ratified and non-ratified Conventions, and of Recommendations. Last year these conclusions concerned forced labour. This year they concern discrimination. Whereas last year the Committee concentrated its attention on the divergences between legislation and the provisions of the Conventions, this year the Committee concentrated its attention rather on dissemination of experience, devoting very little attention to divergences.

My second example concerns the consideration of economic and social conditions when analysing the application of Conventions concerning freedom of association. In the 1957 report the Experts came out in favour of taking into account specific economic and social conditions, but in 1961 they were against this. Now they again favour this principle, although only in a formal manner.

My third example: in 1957 the Experts said that their conclusions concerning the application of Conventions and Recommendations would be based on reports and communications supplied by governments. Five years later they rejected this approach, mainly using outside material in their conclusions on forced labour. This divergence in the approach to identical problems can only weaken the process of supervision. For this reason the Government delegation of the U.S.S.R. tabled a proposal to draft rules for the Committee of Experts which would embody the basic principles for its work. This is mentioned in paragraph 9 of the report now before you.

The individual principles mentioned by the Experts in their reports are no longer sufficient to face present-day realities, and in fact the Experts are not even adhering to them. Rules such as those proposed should determine the terms of reference and the organisation of the Committee they should be prepared by the Conference, and the Experts should be required to adhere to them. Adoption of such rules would undoubtedly improve supervision of the application of Conventions and Recommendations.

In discussion of this problem in the Conference Committee there were many members who spoke against our proposal and we did not put forward any positive proposals. I would like to draw the attention of the members of this Conference to paragraph 11 of the report before you where the statement of the Government member from the Central African Republic is mentioned. He rightly pointed out that those who were against the Soviet proposals never made any constructive proposal and that this had a purely negative effect.

Prevention of discrimination in employment and occupation is a matter of first-rate importance. It might have been expected that the Committee of Experts would help the Conference to see clearly many instances of discrimination. However, the report submitted by them has not proved to be satisfactory. The Experts have not found sufficiently energetic words to condemn discrimination, not even in the Republic of South Africa. They mentioned apartheid only in passing, although the Government of South Africa cynically refused to change its legislation. The only thing this Committee was able to do was to confine itself to a simple statement of fact, and it says in paragraph 88 of the report, referring to South Africa, that “the legislation and practice of the country establish extensive discrimination in employment and occupation: they did not implement the provisions of this Convention.” And this is all that directly concerns the Republic of South Africa. Judge for yourselves: the I.L.O. has adopted a resolution to invite South Africa to leave the Organisation. The United Nations has condemned the policy of apartheid. The African countries are boycotting South Africa in protest against this policy, but the Committee of Experts devoted only a few lines of its bulky report to stating that discrimination exists there. How lamentably insufficient this seems in the light of the decisive protest made against apartheid at the present session of the International Labour Conference.

In the report of the Committee of Experts reference is made to prevention of discrimination not only in law but also in practice. This is very good, but the report presents as a positive example the legislation of countries where discrimination is actually practised, one of these being Portugal. How can Portuguese legislation be quoted as a positive example when it is well known that in Angola and Mozambique there reigns not only discrimination but even terror as regards the indigenous workers? This fact was brilliantly stated by the representatives of African countries and the African trade unions in the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

The question of discrimination in the field of employment and occupation must remain on the agenda of the Conference. The Conference Committee is now appealing to all countries to ratify Convention No. 111, and it points out in its report that this Convention can be ratified even by federal States. We cannot confine ourselves to a mere appeal. We must revert to the problem of discrimination at a future session and consider how States react to this appeal and how in practice they implement the provisions of this Convention.
Here, as in preceding years, some members of the Committee of Experts continue to adopt an erroneous position as regards the application by the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries of the Conventions concerning freedom of association. As regards the Soviet Union, the main "argument" put forward in support of the allegations that divergences exist between the provisions of Soviet legislation and the Conventions concerning freedom of association is the statement that there is a legal obligation to register with the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions. Last year, from this very rostrum we put the simple question to the Experts: in the Labour Code of the R.S.F.S.R. referred to by the Experts is there, or is there not, an obligation to register with the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions? The Experts did not, of course, reply. Nor could they reply, because in the Labour Code there is no such obligation.

In this connection I should like to say a few words about Mr. Seidman's statement. Mr. Seidman referred to section 152 of the Labour Code of the R.S.F.S.R. I am convinced that Mr. Seidman has not read this law, but if he has not read it then, to speak frankly, he should not have missed this splendid opportunity to keep silent. I should like to add that Mr. Seidman's allegation that there is discrimination against the Jews in the Soviet Union is an invention, a falsehood, an irresponsible statement from this rostrum.

Lack of objectivity, combined with tendentiousness, have become a form of principle—and a very bad one, too—for the work of some members of the Committee of Experts and also of some delegates to our Conference. This became clear first in connection with the application in the U.S.S.R. of the Conventions concerning freedom of association and then last year in examination of the question of forced labour in other countries. A number of representatives of African countries pointed this out. Finally, today, in connection with the consideration of discrimination this has once more become very clear. Has the time not come to secure objectivity in the work of the Committee of Experts? We must realise that we cannot go on like this. The tendencies and attitudes fostered by certain circles in the I.L.O. in the most irresponsible manner can only obstruct all efforts to improve the conditions of the workers. This undoubtedly goes against the very purposes and objectives mentioned in the I.L.O. Constitution.

Interpretation from French: Mr. COHEN (Government adviser, Bulgaria)—The report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations reflects the work of that Committee, which this year has become exclusive in character. The question of the representatives of Africa naturally had its repercussions on all the organs of the Conference, including the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, which was deprived of the majority of its work, of the assistance of the excellent representatives of Africa, who came to this Conference with the intention of defending their legitimate interests.

Permit me to draw the attention of the Conference to certain circumstances which in my opinion are of capital importance.

First of all, we have before us a very positive proposal by Comrade Ivanov, Government representative of the U.S.S.R. to the Committee. This proposal was to adopt Standing Orders for the Committee of Experts with a view to improving its work. It was said by certain delegates that the work done recently by the Committee had had tendencies which cast doubts on its objectivity and affected the authority and efficiency of its work.

For instance, the Committee makes observations to my Government concerning the submission of non-ratified Conventions to the Praesidium of our National Assembly. We have explained on many occasions that since our National Assembly, like all legislative authorities of nearly all countries, cannot meet continuously throughout the year, there is a legislative organ called the Praesidium of the Assembly that sits between the sessions of the National Assembly, two or three times during the year. All the actions of the Praesidium are subsequently submitted to the approval of the National Assembly. Furthermore, the Praesidium has ratified a great many Conventions—has it not thus shown its efficiency? Yet the Committee of Experts, which is very sensitive to criticism of non-objectivity, continues to make observations in this regard. Is that objectivity? Is that impartiality? The Conference will draw its own conclusions.

It is easy to understand why the Soviet proposal was vigorously objected to by almost all the Employers' members (except those from the Socialist countries) and some other members of the Committee. It is suggested, as a main objection to this proposal, that in accepting it the Committee would have its work stopped, that the rules would be a straitjacket, and that the Committee should be left free. All these arguments show a lack of good will on the part of those who argue in this way. The very fact that the proposal was summarily and immediately rejected without discussion must involve a reflection on the way in which some members look upon work in this Conference, coming here with their minds made up in advance, without any idea of compromise, resolved to reject immediately any proposal from the socialist countries.

However, this was a very positive proposal, as I have said. We know very well that organisations and committees of much less importance have rules governing their activities: a fortiori such an important committee should have rules to protect it from arbitrary action and partiality on the questions with which it deals, and particularly the question of the application of Conventions and Recommendations, which is of cardinal importance for the Members of the I.L.O. If one accepts the logic of those who oppose having rules, then one must agree that rules and constitutions are aimed at restricting the work of such organs and limiting their initiative, and not at channelling their activities and making them more effective. In that case there is no need for rules or Standing Orders for other committees. There is no need for Standing Orders for the Conference; I would go further:
there is no need for a Constitution of the I.L.O. You can see what absurd conclusions one can reach if one follows that kind of argument.

Our delegation considers that the lack of Standing Orders for the Committee of Experts is a gap which must be filled as soon as possible. Standing Orders would effectively avoid any tendency towards partiality and lack of objectivity which might reduce the role and efficiency of this important Committee.

Let me say a few words now on the speech made by the United States Workers' representative. The trade unions in the socialist countries have much more extensive rights than the trade unions in the United States. I recommend—and here I join Comrade Ivanov—the Workers' representative in question to read the I.L.O. document on this matter. He would do better to say something on the five million unemployed in the United States, on the eight million illiterates, on the recent events in Alabama.

Regarding the position of Jews in the socialist countries, let me tell you that I have experienced the benefits of capitalism with all the degradation of the human being. I am proud to be a citizen of a country whose population rose like one man against the Jewish persecution by the Nazis. All the Bulgarian Jews were saved by the Communist Party and the Bulgarian people. In the socialist countries, for the first time in recent history, the Jews are really free and have access to all posts and functions without discrimination.

The true bastions against antisemitism and discrimination of every kind are the socialist countries, and particularly the Soviet Union.

Interpretation from French: Mr. DOSTÁL (Government adviser, Czechoslovakia)—Last year and again this year I expressed during the general discussion in the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations my opinion on certain documents discussed in the Committee.

What I am referring to is this: I think it would be useful for certain matters of particular importance to be discussed with all States Members, and, of course, with the workers' and employers' organisations, before the opening of the discussion in the Committee. I would emphasise once more that my proposal does not affect all questions, but only those of major importance, for example, the document on forced labour discussed last year and the document on discrimination in matters of employment and occupation discussed this year.

If the Committee of Experts were informed of the position obtaining in member States this could be of considerable assistance in improving the quality of the documents under discussion and in ensuring that they go more thoroughly to the heart of the matter. The objection that this would cause a series of dangerous delays in the submission of documents to the Conference is unfounded. I am sure that the International Labour Office and the Committee of Experts could, in these exceptional cases, with a little good will organise the work in such a way as to avoid such delays. That objection therefore strikes me as being a purely formal one.

There are obviously more serious reasons for the refusal to accept my proposal. The monopoly of the Committee of Experts is one of these factors. The powers of this Committee are such that it interprets the legal standards of the I.L.O. and judges how they are applied by States Members and it does so in a sovereign fashion, like a court of law. But in my opinion the Committee of Experts should not have such powers; it is only a committee of experts and not an international court.

In this connection there is one question which arises, namely does this important Committee operate objectively? I do not think one can give an affirmative answer to that outright question. My belief is reinforced by, for example, its interpretation of the application in socialist countries of Convention No. 87 concerning freedom of association and the right to organise. This questionable attitude of the Committee provides a basis for unjustified attacks on those States.

In this situation, now that the Committee of Experts has become one of the most important organs of this Organisation, and now that legitimate objections to its activities are multiplying, the question arises: What are the rules that govern the operations of this Committee? Any important committee has Standing Orders, especially a permanent or standing committee with extensive powers. This Committee has no Standing Orders, but it is my opinion that it should have them and at an early date. I hope that even the members of this Committee themselves will agree with this.

I am also convinced that the composition of the Committee of Experts should reflect the changes in the modern world. The Committee should take into consideration the existence of different political, economic and social systems and should fully respect this situation in the course of its deliberations.

I therefore hope that the question of precise terms of reference for the Committee of Experts and the question of Standing Orders for that Committee will be taken up in connection with measures to be taken by the I.L.O. to democratise the activities of this Organisation.

(The Conference adjourned at 6 p.m.)
TWENTY-SIXTH SITTING

Wednesday, 26 June 1963, 10.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Dreyer

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE APPLICATION OF CONVENTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ¹: DISCUSSION (concl.) AND ADOPTION

The PRESIDENT—We will continue the general discussion on the report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

Interpretation from German: Mr. THOMAS (Government adviser, Federal Republic of Germany)—The Committee whose report now lies before us has been called the conscience of the Conference. That is quite a fair way of putting it, because it has to examine whether member States have really discharged their obligations in respect of Conventions they have ratified. The Committee therefore has to deal with the whole of the International Labour Code. The ratification of Conventions is not sufficient; somebody has to ensure that they are put into effect.

The supervision of application is an extremely difficult task, however. This is clear when it is realised that the statutory provisions of 108 countries in all parts of the world have to be examined. Since 1927, therefore, the Organisation has used the special Committee of Experts which is composed of highly qualified legal experts, and which places before the Conference every year a report which states where and when there is inconsistency between national legislative provisions and the obligation assumed by States Members under the Conventions they have ratified.

The difficulties for the Committee of Experts consist not only in the complexity of the many different legal problems but also in the very great and steadily increasing workload due to the increased number of ratifications, which now total nearly 2,800. The rationalisation introduced a few years ago whereby a detailed report is required only every two years, with certain exceptions, has proved quite satisfactory and we think it should be retained. Without this procedure for lightening the workload, the work of the Committee of Experts and of the Conference Committee would perhaps already have come to a halt.

This year the Committee of Experts has attached particular attention to the following problems, which we also believe to be most important: firstly, problems concerned with the introduction of standards laid down by Conventions into domestic legislation, and, secondly, the practical application of the international labour Conventions.

As regards the introduction of standards into domestic legislation, I would like to make the following brief remarks. The Committee of Experts, after thorough examination of the problem, has recommended that domestic legislation should if possible be specifically amended in the light of the Conventions ratified, since it sees no other way of making the legal situation sufficiently clear. The Federal Republic of Germany has used this procedure for years. The well-known Swiss specialist in international law, Professor Rap­pard, who died some years ago, and who was for many years a member of the Committee of Experts, advised the representatives of member States at the Conference Committee to follow this course.

Secondly, on practical application, I should like to make the following observation. It is important that the first step, adjustment of national legislation to the provisions of the Conventions, should be followed by a second step, the practical application of such legislation. You are all aware that these two steps do not necessarily coincide. To refer to a recent case, a few years ago, in connection with the existence of freedom of association, to which we are so attached, the McNair Committee was established to study the legal situation in member countries. The resulting impression was that it was not sufficient to study comparative law but that practical enforcement must also be examined. As a result of these considerations, on-the-spot investigations were started. I refer to this instance in order to show that the Committee of Experts, in examining practical application, is faced with a very difficult and complex task, because it is unable to visit the territories of the 108 member States in order to see what practice is really like. It is restricted to the reports of the States Members, which are therefore a constitutional obligation.

It is very helpful to know the attitudes of the employers' and workers' organisations, and we share the surprise expressed by the Committee of Experts that such organisations have made so little use of the opportunity to make written comments on their governments' reports. The

¹ See p. 417.
Federal Republic of Germany is one of the five countries mentioned in the report of the Experts in which employers' and workers' organisations submit such comments. In any case, we appreciate the effort of the Committee of Experts to provide not only a precise picture of the legal situation but also a picture of practical enforcement.

The Committee of Experts has been criticised from some quarters. An attempt has been made to require it to adopt specific rules. I think it is typical of the origin of the criticisms that one of the principles suggested for such rules was that the Experts should be required to act "objectively". We believe that the previous work of the Experts has shown that they do act objectively and that such an insinuation must be regarded as unjustified.

Some of the previous speakers said it was not proper to reject proposals for such rules unless some "constructive proposals" had been put forward by the majority. I think this argument is rather strange, because if the majority of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations considers that there is no need to impose rules on the Experts then it has no reason at all to put forward so-called constructive proposals.

It may be mentioned in this connection that the Experts, who are legal experts from various countries, adopted their conclusions unanimously except in respect of one particularly important Convention. We think this is proof that the Experts from the various countries were in complete agreement that their own work was being carried out impartially and correctly. We therefore think that no rules need be imposed on the Committee of Experts, but that they should be encouraged to continue their highly satisfactory work on past lines.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. OBUKHOVIC (Workers' delegate, Byelorussia)—I had not intended to speak, especially after listening to Mr. Roosevelt of the United States of America, who said that the atmosphere should not be polluted by political considerations. However, in view of what Mr. Seidman said yesterday I felt obliged to take the floor, not because I want to enter into polemics on what he said, but just to quote a few facts to you.

Fact number one is that the American Federationist—an American journal whose editor is Mr. George Meaney and to which Mr. Seidman is also a contributor—pointed out on page 5 of its January 1962 issue that violence, economic blackmail and even illegal imprisonment was being used against respected trade union leaders. This view was shared by the special I.L.O. Mission that studied the trade union situation in the United States and observed that there was an unfavourable atmosphere for the trade unions in the United States for which a parallel could be found in few other democratic countries.

Fact number two is that in his book on discrimination in the United States Senator Javits of New York states on page 107 that in most branches of labour the problem is more of a racial than a religious character, and that the victims are Negroes, Mexicans and people of eastern races. He goes on to say that there is also substantial discrimination against Jews. This book further states that the employment service in the United States uses the symbol 53S to mean Jews, 99S to indicate Negroes and 0 and 5E to represent people of eastern races. What other purpose can these symbols possibly serve except discrimination?

Mr. Seidman has already won a reputation for his readiness to do unwholesome work, but I thought he was still capable of approaching discussion objectively. I fear I was wrong in this assessment, and statements such as his can cause nothing but contempt for such methods of participating in the work of the I.L.O.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. GONZALEZ ASCANIO (Workers' adviser, Venezuela)—In connection with the submission of the report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations to this plenary sitting of the Conference we have heard repetitions of comments and arguments which were put forward and, in the light of observations made, rejected in the Committee itself. These observations are basically criticisms of the alleged partiality and lack of objectivity of the Committee of Experts which prepared the report serving as a basis for the work of the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. As a consequence of this accusation of partiality and lack of objectivity, two main proposals have been put forward. One was made by the representative of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Dostal, with regard to the desirability of communicating to the governments any observations made against them by the Committee of Experts, and the other was made by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Ivanov, to the effect that there should be Standing Orders to regulate the work of the Committee of Experts.

However, the accusations of lack of objectivity and partiality are totally unfounded.

On the one hand it is said that there is not enough information with regard to the factual position, which is not true. On the other hand the argument trying to ignore the fact that the Committee of Experts bases its work on the reports which governments, under the Constitution, are required to send to the Organisation? Other means must be used to find out what the practice is in the various countries, how the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the I.L.O. are applied, for example by securing the effective implementation of article 10, paragraph 2 (c), of the Constitution with regard to inquiries, which have given excellent results in various countries. What really happens is that when some governments feel that they are attacked by what is said by the Committee of Experts they complain that there is no objectivity because the Committee of Experts does not recognise the claim of some governments that the I.L.O. should conform to the standards prevalent in certain countries. In other words, "objectivity" for some means merely their own convenience. Reference is made to freedom of the press in the capitalist countries, but when a country is not capitalist but communist, then what about freedom of
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the press? I do not think the I.L.O. can play with principles in this way.

The countries themselves must comply with I.L.O. standards adopted in the instruments, whether Conventions or Recommendations. No one can logically claim that the I.L.O. should allow certain countries not to respect human rights, the principles of social justice and freedom of association, merely because some representatives of some countries express themselves forcibly and because theirs is a socialist structure.

I will cite a particular case as an example, the case of a country in Latin America which has now entered the socialist camp. One of the rules which govern trade union activities there is a Royal Decree of 1888, and the reply of the government of that country is that that decree is obsolete, archaic, and will only be cancelled when it is in the interests of what they call their revolution. I regard this as inadmissible. To say the least, I think the government in question should be accused of insincerity. This particular case will be found in Appendix I, B, of the Committee's report.

Mr. Ivanov complains that his proposal with regard to the Standing Orders was not replaced by any other more positive proposal. I do not think this is a valid argument. If Mr. Ivanov invites me to play poker, it does not mean that I have to do so—or, on the other hand, that I should invite him to play tennis. I can refrain from playing poker and refuse to play tennis as well.

With regard to the adoption of Mr. Ivanov's proposal regarding Standing Orders, as Mr. Cool, head of the Workers' group in our Committee said—and in passing I should like to express our gratitude for his extraordinary ability in representing the interests of the Workers in the Committee—it is unnecessary, dangerous and vexatious. It is unnecessary because the work of the Committee of Experts is satisfactory and impartial. Even when there are representatives of various countries on that Committee, they make over a hundred complaints against various countries, taking no account of the particular systems prevailing in those countries. It is dangerous because there would detract from the independence of the Committee of Experts by imposing on it inflexible, rigid, and vexatious rules. And it is, above all, vexatious when one speaks of Standing Orders for the Committee of Experts, because to do so implies a lack of confidence, or at least very little confidence, in the Committee of Experts.

Are the complaints levelled against the Committee of Experts and its report consistent with the facts? It is said the report is partial and not objective. But I would remind you that Mr. Gubinski of Poland, who is a Doctor of Laws at the University of Warsaw, and Mr. Korovin of the Soviet Union, who is a member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., a professor at the Faculty of Law in the University of Moscow, a former Director of the Institute of Law in the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., and a former Secretary-General of the Russian Red Cross, are both members of this Committee. In spite of the fact that there are these two experts, whose ideology can well be defined in the light of the information I have just given, there is only one point on which they failed to agree with the opinions of the other 16 members of the Committee of Experts. This point of difference relates to the application in socialist countries of Convention No. 87 concerning freedom of association and the right to organise. That is why the Workers rejected Mr. Ivanov's proposals.

With regard to the proposals by Mr. Dostál, we insist that it was not proper, from the point of view of the tripartite principle which is basic to the working of the I.L.O., that governments should claim that certain observations should be sent to them beforehand, and not also the employers and workers, as though the I.L.O. were exclusively a governmental organisation. There would certainly be no time for the comments of the three groups to be made on these observations before the report was submitted to the plenary Conference.

For all these reasons, I think we must categorically reject the proposals made by Mr. Dostál and Mr. Ivanov from this rostrum.

I also think that, if we want to strengthen the practical application of I.L.O. Conventions and Recommendations, it is necessary that governments should comply with their constitutional duty to send in in good time—and not, as has often occurred, too late—their replies and comments on the observations of the Committee of Experts in order that they may be analysed here.

I also think that it is for the Experts—who are selected not for the ideologies they represent but for their knowledge and unrivalled experience in the legal field and in the field of social affairs—to examine, in the light of the legislation of the various countries, the state of the law of those countries in relation to the Conventions ratified by them, and that it is only for the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations to consider the relevance of any political arguments put forward in assessing the true situation with regard to the application of Conventions in States Members of the I.L.O.

I should like to conclude by taking this opportunity in the two minutes which I think remain to me to draw attention to the obligation on the various countries to submit to the competent authorities the various Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the I.L.O.

Secondly, I would recall the obligation also incumbent upon them to bring their national legislation into accordance with the spirit and the letter of these Conventions and Recommendations. Finally, I should like to draw the attention of employers and workers' organisations to their right to see the reports which governments submit to the I.L.O. and to make their own observations on those reports.

Only thus, only through a greater vigilance on the part of employers and workers—above all I say this as a worker—can one translate into reality in all States Members of the I.L.O. the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by this great Organisation.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. URRIOLA (Workers' delegate, Panama)—I would like to make the following observations regarding the
report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

In my country, Panama, we have a national Constitution and a labour code which in their basic content are wonderful as regards civic and social freedom.

National and international laws are drafted with a view to their application for the tripartite benefit of all parties as provided for in the Constitution of the I.L.O. I took part in the sittings of this Committee and was instrumental in having urgent observations made to my Government with a view to its application of certain Conventions, particularly No. 87, on freedom of association. Each year in the Conference the Government representatives promise to comply with the workers' rights in my country regarding freedom of association, and then all is forgotten. The Committee expresses the hope that each Government will do all it can to overcome the obstacles now impeding the fulfilment of their obligations. On this aspect I must say I disagree with the substance of the report. Those who govern my country, Panama, have failed to comply with the Constitution of the I.L.O. for they have not sent in their reports. This attitude clearly shows indifference to the obligation to the Organisation and to the workers of the country.

I am the representative here of the workers of Panama but it is my wish that workers everywhere may enjoy freedom of association. That would effectively reaffirm our faith in democratic régimes. The Workers' delegation of Panama would like to inform you that the Panamanian press has been exposing the direct intervention of the Panamanian Government in the internal affairs of the workers' organisation I represent in this hall. We have proof of this in La Estrella de Panamá, El Panamá América, the daily newspaper Crítica and Ecos del Valle; in fact all the papers deal with the case to which I have referred.

I should like, before leaving this Conference to return home, to express the hope that the Organisation will make representations to the Government of Panama with a view to securing full compliance with the provisions of the I.L.O. Constitution and to achieving harmony between capital, labour and government.

Mr. HYDE-CLARKE (Employers' adviser, United Kingdom)—There has been a long debate on this subject and it is not my purpose to go over the ground that so many other people have so admirably covered.

My first point, however, speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom employers and their overseas affiliates, is to join in the tribute paid to our Vice-Chairman, Mr. Lagergren, whose ability and tact enabled us to reach unanimity in a report in which there were many divergences of opinion at earlier stages and I would like to join with those in paying him my own personal tribute.

At the outset, of course, I warmly support the adoption of this report. I shall make a few observations which I hope have not been covered before. It is depressing to come year after year to this Conference and to find in the report of the Committee of Experts such remarks as "it is regrettable that after 30 years a certain country (whatever it may be) has failed to harmonise its legislation with the Convention which has been on its books for all these years" and it leads me to think that we may have to stiffen our attitude, the Conference Committee's attitude, towards the question of non-compliance.

At the moment, if you will look at paragraph 15 of our report you will see that we dealt with a special list and the criteria for that special list are three: first, the special list should only include cases where basic undertakings under the Constitution or under Conventions have been persistently disregarded; second, all governments at the Conference should have an opportunity to state what measures they have taken or intended to take in fulfilment of their obligations (as you will see in our report, 56 governments took that opportunity); and third, the Committee should base its decision in each specific case on all the evidence made available in the reports or during the session. I think next year we may have to stiffen our whole attitude towards this continuous lack of compliance.

In paragraph 12 the Employers suggested that, to help to clear up this difficulty, Conventions which have proved to be useless or valueless or outdated should be removed and one Workers' delegate said this should only be done through tripartite discussion, and I am quite happy to support that. But the object of that was to remove deadwood from the International Labour Code which now dates back to 1919 or 1920, many parts of which must be out of date. Also, I do not want to anticipate what may be done by the Director-General or the discussion on the Director-General's Report in regard to revision or removal of these instruments, but I think our object was a constructive one. Secondly, the Employers suggested that when members of technical committees were meeting they should be informed in detail of the essential differences between the Conventions and Recommendations. I would go beyond this in two respects: I would urge governments to consider most carefully their own position—by all means, let them consider the whole question as far as possible; and, secondly, I would urge workers to consider the whole question as far as possible.

The second point I would like to make is that there should be a full explanation, not only at the time of adopting the Convention or Recommendation or other instrument. There must be, especially for the newer countries, a fuller explanation of what is involved from the beginning to the end of the introduction of a new instrument: a meeting of the Governing Body, an item on the agenda, a law and practice report referred to governments for advice and comments, a first discussion—referred back to governments—a second discussion, and then a conclusion at the end of the second discussion, whatever the instrument may be. Then the submission of that instrument, about which we have heard a great deal; then the ratification of it, if it is to be ratified, and then the application of it. It seems to me there is not sufficient information given, especially to the newer countries, on these various processes.
In this matter it is true the I.L.O. has produced a booklet. I have carefully read it, and it does not seem to me to give the answers which I would like to see. This is no criticism, but I would like to see a better book, and one published in a greater variety of languages.

Now if I may take up one or two points which were made in debate, with respect to all the other speakers, I wish to congratulate Mr. Abid Ali, the distinguished Workers' delegate from India. Apart from the fact that his speech was the shortest, I thought it contained the sense. He said—and his thoughts are very much like mine—four things: first of all that there should be more education. That is the point I have just made. Secondly, that there should be less lip-service paid to the adoption of Conventions with no intention to apply them afterwards. His third point was that there might be some on-the-spot studies by the I.L.O.—this would help many countries. Fourthly, he said that all such discussions should be held in the country on a tripartite basis; and I thoroughly agree with that.

I would like just to mention one point which has been admirably dealt with by the Workers' adviser from Venezuela, Mr. González Ascanio, and that is the whole question of standing rules and procedures proposed by Mr. Ivanov, the distinguished and, if I may say so, brilliant delegate of the U.S.S.R. Government. I do give Mr. Ivanov the credit—and I believe this quite sincerely—of being sincere in his proposal; but we are quite unable to go along with him, for the reasons given by Mr. González Ascanio. In supporting his proposals Mr. Ivanov made certain criticisms and gave three examples. I would only touch on one of them. He said that there was a completely different treatment last year of the special examination of Convention No. 29, on forced labour. May I remind him this Convention was adopted in 1930—33 years ago—and it has 87 ratifications and there has been a whole mass of year-after-year material which the Experts could examine. It was replaced, true, in 1957 by Convention No. 105, which has 64 ratifications: and that again has produced a wealth of material for the Experts.

Thirdly, both Conventions were in specific terms, laying down precise standards and laws, whereas the Convention on discrimination, No. 111, is much younger and it was a Convention which really set down an aim of policy, not a matter which you could examine standard by standard and see how it was going; and I think the Committee of Experts have done a first-class job, and it is most helpful to governments in preparing their comments on that particular matter. This is why there is a difference between the treatment one year of a special Convention and the treatment next year of another special Convention—they are intrinsically different.

I cannot extend the congratulations which I have just paid to Mr. Ivanov to his colleague from Bulgaria. It seems an extraordinary thing that when anybody says they are not going to indulge in polemics, polemics immediately appear quite severely that shouting and banging the desk, the rostrum here, does not really impress anybody. There is a first-class microphone system and really able and intelligent interpreters, and if matters are going to be brought up such as Alabama—though I am in no position to defend what happens there—it is my duty to bring up in return what happened in Bulgaria last year and earlier this year among many of my Ghanaian and Nigerian friends who were studying there but who could not continue to remain there, because of discrimination and lack of freedom of association.

It makes me really feel almost sick to hear the last sentence spoken by that particular delegate that "the true bastions against anti-semitism and discrimination of every kind are the socialist countries, and particularly the Soviet Union". It just is not right.

Sir, I will finish now simply by saying that this Committee is a sort of committee of public accounts. The Committee of Experts are auditors. They examine and give us a report. Our Committee examines that report. We could not do it without the auditors. Now the auditors, again, cannot do their job properly unless, as Mr. González Ascanio said, governments submit their reports; but there is a further point to add to what he said. Many governments fail in submitting their report, or they submit reports which do not contain information. How can a Committee of Experts operate without information, and information produced fairly quickly?

My last word on this—and I do not want to make a play on words—is that no code of conduct, no rules or regulations, can induce objectivity. Objectivity is in fact a subjective attitude, and it cannot be induced by law or regulation.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. GETMANETS (Government adviser, Ukraine)—In the report under discussion it is stated that the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations was in favour of the deletion of article 35 from the Constitution. That article has never done honour to the I.L.O. It has always been in contradiction with its Constitution. It has always been a stain on the Organisation. This is especially so now, when colonialism is being destroyed by the newly independent peoples. Article 35 is no longer admissible and the sooner it is deleted from the Constitution the sooner the I.L.O. will be freed from the colonial features vitiating its work and the sooner the progressive principles of the I.L.O.'s labour legislation will spread to the countries still in a state of dependence. Elimination of article 35 is one of the most urgent things we have to do in our Organisation in order that the I.L.O. may be able to protect the interests of all workers without any discrimination whatsoever. The removal of article 35 from the Constitution would be a great step forward, fulfilling in a practical way the United Nations declaration on the final liquidation of colonialism.

It is with pleasure that we see that the Committee was practically unanimous in wishing to remove article 35. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Ukraine and the other socialist countries have for many years resolutely brought this question before the Conference, and have shown the urgent need to eliminate this crying
injustice in respect of the so-called non-metropolitan territories from the Constitution. The wide support we have finally received has been heartening. We should be equally pleased if our other proposals, particularly that submitted by the delegation of the U.S.S.R. on the establishment of rules for the Committee of Experts, were supported as warmly. If we really want the Organisation to be effective we have not any right to ignore these proposals aimed at improving one of the most important bodies of the Organisation. Nearly all the preceding speakers have touched on this matter; unfortunately almost all have considered the Soviet proposal as a dangerous one which would hinder the work of the Committee of Experts and lead to a lack of confidence in its activities. I should like to point out that the representative from Venezuela who followed this line distorted the facts. He said that all the Workers had been against the proposal. That is not true; there were some Workers in favour of the Soviet proposal.

The Committee of Experts determines how States Members of the Organisation are in fact carrying out the principles of the Conventions and Recommendations. Therefore a very great deal depends on the objectivity of the Committee and the principles it follows in assessing information received from Members.

With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to draw the attention of the Conference to just one of the most important aspects of the proposal by the Government delegation of the U.S.S.R., in order to show how groundless are those fears expressed by critics and how unfair their position is. The Soviet proposal provides that the social and economic conditions of a country should be taken into consideration when practical application of a Convention is examined. This would in no way restrict the rights of the Committee or hamper its means of action. I think that every unprejudiced person will understand that this is a legitimate and fair requirement and one that in no way restricts the working of the Committee of Experts.

Unless the Committee of Experts takes into account the specific social and economic conditions existing in member countries it will not be able to carry out its task adequately. And not only this Committee but any international organ, if it wishes to do useful work, must take into account the social and economic conditions, because those conditions definitely have an effect on the application of Conventions and on the ways and means of implementing the principles of the I.L.O. Otherwise the degree and character of application of Conventions cannot be assessed.

Consequently, the proposal to base evaluation of information concerning application of Conventions and Recommendations on the social and economic conditions is no idle fabrication. It is dictated by life itself, by reality. Practical experience of international relations shows that failure to allow for reality leads to grave political errors, among that is what the Soviet proposal is trying to avoid.

"It would be unrealistic for the I.L.O. to become the advocate of one system or set of institutions in opposition to others ", as the Director-General points out in his Report. Even if the critics of the Soviet proposal fail to understand the real meaning, I hope they will at least read what the Director-General says in his Report. Our opponents must be completely at sea if they can agree with all the Director-General's ideas and yet reject the Soviet proposal.

I should like to say just a few words about who should study the position regarding the Soviet proposal. We think this should be the responsibility of the Conference, which is the supreme organ of our Organisation. The Conference should be the sole judge of the role and function of the Committee of Experts. We think this is the only course in accordance with international practice. Usually in international organisations it is the supreme organ which determines the basic activities and principles governing the work of all its auxiliary bodies when it sets them up.

I should like to draw attention to the fact that the Soviet proposal has so far not been countered by any valid arguments. Those who have spoken against it have not said how we could improve the work of the Committee of Experts. It seems to us that this is the best evidence that the proposal is businesslike and topical. In this connection we consider that the Soviet proposal may not now be in final form, but we think it is an excellent basis for discussion, and we appeal for a constructive attitude towards it. It is just one link in the chain of measures necessary in order to adapt the activities and structure of the I.L.O. to present-day conditions, and we think this is something that has to be done. The I.L.O. needs a newer, more democratic order corresponding to present needs. The Soviet proposal is directed at improving the efficiency of the Committee. You can call it propaganda, you can call it undesirable, but you cannot ignore it. What it provides for is something that should be done, and we have no doubt that it will be done in the long run, because life must always triumph.

Mr. RADAY (Government delegate, Israel)—In the discussion yesterday on the application of Conventions the subject of discrimination against the Jewish minority in a certain important member State of the I.L.O. was mentioned. It will be well understood that this subject is of special concern to the delegation of Israel. It might be argued that religious and ethnic discrimination is irrelevant to discrimination in employment. However, we all know that discrimination is in fact indivisible; we cannot single out a certain group for religious, ethnic or other reasons and deny it in practice equal rights of freely and fully practising its faith and beliefs without causing repercussions in all spheres of life. There was once a numeros clausus limiting access to university and higher education and applied by written regulations. There can be and there does exist today a numeros clausus de facto.

Another point has to be kept in mind. We all in this forum, and particularly the United Nations, are truly supporting the revolution against the policy of apartheid, based on so-called laws and brutally executed in practice. There are countries where the law is enlightened, as the Soviet delegate pointed out
yesterday, but where the practices also men-
tioned yesterday give rise to grave misgivings.
When discussing the application of Conven-
tions the important aspect of the actual im-
plementation and application of the indivisible
principle of non-discrimination must be fore-
mast in our minds. Therefore, we welcome this
issue being raised here, stressing an important
complex of discriminatory practices amongst
the major member States of our Organisation.
This certainly warrants serious study and con-
cern.

Mr. POULSEN (Employers’ adviser, Den-
mark; Vice-Chairman of the Committee on the
Application of Conventions and Recommenda-
tions)—It is a great pleasure for me to come
back to this rostrum again this year and
recommend to the whole Conference the
use of the report we have before us. It is,
I think, again this year a very well-
balanced report. It was adopted without any
abstentions in our Committee because it
reflects, in a good and objective way, all the
deliberations and all the opinions which were
put forward or brought to the notice of the
Committee. This was to a very large extent
due to the very able work performed by our
Acting Reporter, Mr. Lagergren, and to the
valuable assistance we had from the staff.

I have listened with great interest to this
rather lengthy debate on the report both
yesterday and today. I would first draw your
attention to a few points which, as they are
rather positive in character, I think are worth
mentioning.

The first one is paragraph 1 of the report.
We do not usually make any reference to para-
graph 1, as it states only how the Committee is
constituted; but there is one positive item in
it this year, and that is that we have had no
less than 80 governments as titular members
of the Committee and more than 100 titular
members in all. Some of you may recall that
a few years ago we raised the question of
making it compulsory for the newer member
States to attend our meetings because we
thought it was the best way of giving them
technical assistance on how Conventions should
be understood. This year we noted with great
pleasure that many governments have followed
our advice.

I would like also to draw your attention to
paragraph 16 in which you will find, as in
previous years, what we call our “special
list”—some call it a “black list”—but it does
contain what we call the serious cases. These
cases are enumerated by names of governments.
What is positive about that? The positive
thing about it is that this year more countries
than usual have dropped out of the list, so you
have to compare it with last year’s list. We in
the Committee think that this way of enumerat-
ing cases has had some positive effect.

Yesterday, Mr. Alders, Workers’ adviser
from the Netherlands, when talking about
paragraph 12 said that in the opinion of the
Workers’ group a Convention would always be
of some value even if it was not ratified by
anybody at all. We do not hold that opinion;
we think we must be practical and realistic,
and by being practical and realistic we could
strike out all dead letters in our enormous
International Labour Code. May I ask how
many of you have ever actually read this
Code? It is enormous and it is heavy, and it
would be a realistic approach if we struck out
all dead letters and, as far as it is a question of
deletion of dead letters, we would even agree
to simplify procedure.

Another minor point: I think it was the
Government adviser from Ukraine who spoke
about article 35 of the Constitution. You will
find all his points of view expressed in our
report, and you will find some other points in
paragraphs 29 and 30. The only thing I want
to say at this stage about article 35 is that some
years ago the Governing Body established a
committee to deal with it, and we think we
should leave it at that and take up this whole
question when that committee has finished its
work.

Now I turn to a more controversial question
which was discussed at great length both
yesterday and today. Mr. Ivanov, Government
adviser from the U.S.S.R. has, as everybody
in this room knows, made a proposal on some
new kind of procedure for the Committee of
Experts. Much has already been said about it
and so I do not wish to repeat the arguments,
but I would only draw attention to the fact
that in such rules it is proposed (1) that the
Experts should be objective, and (2) that they
should take into consideration the factual,
social and economic conditions in the individual
country. How can you make rules of procedure
saying you must be objective? I personally
regard that as an insult because if a man is
ominated as an expert in whatever field it
may be, he is a nominated expert. You cannot
tell him that he must be objective because
there would be no sense in that. Either he is
objective because we have chosen the right
man, or he is not because we have chosen the
wrong man. But it would not help whether we
wrote it down or not.

The next point was that we should take into
consideration the social and economic condi-
tions prevailing in the different countries. I
suggest that this is not the task of the Com-
mittee of Experts. We might, in our Conference
Committee, discuss such matters from time to
time, but it cannot be the task of the Com-
mittee of Experts. That would lead them
completely astray.

I will tell you that, during our discussions
about forced labour in one communist country,
where the Committee of Experts had found
out that there were several legislative provi-
sions indicating that forced labour was actually
exacted in that country, the Government
representative said the following in reply: that
the special conditions of every country
must be taken into account in any assessment
of the situation in this respect; in a socialist
country all work was carried out freely for the
well-being of all, in a spirit of comradeship.

I hope it is true, but it has nothing to do
with what we are discussing in our Committee.
It is not for our Committee to take into
consideration what they have as legislation
which is not in accord with the Convention.
I suggest that the philosophy behind this
whole proposal is that the Committee of
Experts, as soon as a country is labelled a
socialist country or a communist country, should not be allowed to criticise anything because nothing can be wrong in such a country. That is the suggestion that has been made. But as soon as other countries are involved, then the Committee of Experts is very welcome to make criticisms.

Now, that is not a proper approach. We think the rules are right and we want to stick to them. We think it would be an impossible task both for the Conference Committee and the Committee of Experts if they should consider these elements of the steps taken by the government of any particular country compared with the ratified Conventions.

Another paragraph to which I have to draw your attention is paragraph 26. This is another of our old friends, the human rights Conventions in certain countries, and I refer especially to the communist countries. You know, most of you in this hall, that this question has been discussed for years and we can never find any agreement. It is impossible to find any agreement because using the same words, freedom of association, forced labour, discrimination, we mean something different by those words. Because we have not been able to establish a kind of dictionary for our deliberations, we are getting into serious trouble and we have borne the consequences this year. We do not want to reopen the whole discussion which we had last year. We maintain our position. The majority of the Committee was of opinion again this year that these Conventions were not applied in the communist countries and that therefore there was no reason to take up the whole discussion again as the governments concerned stuck to their point of view. But this is a matter about which we are quite anxious. We are quite anxious for the future work of our Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations because, if we get stuck this way, not only when talking about the most important Conventions but on others, too, then we really do not know what is the value of continuing this application apparatus.

We have great faith in the work performed by the Committee in the past, and we really hope that this unique instrument, this unique Committee, will be of value in the future. But when it comes to places where countries refuse point-blank to accept any criticism on the part of the Committee of Experts, then we are stuck. There are provisions in our Constitution, but I think it would be a task for the Governing Body or other bodies within this Organisation to try to help us out of this dilemma in which we find ourselves.

I think I should conclude by repeating that we have been dealing with these affairs in our Committee this year, these very delicate affairs, in a very positive atmosphere. We have been working in very difficult conditions this year, having had to deal with similar tasks on similar topics to those which have arisen in this very hall. I would say that the approach to those problems in our Committee was preferable, and I would congratulate all the members of the Committee on their behaviour during those discussions. I found the atmosphere extremely good.

Finally, on behalf of the Employers' group, I ask you to adopt this report unanimously.

The PRESIDENT—Are there any further speakers? If not, the general discussion is closed.

We will now proceed to take a decision on the report. I take it that the report is adopted unanimously by the Conference? It is adopted.

(The report is adopted.)

The PRESIDENT—I would like, on behalf of the Conference, to associate myself with the thanks which have already been expressed by many speakers to Mr. Lagergren, Government member, Sweden, who has served as Vice-Chairman and Acting Reporter of the Committee. I thank Mr. Lagergren not only for the work he has done in the Committee but also for the way in which he submitted the report of the Committee to the Conference.

Final Record Vote on the Recommendation concerning Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer

The PRESIDENT—We shall now take a record vote on the Recommendation concerning termination of employment at the initiative of the employer.

(A record vote is taken.)

The PRESIDENT—The result of the record vote just taken is the following: 196 votes in favour, 14 votes against, with 10 abstentions. The Recommendation concerning termination of employment at the initiative of the employer is adopted.

Reply of the Director-General to the Discussion of His Report

The PRESIDENT—I call on Mr. Morse, the Director-General, who will reply to the discussion of his Report.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL—The discussion of my Report this year, as you recall, was intended to be of an exceptional character. During the last few years, a number of questions have been raised in debate and through resolutions touching the policy, direction, programme and structure of the I.L.O. Last year I suggested that it would be better not to discuss these matters piecemeal, and that we should try to look at these various questions and perhaps others in the total perspective of the I.L.O. and of its role in the world. I therefore attempted to make of my Report to the present session a basis for such a comprehensive discussion. And I appealed to the delegates, for one year, not to present resolutions on specific issues so that all the important issues would be raised in the discussion on my Report. Let me say at the very outset how grateful I am for the unanimous way in which this appeal was accepted and heeded.

1 See p. 379, and Appendix XIV, p. 658.
2 The detailed results of the vote will be found on pp. 443-444.
Nevertheless, I think we are all aware that the hopes placed in this discussion have not been entirely fulfilled. Various ideas were canvassed—this happened early in the session—for a procedure which would permit more intensive discussion of at least certain parts of the Report. There was, I think, a rather widespread desire to introduce some element of real debate which would have made it possible to have conferences among the constituents of the I.L.O.'s constituents on certain major topics—a test which it is difficult to have on the basis of a series of 15-minute speeches each of which may deal with a different set of topics. But no agreement on what these novel arrangements for the discussion should be was reached during the early days of the session.

Then, you will recall, came the crisis over South Africa. This resulted in the suspension of plenary sittings for some days, and in addition much of the remaining time in plenary was taken up with discussion of the South African question. There was no longer any practical possibility of experimenting with new arrangements for probing in depth into some of the issues discussed in the Report. Furthermore, the withdrawal from participation in the session of the African and Arab States' delegations made it impossible for many of them to comment on the Report. This significantly limits the value of the discussion just concluded, since so many of the programme and structural questions confronting the I.L.O. relate to the Organisation's effectiveness in dealing with problems of the emerging nations.

I shall not say anything further about the South African question in my reply to the debate. The next step in this matter must be taken by the newly elected Governing Body which meets on Friday. I have submitted new proposals to the Governing Body as a basis for dealing with this matter in a way which will satisfy the deeply felt conviction of this Conference that justice be done while at the same time due process is respected. I need say no more here.

Even though the discussion on my Report has been incomplete, it has nevertheless been extensive. There have been 150 speakers altogether; and on some questions there seems to me to be sufficient consensus for me to suggest that these particular questions be taken out of the context of general debate and dealt with through more precise procedures. In my summation, I shall try to separate out those questions which could be dealt with in this way from those requiring further and fuller discussion. Thus my remarks will have a primarily procedural character—an interim character.

The discussion as a whole should, I think, continue at the next session in 1964. I shall accordingly lay my Report—the same document that you had this year—before the next session. I shall accompany this by some guide lines for discussion based upon what I now intend to say; and in addition will give the Conference a concise up-to-date account of recent I.L.O. activities, a kind of stockholders' report. It would, however, be unnecessary and wasteful to repeat in any measure the speeches made this year. The full record of the two successive sessions would be the basis upon which conclusions might be drawn from the debate. Those who did not take part in this year's discussion would have an opportunity next year. Those who did speak this year could—if they consider this desirable—address themselves to different topics next year or reply to comments made by others in the debate that has taken place on this occasion this year.

Certain general conclusions can, however, be drawn from this year's discussion, and I would like to try to do that.

The first of these is the usefulness of periodic reviews by the Conference of the I.L.O.'s place in the world and the adequacy of its programmes and machinery. Some have suggested this be done every five years, some at least once in ten. I think the frequency must be dictated by the pace of change, the emergence of new factors in the situation. I hope that the work we do this year and next—and the action that subsequently will be taken by the Governing Body to give effect to the wishes of the Conference—will stand the I.L.O. in good stead for many years. A review of basic issues, if it is to be serious, should not be undertaken too frequently. There is no need to fix a timetable. But there is a need, from time to time, to give the Conference the opportunity of proposing what adjustments should be made to a changing world situation.

There is also, I conclude, agreement that the I.L.O.'s programme should be planned in relation to priorities. Of course, as some speakers have said, priorities cannot be absolute and exclusive. There must be some flexibility for dealing with urgent matters that may not strictly conform to long-term plans; and there must be periodic review of these priorities. I shall return to the specific programmes priorities in just a moment. But I would mention now that the consequences of a priorities approach to programming could be important for the Director-General, for the Governing Body and for the Conference. It would mean developing criteria for assessing specific proposals, whether for Conference agenda items, Industrial Committee meetings, studies or missions, in relation to the attainment of priority objectives. It would mean cutting out activities which are less important or not clearly related to the main or principal priorities; and it is often more difficult to secure agreement on the cuts than on new activities. It might also imply, as has been suggested from this rostrum, some change in procedures whereby the Governing Body plans and reviews I.L.O. activities. I have in mind certain steps which could be taken to improve programming procedures within the Office; and I shall feel strengthened by this Conference discussion in going ahead with these. I shall also consider further what changes could be recommended in the Governing Body methods of dealing with the programme.

The third general conclusion I draw from the discussion is a strong reaffirmation of the tripartite principle. This has come out in many ways. Not only is there no evidence of a desire in any quarter to change the tripartite basis of the I.L.O.; but there has been a vigorously expressed desire to protect and
strengthen the representative character of I.L.O. policy-making and decision-making.

This even took the form on occasions of criticism of some of my own proposals. It was interesting that the spokesmen for the World Federation of Trade Unions and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions both criticised what they detected as a "technocratic" tendency in my Report. Specifically, they interpreted my recommendations for greater research and greater use of expert meetings as calculated to undermine or detract from the work of representative tripartite bodies.

I would like to make my intent quite clear on this point. The I.L.O. is a representative organisation, and its policies must be fixed as a result of tripartite deliberation. But the issues with which we are faced in the world today, as I see them—economic development, incomes policy and so forth—are highly complex. The Workers', Employers' and Government representatives are entitled to expect that the I.L.O. will provide them with the very best, most up-to-date and most relevant analyses as a basis for discussion. This does not mean that the conclusions of experts have to be or should be accepted. There are often very good reasons for rejecting or modifying these conclusions, and representatives in tripartite meetings, of course, take their responsibilities in this. Of course, it is the tripartite representative organs which have, and must have, the last word. The I.L.O.'s action, whether expressed in adopted standards or in technical assistance, conforms to policies fixed through tripartite deliberation. We go in the direction and we go just as far as our constituents through their representatives want us to go. If, however, we continue merely treading old paths we cannot expect to reach new destinations. Research and expert study, far from undermining the tripartite principle, can, I believe, give representative I.L.O. meetings the stimulus with which to fix the policies of our Organisation in effective response to a complex and a rapidly changing world.

In trying to sum up the results of the discussions I shall deal separately with programme and structure, dealing first with programme questions.

Now as to programme questions, certainly the most prominent of all topics—which has been referred to by most speakers and at the greatest length—is that dealt with in Chapter IV of my Report: trade unions and labour relations. The attention given to this question is further evidence of the concern of the Conference for the vitality of the tripartite principle, for the key issue is the growth of strong and independent trade unions in the developing countries. The many statements made on the theme of this chapter showed a very broadly based desire for the I.L.O. to help towards the improvement and strengthening of labour relations systems in these countries. The only dissent was from a few Eastern European countries, who reiterated previously expressed criticism that the I.L.O. should not attempt to promote co-operation between labour and management; but this view towards I.L.O. action in the labour relations field is not widely held in the Conference. I found no express disagreement with the view which I put forward that I.L.O. action in this matter should be conceived as a comprehensive programme embracing interrelated and complementary action in such fields as training of labour administrators, management development and workers' education, industrial relations legislation, personnel policy and labour-management relations procedures. Nor was there any disagreement with the idea that labour relations policy should be elaborated as part of national economic and social policies for expanding production and employment.

There was, however, an apparently marked divergence of views on certain aspects of the problem having to do with trade union development. While many speakers supported the suggestions in the Report, others criticised particularly the I.L.O. concerning itself with trade union development, giving direct aid to trade unions, providing trade union education, or providing such education independently of the ideological divisions within the trade union movement.

I do not intend to deal with these criticisms now, because I think this is an issue of such serious fundamental importance to the I.L.O. that the discussion of it should continue next year. Moreover, it is a very complex issue; and I would like to hear more views, from the standpoint particularly of Workers' delegates from different countries and above all from the developing countries. The fact that relatively few African Workers' delegates were able to speak in the discussion has perhaps distorted somewhat the findings, because it is in their countries that the problems of trade union growth are in their most critical phase. Thus, before concluding the debate, I would hope to hear more, particularly about those controversial aspects concerning how governments and how the I.L.O. can aid and facilitate the emergence of strong trade unions and of respect for freedom of association.

Meanwhile, there are two elements in the suggested programme that I think we can go ahead with and which should not be delayed. The first is to carry out studies, particularly studies of national conditions, which would be necessary to help define in concrete terms the "strategy for labour relations" I have advocated. The second is to take such steps as may be necessary within the Office so that labour relations activities form a more coherent, more integrated programme. We can do this now and during the coming year, while holding back for the time being action on the more controversial proposals concerning trade union education.

The subject which ranked next in importance in the discussion was that dealt with in Chapter II: human resources and economic development. In contrast to labour relations, this question proved to be non-controversial. The twin problems of employment creation and training at all levels are recognised to be indispensable attributes of economic development policy. The I.L.O. approach outlined in this chapter of my Report appears to have met with the approval of the Conference. I interpret the discussion as endorsement of this approach, which is the fruit of the I.L.O.'s intensive
experience in the field during the past 15 years through continuing and expanding programmes of technical co-operation. These programmes are moving forward, and new types of action are being planned. The Turin Centre for advanced training is being set up; and this coming autumn a tripartite conference on employment policy will afford further opportunity to consider national and international action in the field of human resources utilisation. Consequently, I think this chapter of my Report could, so to speak, be removed at this stage from the discussion, and I would not expect the delegates to need to focus attention upon it next year.

Incomes policy—the theme of Chapter III of my Report—was also referred to by a number of delegates. This is, however, a difficult issue, and for the International Labour Conference it was presented for the first time in a new way. There were, as might be expected, many references in the speeches to the desirability of associating employers and trade unions in the formulation of national incomes policies. To some extent this is, indeed. But it is not surprising that the discussion has not yet given any very clear guidance. I would hope that next year delegates could go into this somewhat more thoroughly, after having reflected on the problem, so as to help trace out the lines for future I.L.O. action. Thus I am suggesting incomes as a focal topic for the next phase of debate.

Now, as regards automation, there was a substantial measure of support for the automation programme outlined in Chapter VI of the Report. Steps have already been taken to ensure that this programme is carried out. Plans are being made now for a meeting of experts early in 1964 on certain technical labour aspects; and arrangements are also being made for a special conference on automation and employment to be held under the auspices of the International Institute for Labour Studies later next year. Several governments have given or have promised valuable co-operation in this programme. Thus there seems little need to give further attention to automation in the discussion of my Report at the next session. I am satisfied that the support from the countries most concerned and from all three groups in the Conference is a sufficient basis for the action proposed. We shall go ahead with this on the lines set forth in the Report.

I was rather surprised at the very scant attention given to Chapter V—that is the chapter on status and conditions of the worker. Perhaps it was just crowded out by the desire of delegates to speak about matters which seemed more pressing. Nevertheless, this covers the substance of the historical work of the I.L.O. There are, it seems to me, some important things to be done towards improving the working environment in both newly developing centres and in those feeling the impact of advanced technology. There is also the problem of eradicating discrimination in employment. Our attention has been directed to South Africa; but perhaps it is important to consider remedial action—and especially educational action—in other cases as well, since, as we were reminded, discrimination exists in some form in all countries. Thus I refrain at this stage from drawing the conclusion that these are low-priority matters in the collective judgment of the Conference. I would like to give delegates next year an opportunity to discuss I.L.O. action concerning the status and conditions of the worker.

Let me now turn to the questions affecting the I.L.O.'s structure, its organisation and methods of action.

The growth of our technical co-operation activities has been once again endorsed by the Conference as judge and executioner of the sponsoring countries and the time they devoted to the subject. This is the most widely supported method of I.L.O. action. I would only take up here two points from among the comments made. One is a tendency towards a greater degree of comprehensive national planning of technical aid, so that different aid projects fit into a coherent pattern in support of national economic and social programmes. To the extent that this tendency is strengthened, international programmes of technical co-operation will become more effective. The other—and indeed complementary—idea is the demand for better evaluation of the impact of I.L.O. technical co-operation activities and a better research basis for technical aid programming. I intend to examine further during the coming year how our evaluation and operations-oriented research can be improved. I think this is very important indeed.

In addition to this emphasis on technical co-operation, there was a very considerable discussion on standards—on the adaptation of the I.L.O.'s standards and standard-setting work to the needs of an expanded membership. The discussion confirms the vitality of this traditional form of I.L.O. action and I think this is very interesting; and it again testifies to the attachment of the Organisation to the tripartite method of policy-making.

Several large issues have been discussed. They are not new issues. We have heard about them before in recent years. One is expressed in the argument that there should be a moratorium on new standards, so that attention could be focused upon revision of existing instruments and on technical co-operation. A number of employers and some governments have taken this view. Another issue is raised in the proposal that standards should be made more flexible. This view has been taken particularly by delegates from some developing countries. Each of these views has its very firm opponents. There are many who maintain that the standard-setting work should continue to break ground in new areas of social policy; or that there are dangers in making standards too flexible if thereby they may be emptied of real substance. These are arguments about issues which cannot be decided in terms of general propositions. We should deal with them, I believe, as considerations to be taken into account in fixing specific Conference agendas and in bringing forward proposals for the revision of specific Conventions or Recommendations.

Consequently, I propose that we deal with the matter in this way. In the first place, there seems to be the basis for agreement that
a procedure be devised to cut out the deadwood, to remove from the I.L.O. statute book certain Conventions which serve no useful purpose. I shall raise this matter with the competent Governing Body committee in November that proposals can be submitted for action to the next session of the Conference. This would be a first step.

Then there are a number of existing Conventions which might be revised in respect of anomalies which do not affect any matters of principle but are obstacles to ratification and application. I think there is now a basis for working out proposals for a simplified amendment procedure for such cases, and for bringing forward certain Conventions for revision under this procedure. I shall take this up in the same way with the Governing Body committee in the first instance.

Thus two specific courses of action can now be initiated. As regards the broader question of the applicability of many standards in the conditions of developing countries, I would like to examine this question further. I do not think we will make much progress until we pass from generalities to concrete instances, to find out more precisely what the difficulties are. It is only at this point that it would be possible to determine whether the degree of flexibility that would facilitate ratification would be detrimental to the principles and objectives of the instruments. Accordingly, I am personally attracted to the suggestion that the problems in application of, perhaps, certain groups of Conventions be explored through regional conferences. The regional conferences would not, of course, be empowered to amend in any way the instruments in question nor would they intervene in the process of international supervision. But the conclusions of regional conferences, if they could carry out a thorough review, would give valuable guidance to the Governing Body and General Conference as to whether or not certain instruments needed to be revised in any important respect. This is a course of action which perhaps merits testing.

Next among the structural questions in the order of emphasis in this year's debate is the question of the representative character of the Governing Body, a question which is linked in the minds of some speakers with the relationship of the Governing Body to the Conference and their respective functions. These questions have recurred in Conference discussions in recent years. They have been reflected in some of the draft resolutions moved at past sessions. It is not surprising that they would have a certain prominence during a Governing Body election year. It would, of course, be quite inappropriate for me, as Director-General, to comment in any way on the results of these elections. Obviously, certain parties will be disappointed and others satisfied; and to those who are disappointed it can only be said that this is a matter for the electoral colleges of the Conference.

The question of the relationship of the Governing Body and Conference, however, does call for some comment. It is sometimes said that the Conference is the "crown" of the I.L.O. Now the Constitution describes the Conference, the Governing Body, and the Office each as "organs" of the I.L.O. The concept of "sovereignty" is not really applicable. The powers of the Organisation are conferred upon it by member States. They are defined by the Constitution itself and not by any organ, be it the Conference or be it the Governing Body.

The Conference is, of course, the most broadly representative organ with 108 delegations from member States at the present time; and the increase in I.L.O. membership in recent years has made it not only larger but obviously more heterogeneous. The role of the Conference as a forum for the expression of the needs and desires of workers, employers and governments has become more important than ever before in the history of the I.L.O. That is why I have put all these questions concerning programme and structure to the Conference in my Report. That is the significance of the discussions begun this year.

But effective action requires a strong Governing Body and a competent and efficient Office. The Governing Body will need to exercise powers and a capacity of initiative in order to articulate into action the prevailing views, the sentiment, the synthesis and the decisions of the Conference. And, furthermore, a strong and effective Governing Body can show the Conference ways of overcoming disputes which otherwise might persistently divide it. The new Governing Body will be able to provide the kind of initiative which will meet the basic preoccupations expressed and debated during the course of this Conference.

Another structural question which claimed considerable attention was arrangements for regional action. It is clear to me that the Organisation needs to consider some adjustments in working methods in order to meet a real and widespread preoccupation so that the I.L.O.'s impact in different parts of the world, particularly the economically developing regions, should be more direct. This is another point concerning which it is regrettable that the Conference could not hear more fully from the African delegates.

One suggestion which has been voiced in the past received very little support, and that is the proposal that there should be regional Conventions. I think it is important to note this, because we should look in different directions for the development of I.L.O. regional arrangements. On the other hand, a number of speakers showed interest in closer study of the mode of application of universal Conventions in the regional context; and I have already suggested experimenting with action on these lines.

Regional conferences have been criticised in the past, and some of my comments in the Report reflected these criticisms. But it is quite clear, or so it seems to me, that the solution is to improve these conferences and not to diminish their role. There are many other ways which need to be explored for making more effective regional arrangements. These need not follow a common pattern; they may well differ from region to region dependent upon circumstances.

Thus, I suggest that fuller attention be given to this question again next year. It would then, I hope, be possible to analyse more closely the views and proposals expressed by...
delegates from the different regions. Meanwhile, I shall consider whether action on some points, consistent with the general desires of the Conference, might be initiated through the Governing Body.

One problem I went into at some length in my Report was the credentials problem of the International Labour Conference. I made a proposal—and I should like to comment on this for just a moment—the proposal that an independent judicial body be established which would consider objections to credentials before they were submitted to the Credentials Committee or the Conference. Let me reiterate that this suggestion was not prompted by any disrespect towards those delegates who have accepted the thankless—and I repeat "the thankless"—task of serving on the Credentials Committee. It was intended only as an honest effort to facilitate the work of the Credentials Committee; to enhance the authority of the judicial interpretation of whether or not there has been a violation of the Constitution in the appointment of delegates; and to provide a guarantee that the Conference would not be called upon to consider in the guise of objections to credentials political matters which lie outside the competence of the I.L.O.

A number of delegates spoke on this question, and opinion was markedly divided; but the sample was not sufficient to let me know the attitude of the majority of the Conference. I have made my suggestion; if it commends itself widely, some delegates may wish to sponsor it. Otherwise, I certainly would not propose as Director-General to press the matter further. Let me reiterate that, in my view, this suggestion was not prompted by any fear, calculated to reduce the importance of the I.L.O.'s constituents who have in it a guarantee of objectivity and impartiality. It is a strength to this Organisation. It is a strength of the staff, and its inherent sense of discipline which comes to the fore during a time of challenge and of crisis. The personal dedication of the officials of the I.L.O., of the members of my staff, to the survival and the growth of international organisation is a great strength to this Organisation. It is a strength to the I.L.O.'s constituents who have in it a guarantee of objectivity and impartiality.

Finally, in the list of structural questions, there was very little emphasis on arrangements for the work of the committees of this Conference. Perhaps this is in large measure due to the fact that committee work at this session has proceeded so smoothly and so well. It is also, I am sure, due to the gradual application of various adjustments in procedures made at the suggestion of the Governing Body committee on the working of the Conference. I think it may fairly be concluded that neither the size of committees nor their procedures should now be considered to present major problems of growth. The matter can be kept under review; but it hardly seems necessary for the Conference to devote an important share of its attention to it at the next session.

Let me then recapitulate briefly my suggestions for the continuation of the discussion on my Report at the 1964 Session of the Conference.

First, I propose that the speeches in the general discussion should focus on the following questions:

- the status and conditions of the workers;
- incomes;
- arrangements for dealing with industry problems on an industry-by-industry basis; and
- arrangements for regional action.

Then, apart from the general discussion on my Report, it may be expected that certain other structural questions will arise in the form of draft resolutions. I do not think it is either fair or feasible to ask for this year's moratorium on resolutions to be extended another year. Moreover, there may be advantage in putting certain ideas to the test of a vote. The initiative in this respect, of course, lies with delegates.

Finally, as regards certain questions, I propose, prior to the next session, to suggest to the Governing Body that we do this in respect of the revision of existing standards; and I shall consider what further immediate steps might be taken in respect of regional arrangements, pending the conclusion of the full discussion.

It is with these suggestions that I suspend further comment on the discussion until next year. I would only like to add one thing. This has been a most difficult, critical, tiring session of the Conference. Many factors have worked together to enable it to reach a conclusion to its work. One of these is the devotion of the staff, and its inherent sense of discipline which comes to the fore during a time of challenge and of crisis. The personal dedication of the officials of the I.L.O., of the members of my staff, to the survival and the growth of international organisation is a great strength to this Organisation. It is a strength to the I.L.O.'s constituents who have in it a guarantee of objectivity and impartiality.

With this solid foundation in the Office, with a new Governing Body, and next year with a fully representative Conference, we may look ahead towards the completion of our task of reappraisal—and towards an ever more vigorous attack on the roots of poverty, oppression and discord wherever they exist.
The PRESIDENT—The applause given to your speech, Mr. Director-General, has clearly indicated the thanks of the delegates for this speech. It is not necessary for me to add many words, but I should like to say that in your speech you have not only tried to draw conclusions from the ample discussion that has taken place during the Conference on your Report, but you have also mentioned the further procedure that you find should be followed in dealing with the very important question of the way the I.L.O. has to follow in the near future. I feel convinced that your proposal to take a second discussion of the question at the Conference next year will meet with great satisfaction from practically all delegates in the present Conference. We thank you, Mr. Director-General.

(The Conference adjourned at 12.45 p.m.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mr.</th>
<th>Mr.</th>
<th>Mr.</th>
<th>Mr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Hafizullah (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Villaveiran (G)</td>
<td>Pico (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Bland (G)</td>
<td>Furlonger (G)</td>
<td>Perrier (E)</td>
<td>Monk (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Hempel (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Servais (G)</td>
<td>Troclet (G)</td>
<td>Verschuuren (E)</td>
<td>De Bock (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Michev (G)</td>
<td>Tomov (G)</td>
<td>Tsaryvoulasova (E)</td>
<td>Ivanov (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>de Castro (G)</td>
<td>Barboza-Carneiro (G)</td>
<td>Staffor da Silva (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Tun Tin (G)</td>
<td>Htaik (E)</td>
<td>Maung (W)</td>
<td>Maung Tin (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>Gurinovich (G)</td>
<td>Chernushchenko (G)</td>
<td>Koleshin (E)</td>
<td>Obukhovich (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Haythorne (G)</td>
<td>Mainwaring (G)</td>
<td>Robinson (E)</td>
<td>Morris (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Wijewickarama (G)</td>
<td>Kunasingham (G)</td>
<td>Greve (E)</td>
<td>Thondaman (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Lennon (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Cheng (G)</td>
<td>Lee (G)</td>
<td>Chang (E)</td>
<td>Liang (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Araugo (G)</td>
<td>Espinosa (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Rodríguez Aroa (G)</td>
<td>González Quiros (G)</td>
<td>Gutiérrez Matarrita (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Ortega Suárez (G)</td>
<td>Camejo Argudín (G)</td>
<td>Carbonell</td>
<td>Horruitiner (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Spartis (G)</td>
<td>Shevket (G)</td>
<td>Theocharidou (E)</td>
<td>Zintirdes (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Pithart (G)</td>
<td>Kluská (G)</td>
<td>Kicen (E)</td>
<td>Palek (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Coln (G)</td>
<td>Juhl-Christensen (G)</td>
<td>Nielsen (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Alvarado Caraco (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zálniga Garzón (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Rinne (G)</td>
<td>Kanerva (G)</td>
<td>Knuzkenen (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Parodi (G)</td>
<td>Haeck (G)</td>
<td>Walne (E)</td>
<td>Bouladoux (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Mönnig (G)</td>
<td>Ernst (G)</td>
<td>Faubel (E)</td>
<td>Beermann (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Stambelos (G)</td>
<td>Vlachos (G)</td>
<td>Bárdis (E)</td>
<td>Laeacar (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Dupont-Willemin (G)</td>
<td>Víllola (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Mekias (G)</td>
<td>Bartos (G)</td>
<td>Herman (E)</td>
<td>Somoski (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Godjali (G)</td>
<td>Samil (G)</td>
<td>Sodawro (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Azimi (G)</td>
<td>Azam (G)</td>
<td>Ghayour (E)</td>
<td>Seydi (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Mosser (G)</td>
<td>Raday (G)</td>
<td>Hausern (E)</td>
<td>Becker (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ago (G)</td>
<td>Purpura (G)</td>
<td>Marazza (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Marshall (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Tamura (G)</td>
<td>Aoki (G)</td>
<td>Haraguchi (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Kayser (G)</td>
<td>Wilwertz (G)</td>
<td>Krier (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>Tambon (G)</td>
<td>Wong (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Santos Coy (G)</td>
<td>Calderón Puig (G)</td>
<td>Sánchez Maldariaga (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Stokman (G)</td>
<td>Beunner (G)</td>
<td>Fennema (E)</td>
<td>van Tilburg (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Atkinson (G)</td>
<td>Woods (G)</td>
<td>John Allum (E)</td>
<td>Napier (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Mullbaut (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Bull (G)</td>
<td>Ulasker (G)</td>
<td>Heijdhui (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Rahman (G)</td>
<td>Ashraf (G)</td>
<td>Ahmad (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Rivera (G)</td>
<td>Calamari (G)</td>
<td>Urriola (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Aguilar Ladrón de Guevara (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Ocampa (G)</td>
<td>Joson (G)</td>
<td>Reyes (E)</td>
<td>Hernandez (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Chajn (G)</td>
<td>Leciki (G)</td>
<td>Oliszewski (E)</td>
<td>Hanke (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>da Motta Veiga (G)</td>
<td>Ribiero da Cunha (G)</td>
<td>Morales de los Rios Leitão (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote: See p. 436.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegates (Party)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumelia</td>
<td>Mr. Dumitresco (G) Mr. Ionascu (E) Mr. Gheorghiu (E) Mr. Rob (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Mr. Geyser (G) Mr. de Villiers (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Mr. Gómez-Acebo y Santos (G) Mr. Añel-Quiroga Redondo (G) Mr. Galdós García (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mr. Michanek (G) Mr. Bengtsson (G) Mr. Bolin (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Mr. Holzer (G) Mr. Saxer (G) Mr. Mör (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Mr. Ashakul (G) Mr. Ŭdompong (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>Mr. Borisov (G) Mr. Bondadin (G) Mr. Polyakov (E) Mr. Solovyov (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Mr. Weaver (G) Mr. Delaney (G) Mr. Wagner (E) Mr. Faupl (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Mr. Slater (G) Mr. Ferguson (G) Mr. Collison (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet-Nam</td>
<td>Mr. Nguyén (G) Mr. Phan (E) Mr. Tran (E) Mr. Dam (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Against (14)

| Argentina              | Mr. Muro de Nadal (E)                                                           |
| Chile                  | Mr. Montt Balmaceda (E)                                                         |
| Norway                 | Mr. Selvig (E)                                                                 |
| Switzerland            | Mr. Kuntschen (E)                                                              |
| Austria                | Mr. Mautner-Markhof (E)                                                         |
| Denmark                | Mr. Lund (E)                                                                   |
| Finland                | Mr. Hetemäki (E)                                                               |
| Peru                   | Mr. Aparicio Valdez (E)                                                        |
| Trinidad and Tobago    | Mr. Aizpurúa (E)                                                               |
| Chile                  | Mr. Bresso                                                                    |
| Peru                   | Mr. Végh-Garzón (E)                                                            |
| Sweden                 | Mr. Bergenström (E)                                                            |
| Venezuela              | Mr. Martinez Espino (E)                                                        |

### Abstentions (10)

| Ireland                | Mr. MacCarthy (G) Mr. O'Leary (G) Mr. Cuffe (E)                                |
| Luxembourg             | Mr. Hayot (E)                                                                  |
| El Salvador            | Mr. Amy (G)                                                                    |
| Uruguay                | Mr. Bosch (G)                                                                  |
| Malaya                 | Mr. Ubaidulla (E)                                                              |
| Trinidad and Tobago    | Mr. Nunez (E)                                                                  |
TWENTY-SEVENTH SITTING

Wednesday, 26 June 1963, 3 p.m.

President : Mr. Dreyer

Closing Speeches

The President—We have only one item on the agenda of this afternoon’s sitting, the closing speeches.

Interpretation from Ukrainian: Mr. SLIPCHENKO (Government delegate, Ukraine; Vice-President of the Conference)—In political life events sometimes occur which are very similar to the powerful rays of the sun and shed light on the deep-lying processes of social development. They provide rich food for thought for all those who are prepared to consider the essential problems of our time. We live in the second half of the twentieth century and, as Mr. N. S. Khrushchev has said, our era is marked by rapid renewal of the forms of existence of human society, and by unprecedented progress towards complete control by man over the forces of nature and towards a better social structure. But although we live in the twentieth century we still see certain relapses into past ages, and even vestiges of barbarism. However, one of the salient features of our era is the awakening of the formerly backward, subjugated and oppressed peoples. Our era is an era striving for freedom, in which the peoples are shaking off the yoke of colonialism, in which the peoples want to lead a life of dignity and are fighting to achieve that end. That is what Mr. Khrushchev said.

The 47th Session of the General Conference of the I.L.O. is very lucky because owing to the matters on its agenda this Conference has indeed proved to be on the crest of major political events, and has, like a ray of the sun, illuminated another and most important aspect of the historical process of the inevitable eradication of colonialism, namely the task of ensuring the rapid and merciless destruction of its most repulsive form, apartheid. Indeed, the peoples of Africa desire a life of human dignity, and they are fighting for it. This very hall became an international court that passed sentence on the fascists from South Africa. They are the accused. They sit here in the face of the anger of the whole of progressive humanity. Now there are only three of them left, but there could have been none at all had not those who are responsible for directing this Organisation sacrificed its prestige and enabled fascism to mount this prestigious rostrum in spite of the general will and its passionate rejection by a whole continent. This rightful demand of the African peoples, of those who have suffered throughout their lives, was blocked by the conservatism of almost 50 years which is so deeply embedded in our Organisation that it was beyond the power of this session to turn the Organisation from its habitually conservative path.

Who is guilty? Who is to blame for the fact that many delegates who arrived in Geneva with proposals concerning the programme and structure of the I.L.O. were forced to leave the Conference without having been afforded an opportunity to share their views with us?

Who is guilty for the fact that those delegates who succeeded in telling us about their proposals should have to leave the Conference with bitter feelings because they are not sure that their proposals will be properly considered?

Who is guilty for the fact that a serious discussion on measures to improve the programme and structure of the I.L.O. was shamelessly disrupted?

There is only one answer. The guilty ones are those who ignored the 1961 resolution, those who went against the unanimous demands of the African peoples, and who attempt to save their reputations in the eyes of public opinion by substituting weak resolutions for energetic measures.

As the Ukrainian proverb says: “If you cannot hold on to the horse’s mane you won’t hold on to his tail.” To borrow Mr. Johnson’s illustration, the guilty ones are those who are puffing away to make sure that the feather of responsibility lands on someone else.

The Director-General in his Report mentioned the division between East and West and between North and South. If the division between East and West—and everybody knows of course, that this refers to the socialist countries and to the leading countries of the capitalist West—is “characterised by ideological and political conflict,” then the division between North and South, which, in accordance with Mr. Morse’s interpretation, is not based on socio-political systems but rather on differences in the level of economic development, “has in recent years evidenced a growing consciousness of mutual responsibility and the achievement of practical international co-operation”.

A perfectly justifiable question may arise here. What need was there for so ambiguous a
comparison between different parts of the world? Was it not in order to cast a shadow on the East, that is to say the Soviet Union and similarly constituted States, as the Report calls them, “a similar system”, accusing them by implication of intransigence in ideological and political matters—as if to say: that is why the I.L.O. is still experiencing difficulties in solving these problems.

However, the Director-General was quite wrong both as to principle and as to culprit. This Conference has shown who is in favour of the basic principles, who is upholding our ideals. The “East” and the “South” have proved it. They have demonstrated the unanimity of their views, and not only on the question of the Republic of South Africa. Indeed there are incompatible contradictions, but these spring from classic considerations. The Conference, rather than the Director-General, has shown how the world is divided. We understand peaceful co-existence to mean not a division of the world into two but rather competition between two different economic and social systems, reflected in daily contacts and cooperation in all fields. The socialist world is not merely a geographical factor, and is not separated from the capitalist world by the notorious iron or bamboo curtains. The socialist world is fully aware of present-day realities. It lives and participates in the conscience and the fight of millions of workers in formerly colonial countries and capitalist countries who are striving for a renewal of social structures in the direction indicated by the principles of socialism. Many delegates from the African countries, speaking on the Report of the Director-General, mentioned the fact that their countries had voluntarily and independently chosen the socialist path of development.

I would like to remind you that Socialists and socialism existed long before the Soviet State was proclaimed, and if the progressive peoples of all countries turn towards the Soviet State and its socialist experience it is for the very same reasons that, a long time ago, the bourgeois democrats learned their lessons from the experience of the victorious revolutions carried out in other countries.

The time has come to realise that the former East, the former Africa, the former South American Continent—which in their lethargic sleep fed imperialism with its infinite wealth—no longer exist. In their place are new, awakening, turbulent continents which, in the purifying flame of their fight for freedom, are burning away the vestiges of colonialism. Millions of people have stepped over the artificial dikes of colonialism, and their voices have been heard from this rostrum. We are happy that the voices of the workers, the peasants and the intellectual workers are exerting greater influence on the decisions taken by our Organisation.

Another interesting fact has come to light in the heat of the ideological discussion at this Conference. What socialist countries, have been accused of responsibility? It is statements made against colonialism by the popular masses and their leaders. When the workers of a capitalist or colonialist country enter the fray, we very often hear statements such as “this is the work of the Communists. Moscow is behind this.” Of course, we are very happy about the fact that all good deeds of nations are being ascribed to communism. Thereby, the imperialists and their counsellors in the I.L.O., in spite of themselves, help the workers better to understand communist ideas. These ideas are broadly disseminated throughout the world. But this is happening not because the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are imposing their ideas on peoples. No, ideas cannot be carried at bayonet point, as they used to say, though now it would be more correct to say that they cannot be carried by rockets.

Very often, all possible kinds of tricks are tried by those who wish to put up a smoke-screen of misinformation concerning the relationship between the socialist countries and the peoples which have only recently freed themselves from the treadmill of colonial slavery. Anybody with any common sense would realise that there is nothing secret, nothing inexplicable, about these relationships. The tension and drama of the battle against colonialism and imperialism have laid the foundations for the new relationships between the socialist countries and the liberated countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Now, at this Conference, another fact has been disclosed. It is common knowledge that some representatives of Western countries treacherously tried to create a disturbance on the pretext of “strengthening the Afro-Asian bloc” in this Organisation. This is is not a bloc, but a broad and ever-expanding circle of States linked by their love of peace. These are States trying to carry out an independent policy in international affairs, which have rightly felt on the basis of their own tragic experience that imperialism and colonialism are their number one enemies.

The discussion has clearly borne out that there is increasing opposition to using the I.L.O. to serve the selfish aims of the monopolists, as a cover for plans which have nothing in common with the tasks and objectives of the true protection of the interests of the workers. To use the I.L.O. for such wicked ends is becoming increasingly difficult. The policy of those people in the I.L.O. reminds me of Lenin’s words that “people always have been and always will be the foolish victims of deceit and self-delusion in politics until they learn to look for the interests of one class or another behind their moral, religious, political, or social phrases, statements or promises.” Many more delegates are learning from their own bitter experience to distinguish between the interests of different classes and different countries and to distinguish between their enemies.

During the last half-century many changes have occurred, not only in the world but also in the International Labour Organisation. Unfortunately, these changes have had no effect on the views held by certain delegates who refuse to understand that the framework of 1919 is no longer valid for today’s realities, that the fate of the Organisation is dictated by realities, by the development of life. The contemporary political, economic and social development of our world indeed gives rise to the necessity to have a drastic revision of
the activities, structure and procedures of the I.L.O.

First of all, we, the Ukrainian S.S.R. delegation, and many other delegations, are very concerned about the present situation regarding the General Conference and the Governing Body and their place in the general system of the I.L.O. The delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. is concerned by the following fact, and we have mentioned it before, that the role of the Conference has now been restricted to the minimum, whereas the role and the authority of the Governing Body is being expanded all the time. The Governing Body for the last 40 years has been controlled by representatives of the Western world and, frankly speaking, if we draw up a balance sheet of their activities over the last ten years we would see that it is a rather modest one. It is true that in these last ten years not only 100,000 but a million documents, stenographic reports, summaries, resolutions, etc., have been stockpiled.

The Members of the I.L.O. have paid a fabulous sum in contributions: millions of dollars which would easily suffice to maintain that part of the world's population that has reached the age of 60. But the basic tasks of the I.L.O. have not yet been resolved. Just as criminal statistics cannot reduce delinquency, the stating of facts can certainly not solve the problems before us. Some delegates seem to agree only with ways which do not lead anywhere and agree only with proposals that do not change anything, but the very serious discussion initiated at this session concerning the programme and radical reconstruction of the methods of work of the I.L.O. will go on and, we hope, will lead, as we have been told by the Director-General today, to a logical conclusion.

I remember that in the United States exhibition in Moscow many visitors to the pavilion devoted to mankind spent a lot of time looking at one photograph in particular, a close-up of hands, simply hands, work-worn hands, those very hands which create the wealth of society, the wealth of the country. Frankly, I do not know what the artist was really trying to convey. Did he want to show the effect of arduous toil and a man worn out by unreasonable labour, or did he intend to show profound respect for the creative genius of the people? We would prefer the second interpretation because for us, the people of the new world, the working man is above all. He is the direct creator of all material welfare on this earth. He desires to serve only him.

Mr. ROBINSON (Employers' delegate, Canada; Vice-President of the Conference) — The 47th Session of the International Labour Conference opened on a note of high purpose, namely the critical examination of the programme and structure of the L.L.O. The urgent need for such an examination was voiced by the Director-General in the introduction to his Report. "The L.L.O." he said, "is at one of the critical points of its history, at one of those points where it may be possible to swing outwards from accustomed courses into a new and larger orbit of action." I would venture to suggest that in the light of the events of the last two weeks the Director-General knew little of the full truth whereof he spoke.

It is not my intention to discuss the Director-General's timely, able and provocative Report. Many delegates have considered it and placed their views on record. As the evaluation of this discussion proceeds, it is virtually certain that many of the suggestions of lasting value will emerge for the consideration of other sessions of this Conference. This is what we want, for this is the process by which the I.L.O. can be made responsive to changing conditions in a world in ferment, by which this Organisation can develop the strength needed to cope with the infinite variety of social problems to which mankind is heir.

Two weeks ago, however, a series of dramatic events intervened to make this Conference one of the most unusual—if not the most unusual—in the history of the I.L.O. These events diverted attention from the main purpose of the Conference, left many delegates in a state of confusion and frustration and for a time threatened the very existence of the I.L.O. These events bear recapitulation because on examination they reveal a situation in the I.L.O. which I would suggest is of far more fundamental importance than the problems of programme and structure, important as these problems are.

These events include the demonstration against the Employers' delegate from the Republic of South Africa in the protest against the hated policy of apartheid, the further demonstration and walk-out two days later, the resignation of the President of the Conference, Mr. Johnson, and the withdrawal of the African and Arab delegations from the Conference.

It was at this point that another force revealed itself: this was the concerted and organised effort of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, who posed as the spokesmen of the absent delegations and who proposed measures which, if adopted, could serve not only to disrupt the Conference but also to seriously handicap the I.L.O. in carrying out its programmes. I refer to the proposal to postpone the Conference until later in November or early December, the opposition to the adoption of the budget and the refusal, through the exercise of the veto, of the Government Vice-President to allow the Conference to deal with any of the four resolutions dealing with the grave situation submitted to the Conference—and submitted as matters of urgency—under the provisions of the Constitution.

It is history that the Conference did not adjourn and that the budget was adopted. It is also history that the Government Vice-President succeeded in keeping the four resolutions to which I have referred from the floor of the Conference. While it may be plain that each of these spokesmen 일본 외국인 Electric (or "the others") and that they were taken in the interests of the African States and of the I.L.O., the pattern they formed could hardly have been formed by coincidence. I, for one, can see no possible value to the African States or to the
I.L.O. in the proposals of the socialist countries: indeed, quite the reverse is the case. It is these developments which to my mind reveal a problem of much more fundamental and far-reaching significance than the problems of programme and structure, which were to have been the main preoccupation of this Conference. The I.L.O. can have the best programme that the mind of man can devise, and it can have a structure calculated to put the programme into effect in the most effective manner possible, but this programme and structure will go for naught unless we have men of good will and honesty of intention who are dedicated to constructive action, to plan the programme and to carry it out.

If we have learned anything at all from the events of the past two weeks, I would venture to suggest that it is that the real crisis in the I.L.O. is a moral crisis, a crisis created by the failures of human beings rather than the inadequacy of a programme or a deficiency of structure. Happily the crisis has been weathered. The I.L.O. has carried on and is carrying on. We have the advantage of knowing something about our weaknesses and of feeling something about our strength. I believe the great majority of us here believe the I.L.O. will continue to give help to the helpless, to provide hope for those who despair, to fight against aggression and discrimination, and to provide a forum wherein those who wish to do so may exercise the freedoms to which the I.L.O. is dedicated. May I, as my last official act as Vice-President of this Conference, give thanks where thanks are due. I wish particularly to thank my Employer colleagues for the honour they have done me and the confidence they have reposed in me in my election to this high office. For those, and for the support they have given me, I am most grateful.

My thanks go also to the Secretary-General and to the members of his staff for the help and guidance they have provided. On all occasions on which I was required to serve in an official capacity they have made my task easy with valuable knowledge and unobtrusive but exceptionally efficient service. I wish also to express my thanks to my fellow Vice-Presidents for the genial and tolerant manner in which they have put up with my efforts to co-operate. I wish I could say that my efforts were successful with both, but I think it is a matter of record that the Government Vice-President played the role of a rugged individualist in his refusal to agree to a procedure which the rest of us considered to be a matter of urgency. This was otherwise in the case of the Workers' Vice-President. There have been many times in the past when Employers and Workers have differed, and I presume there will be differences in the future, but when fundamental issues occur in which Workers and Employers have a stake the parties seem able to close ranks to meet these issues; I think this situation has characterised this Conference, and it is due in no small measure to the work of the Workers' Vice-President.

Now, Mr. President, may I say a personal word to you. When you took office at short notice and under particularly trying circumstances, I told you that I looked forward to working with you. I can now look back with the greatest pleasure to the kindness you have shown and to your courtesy to an Officer of limited experience, which are greatly appreciated and will be long remembered. May I record, not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of all the free Employers at this Conference, our deep appreciation of the outstanding way in which you have performed your presidential duties under very difficult circumstances. Your genial firmness and your complete fairness and the easy atmosphere you created in this hall after the earlier and tempestuous sessions have won our deepest admiration and respect. It is a privilege, Mr. President, to be able to pay this tribute on behalf of the Employers, together with their thanks, for the vital contribution you have made to the success of this Conference.

Mr. FAUPL (Workers' delegate, United States; Vice-President of the Conference)—As I take the rostrum to make a closing statement to this, the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference, I feel that expression of the customary sentiments, however sincere, would be inappropriate in the light of all that has happened during the past few weeks.

This Conference has tested the strength and purpose and the fundamental principles of the I.L.O. I am happy to say that this Organisation has stood up to the test. Notwithstanding the attempted sabotage by certain groups, we have not foundered, neither have we betrayed the basic principles of social justice, freedom and dignity, which are at the very core of the I.L.O. Each of us here present at this Conference has been met with a challenge—a challenge to the very existence of the Organisation. We have met this challenge and the I.L.O. has been strengthened by the course that you, the delegates to this Conference—Worker, Employer and Government alike—have chosen.

In the words of the Director-General, "we have not run away from the battle". The action this Conference has taken will establish, or lay the groundwork for establishing, new standards in important fields which will bring greater security and better health and safety to millions of workers all over the world.

The decisions we have taken for the adoption of these international instruments lend concrete support to the conviction of the Workers' group that the standard-setting activities of the I.L.O. have not diminished in importance. On the contrary, in today's rapidly changing world this phase of the I.L.O.'s programme can and should be of greater significance than ever before.

It is fitting that in this year when the eyes of the world are focused on the struggle to achieve racial equality in many different parts of the globe this Conference has sought to appraise the effects thus far of the international instruments against discrimination in employment adopted just five years ago. We have seen that progress has been made, but in my own country and in many others, including the communist countries which claim to have eliminated racial discrimination, equality of opportunity is not yet assured. This stock-
As a member of the Governing Body, and one of the Workers' group, to the staff, to the personal appreciation, as well as the appreciation of the regional conferences, I know that the I.L.O. directorate, to you, Mr. President, and everyone join the Director-General in expressing my gratitude for the selfless way in which you took up the reins of this Conference at its outset, and to express our thanks and appreciation to the Officers of the Conference for their assistance and for having overcome so many of the difficult problems that had to be dealt with behind the scenes in order to ensure that we could bring our work to a successful conclusion.

I want to join with them in seeking lawful means to accomplish their objective. It is my belief that Africa needs the I.L.O., but it is just as true that the I.L.O. needs Africa. This temporary rift, based on honest differences of opinion, must be healed as quickly as possible. We must all get on with the historic task of the I.L.O. of improving the welfare and ensuring the freedom of workers all over the world. It is my fundamental conviction that these objectives can best be attained by strength in every way possible the tripartite structure of this Organisation.

I could not close my remarks without expressing to you, Mr. President, my appreciation and gratitude for the selfless way in which you took up the reins of this Conference at its most critical moment. I know I speak for the majority of the free Workers when I say, "Thanks for a job well done". By bringing this Conference through to a successful conclusion in the most difficult circumstances you have made a lasting contribution to the I.L.O. which we shall long remember.

Now may I, on behalf of the Workers' group, join the Director-General in expressing my personal appreciation, as well as the appreciation of the Workers' group, to the staff, to the directorate, to you, Mr. President, and everyone else who has worked so hard in this Conference. As a member of the Governing Body, and one who has attended several Conferences and regional conferences, I know that the I.L.O. staff, under your wise and understanding guidance, do not know anything about an eight-hour day or a 40-hour week. It is only their devotion to the Organisation that keeps them going, and I hope that those who may in the future sit in judgment in determining their working conditions and salaries will bear this in mind.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL—On behalf of my colleagues, and also speaking for myself, I should like to say just a very few words.

First, I want to thank the Officers and Reporters of the various committees for having brought their work to a successful conclusion, and to express our thanks and appreciation to the Officers of the Conference for their assistance and for having overcome so many of the difficult problems that had to be dealt with behind the scenes in order to ensure that we could bring our work to a successful conclusion.

I think I have said about all I can say, or should say, at this Conference, but I should like to add one word concerning yourself, Mr. President.

We have known each other now for 14 years in our work together in this Organisation. You are the veteran of those who come to the I.L.O. This is your fortieth year of service to this Organisation. This is the second time that you have served as President of the Conference. You have established a record and a precedent in that respect.

You took over at the point of no return and brought our ship safely home, for which all of us will be for ever grateful, especially those who are not in the hall but whom we serve. You have deserved the rest that you are now going to take. You and your wife now go into retirement. I understand that this is the last time that you will come to the I.L.O. You are going to Kirkensgaard, to enjoy your family and your lovely home on that delightful island. The whole Conference wishes you and your wife a well deserved future together of happiness and joy.

I should like, on behalf of the Conference, to give you the usual symbol of our affection, the gavel which you used in steering us through these difficult days. Good luck, and all our love to both of you.

The PRESIDENT—May I begin by saying how grateful I am for all the kind words that have been said to me by previous speakers—words that were only too kind. I have tried to do my duty as President of part of this Conference and to act in the way that I promised the Conference when it bestowed on me the great honour of erecting me to the position of President, to be impartial and effective so that the Conference could finish its work in the rather short time that was left.

I wish to thank the three Vice-Presidents for the way in which we have been able to cooperate. As the Conference will know, we did not always agree but in spite of this we managed to negotiate in a gentleman-like manner.

I am grateful to the Secretary-General of the Conference for the help he has been good enough to give me as President, and I am also grateful to the Deputy Secretary-General, to the Assistant Secretaries-General, to the Clerk of the Conference and the Assistant Clerk, with
whom I have had a very close and very useful collaboration during the sittings of the Conference.

I feel authorised on this occasion on behalf of the Conference to convey our thanks to the staff of the I.L.O. They have been of immense help to all of us here, in the committees and in the plenary sittings, and in all the daily life of this big house. We have seen a lot of them moving around among us, but we know that many members of the staff have been working in the premises where we are not allowed to go, and where they have done the necessary work for the effective running of so complex a machine as this Conference.

I am the last speaker in the Conference, which gives me a privilege, as members will have no opportunity of contradicting me, but precisely for this reason it also places a heavy responsibility upon me. I was elected President at a moment in the life of the Conference that was very depressing to all of us. It was quite uncertain whether the Conference could go on or would have to be considered as finished or, perhaps, postponed for some months. I am not going to refer to what happened then; it is known to all of us, but I do feel it necessary to explain why I accepted the office of President. I hope thereby to eradicate some misunderstanding which might have arisen—I say might—in the minds of some delegates.

The African President had resigned and the African, and other delegates, were about to leave the Conference. My Government feels great sympathy for the newly independent African States and takes part wholeheartedly in welcoming them as Members of the I.L.O. The Danish Government has in different ways made its contribution in technical assistance to developing countries, among them the African States, and my Government is prepared to increase its help in the coming years. I had myself during the first sitting of this Conference the pleasure of supporting the nomination of Mr. Johnson as President of the Conference on behalf of the four Scandinavian countries, and to say that we found it natural that the continent of Africa should have a representative in the presidential chair of this Conference. The Danish delegation regretted just as much as other delegations that the African delegates felt it necessary to leave the Conference, but we fully understood their feelings.

My election as President could therefore in no way be interpreted as a challenge to the African delegates. On the other hand, it could even less be considered as an expression of sympathy with or support for the African State whose participation in this Conference has given rise to all our difficulties.

Denmark voted in 1961 for the resolution that condemned the racial policies of the Government of South Africa, and expressed the utmost sympathy with those people of South Africa whose fundamental rights are repressed by the policy of apartheid. The years that have passed since 1961, and the evolution in the apartheid policy which has taken place in these years, have only increased our condemnation, and we are fully in agreement with all the speakers who, during this Conference, have used very strong words in condemnation of the South African Government and its presence here.

The reason for my accepting election to the office of President for the remainder of this Conference will therefore be found in my feeling of duty to the I.L.O., and my hope of being able to help the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference to fulfil its normal work: the discussion of the Director-General's Report, the adoption of the budget for 1964, and the adoption of the reports of the technical committees. The confidence you showed me was, of course, of immense value to me and I am very grateful to you for this and also for the kind help you have given me during the plenary sittings.

I will not try to give a résumé of the results of the Conference. I would prefer to turn for a few moments to the future of the I.L.O. This has been amply dealt with in the Report of the Director-General which he has submitted to the Conference, and many speakers have discussed this Report giving valuable suggestions about the methods that will have to be used if the International Labour Organisation is to be able to reach its high objectives in a changing world. A heavy responsibility will now fall on the Governing Body, the new, enlarged and more representative Governing Body, with ample representation of the developing countries, among them the African States. We do all sincerely hope that the new representatives in the Governing Body, in combination and collaboration with the old and experienced members of this august body, will be able to find the right way and uphold the confidence in the I.L.O. which so many delegates, also from the new member States, have expressed during this Conference. May I wish the negotiations of the Governing Body all success.

I hereby declare closed the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference.

(The Conference adjourned sine die at 4 p.m.)
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APPENDIX I

Reports of the Selection Committee

(1) First Report.¹

Election of the Officers of the Committee.

The Selection Committee has elected the following Officers:

Chairman: Mr. Weaver (Government Member, United States).

Employers' Vice-Chairman: Mr. Bergenström (Sweden).

Workers' Vice-Chairman: Mr. Collison (United Kingdom).

Setting Up of Conference Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the Conference should appoint the following committees:

Standing Orders Committee.
Finance Committee of Government Representatives.
Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.
Committee on Guarding of Machinery.
Committee on Termination of Employment.
Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices.
Committee on Social Security.

Discussion of the Director-General's Report.

The Selection Committee recommends that the discussion of the Director-General's Report should open on Friday, 7 June 1963.

In order to ensure the smooth working of the Conference, the Selection Committee recommends that delegates who wish to take part in the discussion of the Director-General's Report should hand in their names to the Clerk of the Conference without delay. It also recommends that they should make every effort to be on hand and ready to speak at the sitting at which they are to be called upon. Speakers will be informed in advance by the Clerk of the Conference of the sitting and the time at which the President is likely to call upon them to speak.

The Selection Committee, bearing in mind the suggestion to this effect made by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office at its 130th Session (November 1955), proposes that the Conference should appeal to speakers in the discussion of the Director-General's Report to concentrate their remarks as far as possible on the Director-General's Report and on the activities of the International Labour Organisation.

Suggestions concerning Facilities for More Negotiation.

At its 145th Session (May 1960) the Governing Body adopted the report of the Committee to Consider the Improvement of the Practical Methods of Working of the International Labour Conference, which contains, among other things, the following passage:

... The Committee suggests that in order to facilitate more continuous negotiation in committees between the several groups, representatives of each group should meet with the Chairman and Reporter of the Committee, and with the representative of the Secretary-General, when this is desirable, to ensure that the leaders of each group know fully the minds of their colleagues in the other groups; it should be regarded as normal to have such meetings after each group has explored each of the major issues which arise but before it has committed itself to a definite attitude. The proposed meetings would have no formal powers or authority; their function would be to afford opportunities for a fuller understanding of differences of view before definite attitudes have crystallised.

The Selection Committee of the 44th Session transmitted this suggestion to the Conference, which approved it on 3 June 1960. The President of the Conference then took the initiative in convening a meeting of chairmen of committees at which he drew attention to the contribution which regular consultation among the officers of each committee could make in securing the widest measure of agreement in the committees.

Reviewing the working of this arrangement, at its meeting in March 1961, the Committee to Consider the Improvement of the Practical Methods of Working of the International Labour Conference welcomed this initiative and trusted that future Presidents of the Conference would make a regular practice of convening similar meetings of chairmen of committees; it suggested that it would be useful if the Employer and Worker vice-chairmen of committees were convened to future meetings of this type.

The Selection Committee draws the attention of the Conference and its committees once again to the suggestion reproduced above.

¹ See Second Part, p. 12.
Suggestions regarding the Conference Quorum and the Timing of Decisions in Plenary Sittings Requiring a Series of Votes.

At its 151st Session (March 1962) the Governing Body adopted the proposals contained in the following paragraphs of the report of the Committee to Consider the Improvement of the Practical Methods of Working of the International Labour Conference:

The Quorum.

6. The Committee has not completed its examination of this question, but has one immediate recommendation to make. Every effort should be made to ensure an accurate calculation of the quorum at all times, in particular by drawing the attention of delegates who intend to leave the Conference before its termination to the importance of giving advance formal notice of their departure to the Secretariat in writing or of ensuring that an adviser has been duly authorised by a notice addressed to the President of the Conference to act in their place after their departure.

7. The Committee accordingly recommends the Governing Body to request the Selection Committee of the Conference to call the attention of delegates, and in particular of the groups, to this matter so as to ensure that members of delegations are fully aware of the importance of giving advance notice of their departure or of ensuring that an adviser has been duly authorised to act as substitute during their absence or after their departure. The Director-General has agreed to have prepared and available a standard form for giving such notice to facilitate the procedure.

The Timing of Decisions in Plenary Sittings Requiring a Series of Votes.

8. The Committee recommends that the Governing Body should draw the attention of the Selection Committee of the Conference at the beginning of the session, to the importance of making appropriate arrangements, in determining the programme of work of the Conference, for matters which will require the holding of votes to come before the Conference at the earliest possible moment.

9. The Committee further considered that the attention of delegates should be drawn to the fact that acceptance of appointment as delegates implies an obligation to be available in Geneva for the work of the Conference, personally or through an adviser authorised to act as substitute, throughout the Conference. In this connection it noted that the Director-General has recently, by a letter of 19 January 1962 to governments, drawn their attention to the fact that important votes, i.e. the final votes on the adoption of international labour Conventions and/or Recommendations, frequently take place on the last day of the Conference and that, as it is essential that delegates or their duly authorised substitutes should be present when such votes are taken, they should accordingly make arrangements to be available until the very end of the Conference. He has requested governments to draw the attention of delegates to the forthcoming session of the Conference to the matter and to the fact that they or their duly authorised substitutes should therefore be present in Geneva as from the morning of Tuesday, 5 June and should be available in Geneva until the evening of Thursday, 28 June, when it is expected that the Conference will have completed its work. The Committee understands that the Director-General intends to follow this practice regularly in the future and trusts that governments will not fail to bring the matter to the attention of the delegates at the time of their appointment.

10. The Committee also recommends that the Governing Body request the Selection Committee to draw the attention of delegates at the next session of the Conference to the obligations which acceptance of appointment as delegate implies.

The Selection Committee of the 46th Session transmitted these suggestions to the Conference, which approved them on 8 June 1962.

The Selection Committee draws the attention of the Conference once again to the suggestions reproduced above.
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International Confederation of Executive Staffs.
International Confederation of Senior Officials.
International Federation of Plantation, Agricultural and Allied Workers.
International Social Security Association.
International Young Christian Workers.
World Young Women’s Christian Association.

Appointment of a Member of the Appeals Board Panel.

Mr. A. Emil F. Sandström, a member of the Appeals Board Panel, died in July 1962. At its 154th Session the Governing Body decided to propose to the International Labour Conference that Mr. Hans Henrik Koch (Danish), Chairman of the Executive Board of the Danish Atomic Energy Commission, former Permanent Under-Secretary of State of the Danish Ministry of Social Affairs and Government delegate of Denmark to the International Labour Conference from 1946 to 1956, be appointed to the Appeals Board Panel, in succession to the late Mr. A. Emil F. Sandström.

The Selection Committee accordingly recommends the Conference to appoint Mr. Hans Henrik Koch (Danish) a member of the Appeals Board Panel for a period of three years.

The Employers’ members asked that it should be placed on record that they took no part in this decision.

Composition of the Credentials Committee.

The Selection Committee proposes to the Conference that the Credentials Committee should be composed of three members, as provided in the Standing Orders of the Conference, as follows:

**Government member**: Mr. Barboza-Carneiro (Brazil).
**Employers’ member**: Mr. Perera (Malaya).
**Workers’ member**: Mr. Sánchez Madariaga (Mexico).

Appointment of the Drafting Committee of the Conference.

The Selection Committee recommends that, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 6 of the Standing Orders, the Drafting Committee of the Conference be composed as follows:

- The President of the Conference.
- The Secretary-General of the Conference.
- Mr. Jenks, Assistant Secretary-General of the Conference.
- Mr. Wolf, Legal Adviser of the Conference.
- Mr. Valticos, Chief of the International Labour Standards Division of the International Labour Office.

The Selection Committee thinks it desirable to remind the Conference that the special drafting committees appointed by committees under the Standing Orders and consisting of one Government delegate, one Employers’ delegate and one Workers’ delegate, together with the Reporter or Reporters of the committee and the legal advisers of the Conference, form part of the Drafting Committee of the Conference when proposals submitted to the Conference by the committee concerned are under consideration.

(2) Second Report.

(The second report was submitted orally to the Conference. See Second Part, page 12.)

ANNEX TO THE SECOND REPORT: COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES

Standing Orders Committee

**Government members**:
- Albania.
- Algeria.
- Argentina.
- Australia.
- Belgium.
- Bulgaria.
- Byelorussia.
- Cameroon.
- Canada.
- Central African Republic.
- China.
- Congo (Brazzaville).
- Czechoslovakia.
- Denmark.
- France.
- Gabon.
- Federal Republic of Germany.
- Greece.
- Guinea.
- Hungary.
- India.
- Iraq.
- Ireland.
- Israel.
- Italy.
- Japan.
- Lebanon.
- Mali.
- Morocco.
- Netherlands.
- New Zealand.
- Nigeria.
- Philippines.
- Poland.
- Portugal.
- Rumania.
- Senegal.
- Spain.
- Switzerland.
- Tunisia.
- Turkey.
- Ukraine.
- U.S.S.R.
- United Arab Republic.
- United Kingdom.
- United States.
- Uruguay.
- Venezuela.

**Deputy members**:
- Ghana.
- Ivory Coast.
- Kuwait.
- Liberia.
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Employers' members:
Mr. Fennema (Netherlands).
Mr. Gonzales Blanco (Brazil).
Mr. Kuntschen; substitutes: Mr. Dubois, Mr. Rudin (Switzerland).
Mr. Ofurum; substitute: Mr. Idajo (Nigeria).
Mr. Reyes; substitute: Mr. Isip (Philippines).
Mr. Wagner; substitute: Mr. Pantos (United States).

Deputy members:
Mr. Abdelmoneim (Sudan).
Mr. Campanella; substitute: Mr. Mochi-Onori (Italy).
Mr. Cooper; substitute: Mr. Richards (Liberia).
Mr. Martinez-Espino; substitutes: Mr. Villalobos, Mr. Sánchez (Venezuela).
Mr. Peretti; substitutes: Mr. Talantikit, Mr. Taoug (Algeria).
Mr. Ubaldilla; substitute: Mr. Perera (Malaya).
Mr. Waline; substitutes: Mr. Leblanc, Mr. Mermillod (France).

Workers' members:
Mr. Beard (United Kingdom).
Mr. Bendris (Algeria).
Mr. Bothereau (France).
Mr. Coppo (Italy).
Mr. Kanaviev (U.S.S.R.).
Mr. Kaplansky (Canada).
Mr. Möri (Switzerland).
Mr. Rob (Rumania).
Mr. Seidman (United States).

Deputy members:
Mr. Beermann (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Bolin (Sweden).
Mr. Gregor (Czechoslovakia).
Mr. Heise (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Kane (Mauritania).
Mr. Rocchi (Italy).
Mr. Tubman (Liberia).

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations

Government members:
Algeria.
Australia.
Belgium.
Bulgaria.
Byelorussia.
Canada.
Central African Republic.
Chad.
Colombia.
Congo (Brazzaville).
Congo (Leopoldville).
Costa Rica.
Cuba.
Cyprus.
Czechoslovakia.
Dahomey.
Ecuador.
France.
Gabon.
Federal Republic of Germany.
Ghana.
Greece.
Guinea.
Hungary.
Iran.
Iraq.
Israel.
Italy.
Ivory Coast.
Liberia.
Mali.
Mauritania.
Mexico.
Morocco.
Nigeria.
Norway.
Pakistan.
Peru.
Philippines.
Poland.
Portugal.
Rumania.
Senegal.
Spain.
Sweden.
Switzerland.
Tanganyika.
Togo.
Trinidad and Tobago.
Tunisia.
Turkey.
Uganda.
Ukraine.
U.S.S.R.
United Kingdom.
United States.
Upper Volta.
Venezuela.
Yugoslavia.

Deputy members:
Cameroon.
Chile.
China.
Ethiopia.
Indonesia.
Japan.
Kuwait.
Luxembourg.
Sudan.
United Arab Republic.

Observers:
Bermuda.
Malta.
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

Employers' members:
Mr. Campanella; substitutes: Mr. Chericoni, Mr. Mochi-Onori (Italy).
Mr. Cooper; substitute: Mr. Richards (Liberia).
Mr. Fourn (Dahomey).
Mr. Kuntschen; substitutes: Mr. Rudin, Mr. Fink (Switzerland).
Mr. Leilão; substitutes: Mr. Bustorff Silva, Mr. Sena da Silva (Portugal).
Mr. Lund; substitute: Mr. Poulsen (Denmark).
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Sir George Pollock ; substitute : Mr. Hyde-Clarke (United Kingdom).
Mr. Reyes ; substitute : Mr. Isip (Philippines).
Mr. Robinson ; substitute : Mr. Frêchette (Canada).

Deputy members :
Mr. Abdelmoneim (Sudan).
Mr. Gacio Fuerte (Cuba).
Mr. Gonzales Blanco ; substitute : Mr. Raposo (Ceylon).
Mr. Greve ; substitute : Mr. Ranawake (Ceylon).
Mr. Kettani ; substitute : Mr. Zennouri (Morocco).
Mr. Klecan (Czechoslovakia).
Mr. Ofurum ; substitute : Mr. Lewis (Nigeria).
Mr. Rebol (Chad).
Mr. Selvig (Norway).
Mr. Theocharides ; substitute : Mr. Bullock (Cyprus).
Mr. Wagner ; substitutes : Mr. Van Meter, Mr. Pantos (United States).
Mr. Waline ; substitutes : Mr. Leblanc, Mr. Mermillod, Mr. Saintigny (France).
Mr. Yllanes Ramos ; substitute : Mr. Oamopuzano Oñate (Mexico).

Observer :
Mr. Richmond (Kenya).

Workers' members :
Mr. Abid Ali (India).
Mr. Alders (Netherlands).
Mr. Bah (Guinea).
Mr. Barben (Togo).
Mr. Bo-Boliko (Congo (Leopoldville)).
Mr. Bresso (Uruguay).
Mr. Cool (Belgium).
Mr. Efremenko (Ukraine).
Mr. Flissi (Algeria).
Mr. Hewitt (United Kingdom).
Mr. Junah (Liberia).
Mr. Kelly (Jamaica).
Mr. Keren-Zvi (Israel).
Mr. Kocani (Albania).
Mr. Louet (France).
Mr. Mange (Cameroon).
Mr. Meany (United States).
Mr. Mendoza (Philippines).
Mr. Morris (Canada).
Mr. Musa (Rumania).
Mr. Nilsson (Finland).
Mr. Obukhovich (Byelorussia).
Mr. Pedroso Lima (Portugal).
Mr. Pongsault (Congo (Brasaville)).
Mr. Rafalimanana (Malagasy Republic).
Mr. Tabor (Uganda).
Mr. Vonarburg (Switzerland).
Mr. Wagner (Luxembourg).
Mrs. Weber (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Wiszkielis (Poland).

Deputy members :
Mr. David (Malaya).
Mr. Farine (France).
Mr. Filippov (Ukraine).
Mr. González Ascanio (Venezuela).
Mr. Halden (Norway).
Mr. Kabore (Upper Volta).
Mr. Kaplansky (Canada).
Mr. Martucci (Italy).
Mr. Nichum (Libya).
Mr. Schockmel (Luxembourg).
Mr. Samoko Yamara (Chad).
Mr. Thondaman (Ceylon).
Mr. Yamada (Japan).

Observers :
Mr. Devan-Nair (Singapore).
Mr. Ho (Singapore).
Mr. Hsu (Singapore).
Mr. Simmons (Bermuda).
Mr. Watson (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).

Committee on Guarding of Machinery

Government members :
Algeria.
Australia.
Austria.
Belgium.
Brazil.
Cameroon.
Canada.
Cyprus.
Denmark.
Ecuador.
Ethiopia.
France.
Federal Republic of Germany.
Ghana.
Guinea.
India.
Iran.
Ireland.
Italy.
Jamaica.
Japan.
Kuwait.
Lebanon.
Luxembourg.
Netherlands.
New Zealand.
Nigeria.
Norway.
Philippines.
Senegal.
Spain.
Sweden.
Switzerland.
Turkey.
Uganda.
U.S.S.R.
United Arab Republic.
United Kingdom.
United States.
Venezuela.

Deputy members :
Gabon.
Ivory Coast.
Libera.
Morocco.
Portugal.
Rumania.
Sudan.
Tunisia.
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Employers' members :

Mr. Al Jadir (Iraq).
Mr. Alam ; substitute : Mr. Kip (Turkey).
Sir John Allum (New Zealand).
Mr. Bergenström ; substitutes : Mr. Gerhardsson, Mr. Rugfelt, Mr. Forstadius, Mr. Hydén (Sweden).
Mr. Campanella ; substitutes : Mr. Calvanese, Mr. Chericoni (Italy).
Mr. Chang ; substitute : Mr. Kuo (China).
Mr. Faubel ; substitutes : Mr. Doetsch, Mr. Gasde, Mr. Kanlen, Mr. Schlotfeldt (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Ferrier ; substitute : Mr. Anderson (Australia).
Mr. Galdós ; substitute : Mr. Irurzún (Spain).
Mr. Gonzales Blanco ; substitute : Mr. Martins Abelheira (Brazil).
Mr. Maboungou M'Bimba (Congo (Brazzaville)).
Sir George Pollock ; substitutes : Mr. Miller, Mr. Watson (United Kingdom).
Mr. Riffaat ; substitute : Mr. Orphy (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Robinson ; substitute : Mr. Watt (Canada).
Mr. Wagner ; substitute : Mr. Denise (United States).

Deputy members :

Mr. Fennema ; substitutes : Mr. Mauritz, Mr. Renaud (Netherlands).
Mr. Gheorghiu (Rumania).
Mr. Ketani (Morocco).
Mr. Kuntshen ; substitutes : Mr. Dubois, Mr. Weiersmüller (Switzerland).
Mr. Leitão ; substitute : Mr. Ferreirinha (Portugal).
Mr. Martinez-Espin ; substitutes : Mr. Sánchez, Mr. Casas Rincón (Venezuela).
Mr. Ofurum ; substitute : Mr. Keylock (Nigeria).
Mr. Reyes ; substitute : Mr. Imperial (Philippines).
Mr. Verschueren ; substitutes : Mr. Lepage, Mr. Piron (Belgium).
Mr. Vuño (Yugoslavia).
Mr. Wajid Ali ; substitute : Mr. Lodhi (Pakistan).
Mr. Waline ; substitutes : Mr. Bouvier, Mr. Mermillod (France).

Workers' members :

Mr. Dalziel (New Zealand).
Mr. Danladi (Nigeria).
Mr. Ezzeldin (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Geoffroy (Canada).
Mr. Hansen (Poland).
Mr. Javaux (Belgium).
Mr. Karlsson (Sweden).
Mr. Keenan (United States).
Mr. Kuukkanen (Finland).
Mr. de Meyembourg (France).
Mr. O'Hagan (United Kingdom).
Mr. Rachini (Argentina).
Mr. Schüssler (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Takehana (Japan).
Mr. Tsyganov (U.S.S.R.).

Deputy members :

Mr. Antonio Rueda (Mexico).
Mr. Beard (United Kingdom).
Mr. Brown (Australia).
Mr. Durgawat (India).
Mr. McGill (Liberia).
Mr. Montagnani (Italy).
Mr. Nilsson (Finland).
Mr. dos Santos Calisto (Portugal).

Observers :

Mr. Dube (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).
Mr. Pace (Malta).
Mr. Watson (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).

Committee on Termination of Employment

Government members :

Afghanistan.
Algeria.
Argentina.
Austria.
Australia.
Austria.
Belgium.
Burma.
Cameroon.
Canada.
Central African Republic.
Ceylon.
Colombia.
Congo (Brazzaville).
Congo (Leopoldville).
Costa Rica.
Cuba.
Cyprus.
Czecho-Slovakia.
Dahomey.
Denmark.
Ethiopia.
France.
Federal Republic of Germany.
Ghana.
Greece.
Guinea.
Honduras.
India.
Indonesia.
Iran.
Iraq.
Ireland.
Israel.
Italy.
Ivory Coast.
Jamaica.
Japan.
Jordan.
Kuwait.
Lebanon.
Liberia.
Luxembourg.
Malagasy Republic.
Malaia.
Mali.
Mexico.
Mexico.
Netherlands.
New Zealand.
Nigeria.
Norway.
Pakistan.
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Panama.
Philippines.
Poland.
Estonia.
Senegal.
Sierra Leone.
Spain.
Sudan.
Sweden.
Switzerland.
Turkey.
Uganda.
U.S.S.R.
United Arab Republic.
United Kingdom.
United States.
Uruguay.
Venezuela.
Viet-Nam.

Deputy members:
- Brazil.
- Finland.
- Gabon.
- Morocco.
- Peru.
- Portugal.
- Trinidad and Tobago.

Observers:
- Bermuda.
- Kenya.
- Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

Employers' members:
- Mr. Achour; substitute: Mr. Letaief (Tunisia).
- Sir John Allum; substitute: Mr. McKenzie (New Zealand).
- Mr. Aparicio Valdez; substitute: Mr. de Cossio (Peru).
- Mr. Bekombo (Cameroon).
- Mr. Bergenström; substitutes: Mr. Forstadius, Mr. Rugfelt, Mr. Gerhardsson (Sweden).
- Mr. Campanella; substitutes: Mr. Boccardi, Mr. Misserville, Mr. Tosti (Italy).
- Mr. Cuffe; substitute: Mr. O'Began (Ireland).
- Mr. Faubel; substitutes: Mr. Erdmann, Mr. Müller, Mr. Schlotfeldt (Federal Republic of Germany).
- Mr. Ferrier; substitute: Mr. Polites (Australia).
- Mr. Galdós; substitute: Mr. Irurzún (Spain).
- Mr. Gaye; substitute: Mr. Thiam (Senegal).
- Mr. Ghayour; substitutes: Mr. Maleknia, Mr. Nasser Faili (Iran).
- Mr. González Blanco; substitute: Mr. Pinto (Brazil).
- Mr. Greve; substitute: Mr. Ranawake (Ceylon).
- Mr. Hamilton; substitute: Mr. Du Plessis (Republic of South Africa).
- Mr. Al-Fadi; substitute: Mr. Haseeb (Iraq).
- Mr. Hetemäki; substitutes: Mr. Mildh, Mr. Laatunen, Mr. Strandén, Mr. Vihma (Finland).
- Mr. Leechman (Tanganyika).
- Mr. Leitão; substitutes: Mr. Neto de Miranda, Mr. Vaz de Almada (Portugal).
- Mr. Lund; substitute: Mr. Degerbøl (Denmark).
- Mr. Martínez-Espino; substitutes: Mr. Oyarzábal, Mr. Arcay (Venezuela).
- Mr. Al-Masri; substitute: Mr. Djäfani (Jordan).
- Mr. Maung Maung (Burma).
- Mr. Mishiro; substitutes: Mr. Watanahe, Mr. Kondo (Japan).
- Mr. Muro de Nadal; substitutes: Mr. Vítaic o Jakasa, Mr. Decker (Argentina).
- Mr. Naar; substitute: Mr. Mina (Lebanon).
- Mr. Nuñez (Trinidad and Tobago).
- Mr. Ofurum; substitute: Mr. Abebe (Nigeria).
- Mr. Peretti; substitute: Mr. Talantikit (Algeria).
- Sir George Pollock; substitute: Mr. Lowry (United Kingdom).
- Mr. Reyes; substitute: Mr. Imperial (Philippines).
- Mr. Robinson; substitute: Mr. Stevens (Canada).
- Mr. Selvig; substitutes: Mr. Aarvig, Mr. Meyer (Norway).
- Mr. Solomon (Sierra Leone).
- Mr. Tata; substitute: Mr. Swaminathan (India).
- Mr. Theocharides; substitutes: Mr. Bullock, Mr. Alexandrou (Cyprus).
- Mr. Al-Tuaimain (Kuwait).
- Mr. Ubaidulla; substitutes: Mr. Ratnam, Mr. Perera (Malaya).
- Mr. Végh-Garzón; substitute: Mr. Montero Zorrilla (Uruguay).
- Mr. Verschueren; substitutes: Mr. Piron, Mr. de Bruyn, Mr. Bernaert (Belgium).
- Mr. Wagner; substitute: Mr. Branch (United States).
- Mr. Wajid Ali (Pakistan).
- Mr. Waline; substitutes: Mr. Leblanc, Mr. Mermillod (France).
- Mr. Walker (Uganda).
- Mr. Yllanes Bamos; substitute: Mr. Campuzano Oñate (Mexico).

Deputy members:
- Mr. Alan; substitute: Mr. Kip (Turkey).
- Mr. Arango Restrepo (Colombia).
- Mr. Bannerman-Menson; substitute: Mr. Hawkins (Ghana).
- Mr. Bardas; substitute: Mr. Angelou (Greece).
- Mr. Bekti (Indonesia).
- Mr. Chang; substitute: Mr. Kuo (China).
- Mr. Cooper; substitute: Mr. Ryan ( Liberia).
- Mr. Fennema; substitutes: Mr. Peynenburg, Mr. van Rooy (Netherlands).
- Mr. Gebregziabher (Ethiopia).
- Mr. Hausman (Israel).
- Mr. Hayot; substitutes: Mr. Beissel, Mr. Müller, Mr. Roillaer (Luxembourg).
- Mr. Jeonkheere; substitute: Mr. Lomboto (Congo (Leopoldville)).
- Mr. Kettani (Morocco).
- Mr. Koloshin (Byelorussia).
- Mr. Kuntachen; substitutes: Mr. Fink, Mr. Rudin (Switzerland).
- Mr. Marshall (Jamaica).
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Mr. Mautner-Markhof; substitute: Mr. Tutschka (Austria).
Mr. Picard (Central African Republic).
Mr. Rifaat; substitute: Mr. Badawi (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Sallabanda (Albania).
Mr. Tran-Van-Lôc (Viet-Nam).

Observers:
Mr. Cameron (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).
Mr. Plowman (Bermuda).
Mr. Portelli (Malta).
Mr. Thio (Singapore).

Workers' members:
Mr. Albeda (Netherlands).
Mr. Alexander (Trinidad and Tobago).
Mr. Ali (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Fall (Mauritania).
Mr. Carbonell Horruitiner (Cuba).
Mr. Coffie (Ivory Coast).
Mr. Dam-Sy-Hien (Viet-Nam).
Mr. Diallo (Mali).
Mr. Djermane (Algeria).
Mr. Dölken (Turkey).
Mr. Durgawat (India).
Mr. Fall (Mauritania).
Mr. Fernández (Argentina).
Mr. Fernández (Philippines).
Mr. Ferro Sánchez (Peru).
Mr. Foevie (Ghana).
Mr. Filippov (Ukraine).
Mr. Gagnebin (Switzerland).
Mr. Gerger (Sweden).
Mr. Georgiakostis (Sierra Leone).
Mr. Grigorov (U.S.S.R.).
Mr. Haldane (Republic of South Africa).
Mr. Halden (Norway).
Mr. Hanke (Poland).
Mr. Hill (United Kingdom).
Mr. Ivanov (Bulgaria).
Mr. Jassafar (Kuwait).
Mr. Kabore (Upper Volta).
Mr. Khoury (Lebanon).
Mr. Kibuka (Uganda).
Mr. Liang (China).
Mr. Maury (Portugal).
Mr. McPherson (Jamaica).
Mr. Mercado (Colombia).
Mr. Monnerot (France).
Mr. Napier (New Zealand).
Mr. Nyamnjweng (RWANDA).
Mr. Pereira (Austria).
Mr. Pinther (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mrs. Popović (Yugoslavia).
Mr. Potofsky (United States).
Mr. Salem (Jordan).
Mr. Sanguino (Uruguay).
Mr. Scheer (Austria).
Mr. Siwa (Congo (Leopoldville)).
Mr. Thondaman (Ceylon).
Mr. Ticarau (Rumunia).
Mr. Välikangas (Finland).
Mr. Van Rompaey (Belgium).
Mr. Vothzina (Israel).

Mr. Walker-Anguilet (Gabon).
Mr. Walter (Canada).
Mr. Weiss (Luxembourg).
Mr. Yasseen (Iraq).
Mr. Yeon (Malaya).
Mr. Zivanas (Cyprus).

Deputy members:
Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan).
Mr. Bolin (Sweden).
Mr. Dessev (Bulgaria).
Mr. González (Costa Rica).
Mr. Gregor (Czechoslovakia).
Mr. Hansen (Poland).
Mr. Haraguchi (Japan).
Mr. Inhanli (Turkey).
Mr. Jumah (Liberia).
Mr. Katzbach (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Lascaris (Greece).
Mr. MacGougan (Ireland).
Mr. Mayorga (Mexico).
Mr. Nilsson (Finland).
Mr. Tabarri (Italy).
Mr. Urriera (Venezuela).

Observers:
Mr. Dube (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).
Mr. Ho (Singapore).
Mr. Hsu (Singapore).
Mr. Pace (Malta).
Mr. Watson (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).

Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices

Government members:
Argentina.
Australia.
Austria.
Belgium.
Brazil.
Burma.
Byelorussia.
Cameroon.
Canada.
Central African Republic.
Ceylon.
Chile.
Congo (Leopoldville).
Costa Rica.
Finland.
France.
Federal Republic of Germany.
Guinea.
India.
Iran.
Ireland.
Italy.
Ivory Coast.
Jamaica.
Japan.
Kuwait.
Lebanon.
Malaya.
Mexico.
Netherlands.
New Zealand.
Nigeria.
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Norway.
Philippines.
Rumania.
Senegal.
Republic of South Africa.
Spain.
Sweden.
Switzerland.
Thailand.
Trinidad and Tobago.
U.S.S.R.
United Arab Republic.
United Kingdom.
United States.
Upper Volta.
Venezuela.

Deputy members:
- Denmark.
- Ethiopia.
- Gabon.
- Liberia.
- Luxembourg.
- Portugal.
- Sierra Leone.
- Sudan.
- Tunisia.

Employers' members:
- Mr. Achour; substitute: Mr. Dargouth (Tunisia).
- Mr. Bergenström; substitutes: Mr. Rugfelt, Mr. Hydén, Mr. Forstadius, Mr. Gerhardsson (Sweden).
- Mr. Campanella; substitutes: Mr. Tosti, Mr. Giove (Italy).
- Mr. Cuffe; substitute: Mr. O’Regan (Ireland).
- Mr. Faubel; substitutes: Mr. Dorschel, Mr. Miroslav, Mr. Doetsch (Federal Republic of Germany).
- Mr. Fennema; substitute: Mr. Porteine (Netherlands).
- Mr. Hetemäki; substitutes: Mr. Vihma, Mr. Mildh, Mr. Strandén (Finland).
- Mr. Jonckheer; substitute: Mr. Ngaba (Congo (Leopoldville)).
- Mr. Mautner-Markhof; substitute: Mr. Meches (Austria).
- Mr. Muro de Nadal; substitute: Mr. Decker (Argentina).
- Mr. Peretti; substitutes: Mr. Taoug, Mr. Talantik (Algeria).
- Mr. Reyes; substitutes: Mr. Singson, Mr. Arcinas (Philippines).
- Mr. Selvig; substitutes: Mr. Meyer, Mr. Aarvig (Norway).
- Mr. Tata; substitutes: Mr. Krishnamurthi (India).
- Mr. Végh-Garzón; substitute: Mr. Montero Zorilla (Uruguay).
- Mr. Verschuere; substitute: Mr. De Bruyn (Belgium).
- Mr. Wagner; substitute: Mr. Niehaus (United States).
- Mr. Waline; substitutes: Mr. Perez, Mr. Sallenave, Mr. Saintigny (France).

Deputy members:
- Mr. Aparicio Valdez; substitute: Mr. de Cosío (Peru).
- Mr. Deschemin (Upper Volta).

Mr. Gonzales Blanco; substitute: Mr. Brotherhood (Brazil).
Mr. Leitão; substitute: Mr. Gomes Gautier (Portugal).
Mr. Martínez-Espino; substitutes: Mr. Casas Rincón, Mr. Villalobos (Venezuela).
Mr. Ofurum; substitute: Mr. Hughes (Nigeria).
Sir George Pollock; substitute: Mr. Gaultier (United Kingdom).
Mr. Eifaat; substitute: Mr. Orphy (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Robinson; substitute: Mr. Lach (Canada).

Workers' members:
- Mr. Almozny (Argentina).
- Mr. Benitez Benitez (Honduras).
- Mr. Dias (Portugal).
- Mr. Fitzpatrick (Ireland).
- Mr. Gaff (Italy).
- Dame Anne Godwin (United Kingdom).
- Mr. Herzeni (Israel).
- Mr. Hodgson (United Kingdom).
- Mr. Odukporo (Nigeria).
- Mr. Verdonck (Belgium).
- Mr. Ziemni (Austria).

Deputy members:
- Mr. Ali (United Arab Republic).
- Mr. Amandan (India).
- Mr. Duhamel (France).
- Mr. Fall (Mauritania).
- Mr. Hansen (Federal Republic of Germany).
- Mr. Kuntscher (Federal Republic of Germany).
- Mr. Lazar (Hungary).
- Mr. Pecor (Italy).
- Mr. Skoda (Austria).
- Mr. Theisen (Luxembourg).
- Mr. van Rompaey (Belgium).
- Mr. Vognbjerg (Denmark).

Observer:
- Mr. Pace (Malta).

Committee on Social Security

Government members:
- Argentina.
- Australia.
- Austria.
- Belgium.
- Burma.
- Cameroon.
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Canada.
Central African Republic.
Chile.
China.
Congo (Brazzaville).
Congo (Leopoldville).
Costa Rica.
Cuba.
Dahomey.
Denmark.
Ecuador.
France.
Gabon.
Federal Republic of Germany.
Greece.
Guinea.
Honduras.
Hungary.
Iran.
Iraq.
Italy.
Ivory Coast.
Japan.
Jordan.
Kuwait.
Lebanon.
Liberia.
Luxembourg.
Malagasy Republic.
Mali.
Mauritania.
Mexico.
Morocco.
Netherlands.
Nigeria.
Norway.
Pakistan.
Panama.
Philippines.
Portugal.
Rumania.
Senegal.
Sierra Leone.
Spain.
Sweden.
Switzerland.
Togo.
Tunisia.
Turkey.
Uganda.
U.S.S.R.
United Arab Republic.
United Kingdom.
United States.
Venezuela.
Viet-Nam.
Yugoslavia.

Deputy members :

Chad.
Colombia.
India.
Israel.
Peru.
Sudan.

Employers' members :

Mr. Achour ; substitute : Mr. el Ghali (Tunisia).
Mr. Al-Jadir ; substitutes : Mr. Al-Dujaili, Mr. Al Fadily (Iraq).
Mr. Pannerman-Menson ; substitute : Mr. Boateng (Ghana).
Mr. Bergenström ; substitutes : Mr. Hydén, Mr. Rugfelt, Mr. Forstadius, Mr. Gerhardsson (Sweden).
Mr. Campanella ; substitutes : Mr. Misserville, Mr. Giove, Mr. Boccardi (Italy).
Mr. Cooper ; substitute : Mr. Ryan (Liberia).
Mr. Dembele (Mali).
Mr. Faubel ; substitutes : Mr. Doetsch, Mr. Schenk, Mr. Schlotfeldt (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Fennema ; substitute : Mr. Nolen (Netherlands).
Mr. Ferrier ; substitutes : Mr. McDougall (Australia).
Mr. Ghayour ; substitutes : Mr. Maleknia, Mr. Zanganeh Jahanbakhsh (Iran).
Mr. Gonzales Blanco ; substitute : Mr. Wagner Battendieri (Brazil).
Mr. Gutiérrez Matarrita (Costa Rica).
Mr. Hetemäki ; substitutes : Mr. Mildo, Mr. Strandén, Mr. Laatunen, Mr. Vihma (Finland).
Mr. Kettani ; substitute : Mr. Slimani (Morocco).
Mr. Konian Kodjo (Ivory Coast).
Mr. Martínez-Espinio ; substitutes : Mr. Arcay Rodríguez, Mr. Óyarzabal (Venezuela).
Mr. Mautner-Markhof ; substitute : Mr. Kinkel (Austria).
Mr. Mishiro ; substitutes : Mr. Okamura, Mr. Kondo (Japan).
Mr. Muro de Nadal ; substitutes : Mr. Rodero, Mr. Vitasco o Jakasa (Argentina).
Mr. Picard (Central African Republic).
Mr. Reyes ; substitutes : Mr. Arcinas, Mr. Singson (Philippines).
Mr. Rifaaat ; substitute : Mr. Badawi (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Robinson ; substitute : Mr. Trottier (Canada).
Mr. Selvig ; substitutes : Mr. Aarvig, Mr. Meyer (Norway).
Mr. Theodcharides ; substitute : Mr. Alexandrou (Cyprus).
Mr. Verschueren ; substitutes : Mr. Bernaert, Mr. De Bruyn (Belgium).
Mr. Wagner ; substitute : Mr. Doherty (United States).
Mr. Waline ; substitutes : Mrs. Seeuw, Mr. Sallent, Mr. Saintigny (France).
Mr. Yllanes Eamos ; substitute : Mr. Garza Felán (Mexico).

Deputy members :

Mr. Bakti (Indonesia).
Mr. Gaye (Senegal).
Mr. Gebregziabher (Ethiopia).
Mr. Greve (Ceylon).
Mr. Hayot ; substitutes : Mr. Pauly, Mr. Müller (Luxembourg).
Mr. Jonckheere ; substitute : Mr. Biyela (Congo (Leopoldville)).
Mr. Kuntschen ; substitutes : Mr. Weiersmüller, Mr. Dubois (Switzerland).
Mr. Leitão ; substitute : Mr. Salgado (Portugal).
Mr. Maboungou M'Bimba (Congo (Brazzaville)).
Mr. Nasr ; substitute : Mr. Mina (Lebanon).
Appendix I: Reports of the Selection Committee

Mr. Ofurum; substitute: Mr. Nanna (Nigeria).
Mr. Oliszewski (Poland).
Sir George Pollock (United Kingdom).
Mr. Prikhodko (Ukraine).
Mr. Ubaidulla; substitutes: Mr. Perera, Mr. Ratnam (Malaya).
Mr. Végh-Garzón; substitute: Mr. Montero Zorrilla (Uruguay).
Mr. Wajid Ali; substitute: Mr. Marker (Pakistan).

Observers:
Mr. Aldridge (Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland).
Mr. Astbury (Bermuda).

Workers' members:
Mr. Aguilar (Peru).
Mr. Anandan (India).
Mr. Angeleri (Argentina).
Mr. Ango (Dahomey).
Mr. Arezina (Yugoslavia).
Mr. Awadalla (Sudan).
Mr. Bo die (Canada).
Mr. Borita (Nigeria).
Mr. Bouraoui (Tunisia).
Mr. Briki (Algeria).
Mr. David (Malaya).
Mr. Delanne (Niger).
Mr. Eichhorn (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Espinosa (Colombia).
Mr. Fahim (United Arab Republic).
Mr. Fugardo Sanz (Spain).
Mr. Ghefi (Switzerland).
Mr. González Cubero (Costa Rica).
Mr. Green (United Kingdom).
Mr. Heymann (Chana).
Mr. Horst (Netherlands).
Mr. Kalinin (Byelorussia).
Mr. Kazi (Mauritania).
Mr. Li (Norway).
Mr. Lopes Ribeiro (Portugal).
Mr. Mario (France).
Mr. Morison (Luxembourg).
Mr. McLoughlin (Australia).
Mr. Missayke (Lebanon).
Mr. Ngamby (Cameroon).
Mr. Pachler (United States).
Mr. Rakotobe (Malagasy Republic).
Mr. Rantanen (Finland).
Mr. Samaan (Kuwait).
Mr. Sobrado Cid (Cuba).
Mr. Sudarwo (Indonesia).
Mr. Svátek (Czechoslovakia).
Mr. Tan (Philippines).
Mr. Tandu (Tanganyika).
Mr. Trubnikov (U.S.S.R.).
Mr. Tubman (Liberia).
Mr. Uenishi (Japan).
Mr. Weissenberg (Austria).
Mr. Ziartides (Cyprus).

Deputy members:
Mr. Ahlgren (Sweden).
Mr. Al-Taii (Iraq).
Mr. Camacho Guzmán (Mexico).
Mr. Cisse (Senegal).
Mr. Farine (France).
Mr. González Navarro (Venezuela).
Mr. Haggerty (United States).
Mr. Hernandez (Philippines).
Mr. Holler (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. Jensen (Denmark).
Mr. Liebenberg (Republic of South Africa).
Mr. Martucci (Italy).
Mr. Maung Tin (Burma).
Mr. Montagnani (Italy).
Mr. Neémann (Israel).
Miss Nordahl (Norway).
Mr. ben Omran (Libya).
Mr. Sobral (Portugal).
Mr. Ticau (Romania).
Mr. Tran-Quoc-Buu (Viet-Nam).

Observers:
Mr. Pace (Malta).
Mr. Simmons (Bermuda).

(3) Third Report.¹

Date for Elections to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

The Selection Committee has decided that the elections to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office will be held on Thursday, 13 June 1963.

Participation of Non-Governmental International Organisations in the Work of Certain Committees.

In accordance with articles 12 and 18 of the Constitution and articles 2 and 56 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, the Selection Committee recommends the Conference to invite the International Metalworkers' Federation to be represented by observers at the Conference, and to add the representatives of this organisation as technical experts without power to vote to the Committee on Guarding of Machinery and the Committee on Termination of Employment.

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of committees:

Selection Committee. Employers' members: add Mr. Pantos (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. Government observers: add Mr. Pang (Singapore). Workers' deputy members: add Mr. Heise (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Seidman (United States).

Committee on Guarding of Machinery. Workers' deputy members: add Mr. Faupl (United States).

Committee on Termination of Employment. Employers' deputy members: add Mr. Montt Balmaceda (Chile). Workers' deputy members: add Mr. Lennon (Chile).

Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices. Government deputy members: add Syrian Arab Republic. Workers' deputy members: add Mr. Lennon (Chile), Mr. Sarr (Senegal).

¹ See Second Part, p. 55.
Committee on Social Security. Government deputy members: add Syrian Arab Republic. Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Thiam (Senegal) as substitute for Mr. Gaye. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Haggerty (United States), Mr. Valdivia (Chile).

Discussion of the Director-General’s Report: Closing Date for the List of Speakers.

The Selection Committee proposes that the list of speakers in the discussion of the Director-General’s Report should be closed on Friday, 14 June, at noon, it being understood that it will be for the President to decide whether any member of the Conference should be authorised to speak if he has not put his name down or has already spoken. In thus proposing a closing date two days later than usual, the Selection Committee places on record its opinion that this should not constitute a precedent for future sessions of the Conference.

(4) Fourth Report.1

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of committees:

Selection Committee. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Cool (Belgium), Mr. Fitzpatrick (Ireland), Mr. Geijer (Sweden), Mr. O’Hagan (United Kingdom) and Mr. Weissenberg (Austria).

Standing Orders Committee. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Amor (Morocco) and Mr. van Tilburg (Netherlands).

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Alioua (Morocco), Mr. Santos and Mr. Stafford da Silva (Brazil).

Committee on Guarding of Machinery. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Gomes de Castro (Brazil).

Committee on Termination of Employment. Government deputy members: add Ecuador. Employers’ members: add Mr. Mochi-Onori and Mr. Chericoni (Italy) as additional substitutes for Mr. Campanella; add Mr. Al-Sherifi (Iraq) as additional substitute for Mr. Al-Jadir. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Hachemy and Mr. Seyfi (Iran), Mr. Soares Telles (Brazil) and Mr. Weerasekera (Ceylon).

Committee on Social Security. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Dehghany (Iran), Mr. Haman (Morocco), Mr. Panjeahvazzy (Iran), Mr. Riani (Brazil) and Mr. Zúñiga Garzón (Ecuador).

Participation of Non-Governmental International Organisations in the Work of Certain Committees.

In accordance with articles 12 and 18 of the Constitution and articles 2 and 56 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, the Selection Committee recommends the Conference to invite the International Federation of Disabled Workmen and Civilian Cripples to be represented by observers at the Conference, and to add the representatives of this organisation as technical experts without power to vote to the Committee on Social Security.

(5) Fifth Report.1

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of committees:

Selection Committee. Employers’ members: add Mr. Van Meter (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

Standing Orders Committee. Employers’ members: add Mr. Van Meter (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner; add Mr. Martins Abelhoira (Brazil) as substitute for Mr. Gonzales Blanco.

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Denise (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

Committee on Guarding of Machinery. Employers’ members: add Mr. Brandão Filho (Brazil) as substitute for Mr. Gonzales Blanco. Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Berrada (Morocco) as substitute for Mr. Kettani.

Committee on Termination of Employment. Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Denise (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices. Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Kettani; substitute: Mr. Kermaudi (Morocco).

Committee on Social Security. Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Dakhil; substitute: Mr. Langhi (Libya). Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Aracena (Chile).

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Aracena (Chile); substitute: Mr. Kermaudi (Morocco).

(6) Sixth Report.2

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of committees:

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Urriola (Panama).

Committee on Termination of Employment. Employers’ deputy members: replace Mr. Van Rooy by Mr. Geerkens (Netherlands) as substitute for Mr. Fennema.

1 See Second Part, p. 142.
Committee on Social Security. Governmental deputy members: add Syria (Arab Republic). Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Thiam (Senegal), Mr. Gaye (Senegal), Mr. Hameur (Morocco). Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Haggerty (United States), Mr. Valdivia (Chile).

Discussion of the Director-General’s Report: Closing Date for the List of Speakers.

The Selection Committee proposes that the list of speakers in the discussion of the Director-General’s Report should be closed on Friday, 14 June, at noon, it being understood that it will be for the President to determine whether any member of the Conference should be authorised to speak if he has not put his name down or has already spoken. In this proposing a closing date two days later than usual, the Selection Committee places on record its opinion that this should not constitute a precedent for future sessions of the Conference.

(4) Fourth Report.

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of the Committee:

Selection Committee: Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Cool (Belgium), Mr. Fitzgerald (Ireland), Mr. Geijer (Sweden), Mr. O’Hagan (United Kingdom) and Mr. Weissenberg (Austria).

Standing Orders Committee: Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Elalia (Morocco) and Mr. van Tilburg (Netherlands).

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Denise (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

Committee on Guarding of Machinery: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Brandão Filho (Brazil) as substitute for Mr. Gonzales Blanco.

Committee on Termination of Employment: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Dukhil; substitute: Mr. Luchhi (Libya). Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Aracena (Chile).

Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Kettani; substitute: Mr. Kermadi (Morocco).

Committee on Social Security: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Dukhil; substitute: Mr. Luchhi (Libya) in addition to Mr. Leite (Portugal) as substitute for Mr. Leite (Portugal); add Mr. Aliquart (Panama).

(5) Fifth Report.

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of the Committee:

Selection Committee: Employers’ members: add Mr. Van Meter (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

Standing Orders Committee: Employers’ members: add Mr. Van Meter (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner; add Mr. Martius de Abreu (Brazil) as substitute for Mr. Gonzales Blanco.

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Denise (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

Committee on Guarding of Machinery: Employers’ members: add Mr. Brandão Filho (Brazil) as substitute for Mr. Gonzales Blanco. Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Berrada (Morocco) as substitute for Mr. Kettani.

Committee on Termination of Employment: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Dukhil; substitute: Mr. Luchhi (Libya). Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Aracena (Chile).

Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Kettani; substitute: Mr. Kermadi (Morocco).

(6) Sixth Report.

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of the Committee:

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Van Meter (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

Committee on Termination of Employment: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. Van Meter (United States) as substitute for Mr. Wagner.

(7) Seventh Report.

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of the Committee:

Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices: Employers’ deputy members: add Mr. de Silva (Brazil) as additional substitute for Mr. Gonzales Blanco. Workers’ members: delete Mr. Hajdahl (Norway); add Mr. Vognberg (Denmark). Workers’ deputy members: delete Mr. Vognberg (Denmark).

(8) Eighth Report.

Composition of Committees.

The Selection Committee recommends that the following changes be made in the composition of the Committee:

Committee on Termination of Employment: Workers’ deputy members: add Mr. Chehadeh (Pakistan).

(9) Ninth Report.

Proposals Regarding Deferment of the Election of the Members of the African Advisory Committee.

The Selection Committee recommends that the Conference decide to defer to the 48th Session of the International Labour Conference (1964) the election of the members of the African Advisory Committee which was due to be held during the present session of the Conference.

The members of office of members of the Committee, as determined by the Governing Body, is normally three years, and the elections for membership of the Committee are normally due to be held during the session of the International Labour Conference at which elections for membership of the Governing Body are held. Elections for membership of the Governing Body will next be held in 1966. The Selection Committee therefore recommends that, as an exceptional arrangement, members of the African Advisory Committee elected at the 48th Session of the Conference, be elected for a period of two years.

Proposed Alteration in the Size of the Selection Committee.

When in 1954 the size of the Governing Body was increased by an amendment to the Constitution, a corresponding alteration was made, in June 1964, in the size of the Selection Committee, which was increased to comprise 20 Government members, 10 Employers’ members and 10 Workers’ members. The size of the Governing Body has recently been increased as the result of the amendment to the Constitution which was adopted by the Conference in June 1962 and came into force in May 1963. The Selection Committee has therefore examined what steps might be taken to effect a similar alteration in its size, following upon the coming into force of the amendment in question.

In order to avoid any difficulty in this matter at the opening of the next session of the Conference, the Selection Committee recommends the Conference at its present session to amend the Standing Orders of the Conference to provide for a Selection Committee of 24 Government members, 12 Employers’ members and 12 Workers’ members.

To this end it recommends that in articles 4, paragraphs 1, and in article 25, paragraph 5, of the Standing Orders of the Conference, the figures “20” and “10” should be replaced by the figures “twenty-four” and “twelve” respectively.

The provisions in question would then read as follows:

ARTICLES

ARTICLE 4

1. The Conference shall appoint a Selection Committee consisting of twenty-four members nominated by the Government group, twelve members nominated by the Employers’ group and twelve members nominated by the Workers’ group, the membership of each of these categories shall a country have more than one member.

ARTICLE 25

5. In accordance with the above amendment of the Standing Orders, the Governing Body shall nominate twenty-four members and the Employers’ group and Workers’ group shall each nominate twelve members. In no case shall the same member of the Governing Body have more than one member.

1 See Second Part, p. 193.
2 See Second Part, p. 236.
3 See Second Part, p. 304.
APPENDIX II

Credentials


The Chairman of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office has the honour to present the cumulative report on the credentials of delegates and advisers as prescribed by article 26 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference.

The composition of each delegation and the method of appointment of delegates and advisers under article 26 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference are governed by articles 8 and 9 of article 3 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation; these paragraphs are as follows:

8. The names of the delegates and their advisers will be communicated to the International Labour Office by the government of each of the Members.

9. The credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be subject to scrutiny by the Conference, which may, by a two-thirds vote of the votes cast by the delegates present, refuse to admit any delegate or adviser whom it deems not to have been nominated in accordance with this article.

Thus, it is for the governments to communicate the International Labour Office the nominations made. The Conference decides, especially in the case of disputes, whether delegates and their advisers have been nominated in accordance with article 3 of the Constitution.

In order to facilitate the verification of credentials, the Conference has included certain provisions in article 26 of its Standing Orders; this article is as follows:

1. The credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be deposited at the International Labour Office at least 15 days before the date fixed for the opening of the session of the Conference.

2. A brief report upon these credentials, drawn up by the Chairman of the Governing Body, shall, with the credentials, be open to inspection by the delegates on the day before the opening of the session of the Conference and shall be published as an appendix to the record of the first sitting.

3. The Credentials Committee appointed by the Conference, in accordance with article 26 of its Standing Orders, the Conference shall consider any objection concerning the credentials of delegates or their advisers which may have been lodged with the Secretary-General.

4. An objection shall not be receivable in the following cases:

(a) if the objection is not lodged with the Secretary-General within 24 hours from 10 a.m. of the date of the publication in the Provisional Record of

the name and function of the person to whose nomination objection is taken. Provided that the above time limit may be extended by the Credentials Committee, if it considers that the nomination of a delegate or adviser from a distant country;

(b) if the authors of the objection remain anonymous;

(c) if the author of the objection is acting as advisor to the delegate to whose nomination objection is taken;

(d) if the objection is based upon facts or allegations which the Conference, by a decision of the Committee, deeming them referring to identical facts or allegations, has already discussed and been recognized as irrelevant or devoid of substance.

5. The procedure for the determination of whether an objection is receivable shall be as follows:

(a) the Credentials Committee shall consider in respect of each objection whether or not of the grounds set forth in paragraph 4 the objection is irreceivable;

(b) if the Committee reaches a unanimous conclusion concerning irreceivability of the objection its decision shall be final;

(c) if the Credentials Committee does not reach a unanimous conclusion concerning the receivability of the objection it shall refer the matter to the Conference, which, shall, on being furnished with a record of the Committee’s discussions and with a report setting forth the opinions of the majority and minority of its members, decide without further discussion whether the objection is receivable.

6. In every case in which the objection is not declared receivable the Credentials Committee shall consider whether the objection is well founded and shall, as a matter of urgency submit a report thereon to the Conference.

7. If the Credentials Committee or any member thereof submits a report advising that the Conference should refuse to admit any delegate or adviser, the President shall submit this proposal to the Conference for decision, and the Conference shall decide if it considers that the delegate or adviser has not been nominated in conformity with the requirements of the Constitution, and, in accordance with paragraph 9 of article 3 thereof, refuse to admit by a two-thirds vote of the votes cast of the delegates present to admit the delegate or adviser. Delegates who are in favour of admitting the delegate or adviser shall vote "Yes", delegates who are opposed to refusing to admit the delegate or adviser shall vote "No".

8. Pending final decision on objection of his admission, any delegate or adviser to whose nomination objection has been made may have the rights and privileges of other delegates and advisers.

The following is the text of article 5 of the Standing Orders referred to above:

1. The Conference shall, on the nomination of the Selection Committee, appoint a Credentials Committee consisting of one government delegate, one employers’ delegate and one workers’ delegate. The Credentials Committee shall examine the credentials of delegates and their advisers, and any objection relating thereto, in accordance with the provisions of Section 3 of Part II.1

1 Article 26 cited above constitutes Section B of Part II of the Standing Orders of the Conference. (Note appended to the brief report by Mr. Parodi.)

The present report is submitted in compliance with the provisions of Standing Orders. The list was closed on Tuesday, 4 June 1963, at 10 a.m., in order that it might be available for inspection by the delegations on the day before the opening of the Conference.

It should be pointed out, as has been done in previous years, that the provisions of article 26 of the Standing Orders are especially intended to facilitate the work of verifying the credentials, not to lay the binding character of the provisions of the Constitution of the Organisation.

Any credentials sent in after the signature of the present report will be communicated to the Conference by the Secretary-General and will be referred to by the Conference to the Credentials Committee. This Committee will examine them together with any objections received by the Officers of the Conference within the time limits laid down in paragraphs 4 and 5 of article 26 of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

The present report serves for fixing provisionally the quorum necessary to give validity to the votes taken. The last paragraph of article 17 of the Annexe states that...

The voting is void unless the total number of votes cast is equal to half the number of the delegates attending the Conference.

And article 20, paragraph 1 (2), of the Standing Orders of the Conference adds—

This number shall be provisionally fixed after the presentation of the brief report referred to in paragraph 2 of article 26 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, in which the Standing Orders of the Conference, on which the officials transmitted to the International Labour Office, shows the numerical composition of the Conference.

The following observations may be made as regards the nominations of the delegates and advisers. Up to date 92 States have notified the nominations of the members of their delegations. Most of them have already
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Credentials


The Chairman of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office has the honour to present the customary report on the credentials of delegates and advisers as prescribed by article 26 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference. The composition of each delegation and the manner of appointment of delegates and advisers for the sessions of the International Labour Conference are governed by articles 8 and 9 of article 3 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organization; these paragraphs are as follows:

8. The names of the delegates and their advisers will be communicated to the International Labour Office by the government of each of the Members.

9. The credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be subject to scrutiny by the Conference, which may, by two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present, refuse to admit any delegate or adviser whom it does not have to be nominated in accordance with this article.

Thus, it is for the government to communicate to the International Labour Office the nominations made. The Conference decides, especially in the case of dispute, whether delegates and their advisers have been nominated in accordance with article 3 of the Constitution. It shall be for the Conference to facilitate the verification of credentials; the Governing Body of the Conference has included certain provisions in article 26 of the Standing Orders; this article is as follows:

1. The credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be deposited with the International Labour Office at least 15 days before the date fixed for the opening of the session of the Conference.

2. A brief report upon these credentials is drawn up by the Chairman of the Governing Body, shall, with the credentials, be submitted to the Conference by the delegates on the day before the opening of the session of the Conference and shall be published as an appendix to the record of the first sitting.

3. The Credentials Committee appointed by the Conference shall consist of three members of the Standing Committee of the Conference shall consider any objection concerning the credentials of delegates or advisers which may have been lodged with the Secretary-General. An objection shall not be receivable in the following cases:

(a) if the objection is not lodged with the Secretary-General within 72 hours from 10 o'clock a.m. of the date of the publication in the Provisional Record of

The present report is submitted in compliance with the provisions above quoted. The list was closed on Tuesday, 4 June 1963, at 10 a.m., in order that it might be available for inspection by the nominations of article 26 of the Standing Orders are especially intended to facilitate the work of verifying the credentials. This committee does not have the binding power of the credentials of the Constitution of the Organization.

The present report serves for fixing provisionally the quorum necessary to give validity to the votes taken. The last paragraph of article 17 of the Constitution makes it clear that the voting shall be equal.

And article 29, paragraph 1 (2), of the Standing Orders of the Conference states:

This number shall be provisionally fixed after the presentation of the brief report referred to in paragraph 2 of article 26 of the rules of procedure concerning credentials and shall be fixed in accordance with article 26. It shall then be determined by the Credentials Committee.

The following table, based on the files containing the names of the delegates and advisers and the credentials with which they have been provided or the official communications transmitted to the International Labour Office, shows the numerical composition of the Conference.

The following observations may be made as regards the nominations of the delegates and advisers. Up to date 92 States have notified the nominations of the members of their delegations. Most of them have already

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Employes</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica (Dependence)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galactic Republic of Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Employes</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Republic of South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uarda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet-Nam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 183 306 86 146 184
International Federation of Commercial, Clerical and Technical Employees.
International Social Security Association.
International Young Christian Workers' Union.
Postal, Telegraph and Telephone International.
Public Services International.
World O.B.T. Union.
World Young Women's Christian Association.


(Signed) A. PARODI.

(2) First Report of the Credentials Committee.

Composition of the Conference and Quorum.
1. Since the brief report made by the Chairman of the Governing Body of the International

1 See Secnd Part, p. 263.

2 See p. 466.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all other countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Kinshasa)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (Fed. Rep.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet-Nam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 390 332 96 777 98 186
communicated credentials (official instruments) or official letters to the International Labour Office; others have forwarded official telegrams. Although by official letter or telegram is not in accordance with customary diplomatic procedure the Conference has always considered this method of nomination as satisfactory.

It may be pointed out that six countries have so far nominated Government delegates only, and two countries have so far nominated only one Government delegate.

The Conference's Credentials Committee have emphasised on previous occasions that article 3 of the Constitution lays an obligation on each government to send a complete delegation to the Conference. It should be noted that in the letters or telegrams confirming their nominations, various governments have mentioned the employers' and workers' organisations which they have consulted and with whom they have come to an agreement in appointing Employers' and Workers' delegates in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Constitution of the Organisation.

Composition of the Conference, and Quorum.

At present the Conference is composed of 182 Government delegates, 96 Employers' delegates and 88 Workers' delegates—a total of 354 delegates. There are in addition 308 Government advisers, 146 Employers' advisers and 164 Workers' advisers—a total of 618 advisers. In accepting these nominations some persons have been nominated both as substitute delegates and as advisers. For the purpose of the quorum, all they have been included among the advisers.

The total number of delegates and advisers who have been in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution of the Organisation to take part in the work of the Conference is 972.

Since one of the States now represented is in arrears in the payment of its contribution to the Organisation, this State, under the terms of paragraph 4 of article 13 of the Constitution, may not at present participate in the voting in the Conference.

In conformity with article 17 of the Constitution of the Organisation and with article 29 of the Standing Orders of the Conference the necessary quorum to give a vote validity will provisionally be 175.

Observers.

Following invitation from the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, tripartite observer delegations have been appointed by Bermuda, Kenya, Malta and the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts to designate an observer delegation at the Conference. The total number of observers present at the Conference is 22.

Representatives of the United Nations, Specialised Agencies, and Other Official International Organisations.

In accordance with paragraph 1 of article II—relating to reciprocal representation—of the Agreement between the United Nations and the International Labour Organisation, which came into force on 14 December 1946, representatives of the United Nations are attending the Conference.

Up to date the following official international organisations have also accepted the invitation to attend the Conference, which was addressed to them in accordance with the decisions taken by the Governing Body.
Representatives of the United Nations, Specialised Agencies, and Other Official International Organisations.

In addition to the organisations listed in the brief report of the Chairman of the Governing Body, the following organisations have accepted the invitation to attend the Conference, which was addressed to them in accordance with the decisions taken by the Governing Body:

League of Arab States.

Representatives of Non-Governmental International Organisations.

In addition to the organisations listed in the brief report of the Chairman of the Governing Body, the following organisations have accepted the invitation to attend the Conference which was addressed to them:

International Federation of Plantation, Agricultural and Allied Workers.

International Metalworkers' Federation.

Objectives to the Nomination of the Chinese Delegation.

10. Objectives to the nomination of the Chinese delegation to the 47th Session of the Conference has been received by the delegations of Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Ukraine and the U.S.S.R.

11. The Chinese delegation to the 47th Session of the Conference has been appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China. Those who have submitted objections consider that China is today lawfully represented only by the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

12. Similar objections have been presented to all the sessions of the International Labour Conference held since 1959, and similar arguments were put forward by the authors of these objections.

13. On the occasions when this question arose the Credentials Committee noted that the General Assembly of the United Nations, adopted on 14 December 1959, had recommended that whenever more than one authority claims to be the Government of a particular State in the United Nations, the attitude adopted by the General Assembly or its Interim Committee in this respect should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the specialised agencies.

14. The Credentials Committee has consistently held that, in the case of the United Nations and the specialised agencies, including the I.L.O., so far as possible adopt a uniform attitude in such matters.

15. On previous occasions the Credentials Committee has found that the question was being examined by the United Nations, that the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China continued to be seated in the General Assembly, that the Chinese Government was pending a decision of the General Assembly on proposals for their exclusion, and that no decision on such proposals had yet been taken. Accordingly, the Committee has always concluded that it was not in a position to accept the objection against the nomination of the Chinese delegation.

16. Since the 46th Session of the Conference (Geneva, 1963), at which the question of the representation of China was not again before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

17. At the 17th Regular Session, a question entitled "Restoration of the Lawful Rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations" was included in its agenda. During this session on 30 October 1962 the General Assembly rejected a draft resolution calling for the participation of the Government of the People's Republic of China in the work of the United Nations. In addition, the credentials of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China were challenged. The challenge was declared out of order by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee of the United Nations on the basis of the position taken by the General Assembly on 30 October 1962. The Chairman of the Committee, and the report of the Committee was thereafter approved by the General Assembly.

18. Accordingly, the Credentials Committee considers that the situation remains substantially the same as was examined, and that there is no reason for it to adopt a different decision. The Committee therefore unanimously decides that it cannot accept the objections before it.

Objectives to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of France.

19. By a letter dated 21 May 1963 an objection to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of France was submitted by the General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.) of France.

20. The French Workers' delegate is Mr. Boulaffez, Honorary President of the French Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.). His advisors include three from the objecting organisation, the C.G.T., and two from the General Confederation of Labour (Force ouvrière) (C.G.T.-F.O.).

21. The objection is based on the claim by the C.G.T. that it is the most representative French workers' organisation in France to undertake all necessary steps for the general settlement of the question, and that with the French Government. The Committee does not consider that such a step falls within its competence. On the other hand, the Committee cannot rule out, in circumstances for instance to nominate non-governmental delegates in conformity with paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Constitution of the I.L.O. and to the examination of the situation as it exists at the time when they are composing the delegation from that country to each session of the Conference.

26. The Committee noted that the objecting organisation also asks in its communication that the French Government's "representatives to the International Labour Organization be to undertake all necessary steps for the general settlement of the question, and this with the French Government. The Committee does not consider that such a step falls within its competence. On the other hand, the Committee cannot rule out, in circumstances for instance, the nomination of non-governmental delegates in conformity with paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Constitution of the I.L.O. and to the examination of the situation as it exists at the time when they are composing the delegation from that country to each session of the Conference.

27. Finally, the objecting organisation requests that the Committee submit to the International Labour Conference a resolution under which the International Labour Organization be to undertake all necessary steps for the general settlement of the question, and this with the French Government. The Committee recalls that the Permanent Court of International Justice handed down an advisory opinion in this case on government and the objecting organisation did not object to the inclusion of this article when nominations of non-governmental delegates and advisers to sessions of the Conference were being discussed. The Committee therefore considers that the objecting organisation has no standing to submit a draft resolution.

Communications concerning the Workers' Delegations of Chile and Uruguay.

28. The Communications Department received a telegram from the National Confederation of Workers of Chile and the National Confederation of Industry and Commerce Employers, in which these organisations state that they object to the procedures of the Conference in nominating a delegate who, they assert, does not legiti-

29. The Committee noted that the objection to the credentials of the delegates of the Workers' delegation of Chile, and therefore does not call for any action on the part of the Committee.

31. The Credentials Committee also took note of a telegram sent from Montevideo on 5 June by the Workers' Federation of Uruguay, in which they recognised as having representative status under Uruguay law and that the delegation was designated in violation of the constitutional procedure. Here the communication did not specifically object to the credentials of the Workers' delegation of Uruguay, nor did it contain any matter on which the Committee could simply consider, or to the object that in this case the communication does not call for any action on its part.
6. The quorum required to give a vote validity is now 194.

7. The Committee found that the necessary documents concerning the patrons of delegations and guarantors had been deposited.

Representatives of the United Nations, Specialised Agencies, and Other Official International Organisations.

8. In addition to the organisations listed in the brief report of the Chairman of the Governing Body, the non-governmental international organisations accepted the invitation to attend the Conference, which was addressed to it in accordance with the decisions taken by the Governing Body:

League of Arab States.

Representatives of Non-Governmental International Organisations.

9. In addition to the organisations listed in the brief report of the Chairman of the Governing Body, the following organisations have accepted the invitation to attend the Conference which was addressed to them:

International Federation of Plantation, Agricultural, and Allied Workers.

International Metalworkers' Federation.

Objections to the Nomination of the Chinese Delegation.

10. Objections to the nomination of the Chinese delegation to the 47th Session of the Conference have been made by the delegations of Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Ussr, and the C.A.S.S.

11. The Chinese delegation to the 47th Session of the Conference has been appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China. Those who have submitted objections consider that China is today lawfully represented only by the Government of the People's Republic of China. These objections have been submitted because the Chinese delegation is not representative of the Chinese people.

12. Similar objections have been presented to all the sessions of the International Labour Conference which has been held since 1929, and similar arguments were put forward by the authors of these objections.

13. On a occasions when this question arose the Credentials Committee noted that the General Assembly of the United Nations, the United Nations General Assembly, or its Interim Committee has a reasonable time to examine this case and to take into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the specialised agencies.

14. The Credentials Committee has consistently stated that the Chinese delegation is a representative of the United Nations and the specialised agencies, including the I.L.O., should so far as possible adopt a uniform and consistent policy.

15. On all previous occasions the Credentials Committee has found that the question was being examined by the United Nations, that the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China continued to be seated in the General Assembly, and that the Governments, Congresses, and workers' federations, pending a decision of the General Assembly on proposals for their exclusion, and that no decision on such proposals had been made. Accordingly, the Committee has always concluded that it was not in a position to accept the objection against the nomination of the Chinese delegation.

16. Since the 48th Session of the Conference (Geneva, July, 1962), the question of the representation of China has been raised once again before the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the credentials of the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China were challenged. The challenge was declared out of order by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee of the United Nations on the basis of the position taken by the General Assembly on 30 October 1961. The Chairman of the Committee, and the report of the Committee was thereafter approved by the General Assembly.

18. Accordingly, the Credentials Committee considers that the situation remains substantially the same as it existed two years ago and that there is no reason for it to adopt a different position. The Committee therefore unanimously rejected the objection before it.

19. By a letter dated 21 May 1963 an objection to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of France was submitted by the General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.F.O.), the C.G.T., and two from the General Confederation of Labour (Force ouvrière) (C.G.T.F.O.).

21. The objection is based on the claim of the C.G.T. that it is the most representative French workers' organisation. The French Government to the Report submitted by the Director-General to the present session of the Conference, the Director-General states that the delegation is the only representative delegates and that the French delegation has been chosen in accordance with the provisions of the General Confederation of Labour (Force ouvrière) (C.G.T.F.O.).

26. The Committee noted that the objection organization also asks in its communication and the French Government acceptance of the report that the Committee "to undertake all necessary steps for the general settlement of the question." This may also be a situation in the same sense as those of previous years.

27. Finally, the objection organisation requests that the Conference a recommendation to the Government of the United Nations that the Conference should be asked to give an opinion on article 3, paragraph 4 (d), of the Constitution of the I.L.O., and on the rules which shall be observed by Members of the Organisation, and to annul the objection on that article. The Committee recalls that the Permanent Court of International Justice handed down an advisory opinion in 1963, in which it ruled that the Common Article 26, paragraph 4 (d), of the Standing Orders of the Conference, which provides that any issue which is "based upon facts or allegations which the Conference, by a debate and a decision referring to identical facts" is not to be recognised as irrelevant or devoid of substance. The objection, in the view of the Committee, is that the objecting organisation has no standing to submit a draft resolution.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of France.

28. By a letter dated 1 June 1963 the National Labour Federation in Erets-Israel objected to the credentials of the Workers' delegate of Israel to the present session of the Conference. Before the Committee had completed its consideration of the matter, it received a further communication from the objecting organisation dated 1 June 1963 stating that the latter had decided to withdraw the objection.

29. The Committee took note of the letter withdrawing the objection, and saw no reason to continue its examination of the question.

Communications concerning the Workers' Delegations of Chile and Uruguay.

30. The Credentials Committee took note of a telegram sent from Santiago on 6 June by the National Confederation of Workers of Chile and the National Confederation of Industry and Commerce of Employees in Chile in which these organisations state that they object to the procedures of the Government in nominating a delegate. They assert, does not legiti- mately represent the workers of Chile. However, this communication does not contain any objection to the credentials of the delegates of the Workers' delegation of Chile, and therefore does not call for any action on the part of the Credentials Committee.

31. The Credentials Committee also took note of a telegram sent from Montevideo on 5 June by the Workers' Federation of Uruguay, in which these organisations state that they are not recognised as having representative status under Uruguayan law and that the delegation was designated in violation of its procedure. Here also the communication did not specifically object to the credentials of the Workers' Delegation of Uruguay, but if it contain any matter on which the Committee could act, and therefore does not call for any action on its part.

* * *
5. The Committee noted from the documents annexed to the communication that it appears that the Government may not have incurred travel expenses of advisors. The Committee in this regard draws the attention of governments to article 13, paragraph 2, of the Standing Orders of the Conference, under which each of the States Members is obliged to pay the travelling and subsistence expenses of its delegation and workers who are attending sessions of the Conference.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers’ Delegation of Spain.

6. By a letter dated 6 June 1963 the World Federation of Trade Unions objected to the nomination of the Workers’ Delegation of Spain to the present session of the Conference.

7. Since Spain rejoined the Organisation in 1956 the Conference has had analogous objections to the Spanish Workers’ Delegation on four occasions. In consequence the Credentials Committee was obliged to consider whether the present objection was receivable, in view of the requirement of article 26, paragraph 4 (d), of the Standing Orders of the Conference that an objection is not receivable if it “...is based upon facts or allegations which the Conference, by a debate and a decision referring to identical facts or allegations already ruled to be not recognised to be irrelevant or devoid of substance”.

8. The first occasion on which such an analogous objection was made was in 1956. In that year objections were made by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions. These objections were based on the following allegations:

(a) that the delegate and advisers concerned were not appointed in agreement with the Spanish representative workers’ organisations;

(b) that there were no free trade union organisations in Spain, the only trade union organisations being state organisations, and that accordingly there could be no agreement with an organisation, since agreement would have presupposed their arrival at the conclusion of irre irreversibility with extreme regret because, in their firm opinion, the constitutional and political decentralisation which is not completely free of his government should in no circumstances be recognised. At the last session of the Conference, in 1962, the Committee found that the circumstances had remained in essence the same since the first time the question was raised. The Committee concluded that the objections were unfounded because the objections were unfounded.

9. In 1956 the Chairman of the Credentials Committee submitted a report in which he expressed concern that the various points raised in the objections—e.g., the need for the government to come to the conclusion of the Standing Orders, which the Workers’ Delegation of Spain and his advisers were not appointed in conformity with paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Constitution, since Spain had consulted the existing trade union organisations in Spain and it was this organisation which had chosen the representatives designated. The Workers’ member of the Committee, on the other hand, maintained that the allegations in the objections were relevant and recommended to the Conference that it invalidate the objections raised in question in Spain in law and in fact, and that the documentation submitted to the Committee was not sufficient. In any event we would have to submit to the adoption of firm conclusions. In consequence, he declared that he would abstain. The Conference, after discussion, rejected the Workers’ member’s recommendation to invalidate. Forty-eight votes were cast in favour of invalidation and 29 abstentions.

10. Subsequently, in 1958, 1961 and 1962, analogous objections were made to the credentials of the Spanish Workers’ delegation. On each occasion the Committee found that the objection was irreceivable under article 26, paragraph 4 (d), of the Standing Orders. In each conclusion the Committee stated that it wished to emphasise most strongly that it did so only because it considered itself bound by the statutory provisions dealing with the receivability of objections. The Committee added, in finding the objection irreceivable, it is by no means intended to determine the question whether the Government of Spain had referred to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of the ILO in making the nominations in question. The Committee records the statement it had made in 1958; and the Employers’ and Workers’ members stated that the Governments and the employers concerned agreed that the conclusions to the conference in 1962, the Committee found that the circumstances had remained in essence the same since the first time that the question was raised. The Committee concluded that the objections were unfounded because the objections were unfounded.

11. The objection this year again states that the nomination could not have been made in agreement with the representative workers’ organisations as required by the provisions of the Constitution of the ILO, because these organisations existed in Spain. The objection also alleges, as in prior years, that freedom of association does not exist in Spain and that the organisations that do exist in Spain have, in fact, slowed down trends within the country aimed at securing social rights, because these have been opposed to the policy and measures of repression and terror of employers and the Government.

12. The Committee finds that the circumstances have not changed as they existed in 1956, when the conference was first called upon to examine the question. The objection is once again based substantially on the non-existence of free trade union organisations and on the assertion that freedom of association does not exist in Spain.

13. The Committee therefore finds that the objection is irreceivable under article 26, paragraph 4 (d), of the Standing Orders. In so doing the Committee is in no way expressing its approval of the trade union situation prevailing in Spain.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers’ Delegation of Portugal.

14. By a letter dated 7 June 1963 the World Federation of Trade Unions objected to the nomination of the Workers’ Delegation of Portugal to the present session of the Conference.

15. Analogous objections to the nomination of the Workers’ Delegation of Portugal were made at the last two sessions of the Conference, in 1961 and 1962, based on grounds essentially similar to those given in the objections made in 1963. The objections were based on the following allegations:

(a) that trade unions in Portugal cannot be considered as industrial organisations representing the workers as such, since as such organisations are required by the Constitution, they are in fact and in law, quasi-governmental institutions under the control of the Government.

(b) that, on the other hand, the Portuguese overseas provinces are denied their democratic and trade union rights in all but a few exceptional circumstances.

(c) that the repressive action taken by the authorities against strikers.

16. In 1961 the Credentials Committee decided in favour of the objection, and means at its disposal, it was unable to investigate the important and extensive questions of fact that were contained in the objections, which questions should rather be examined and decided by means of the machinery existing in the ILO. The Committee therefore decided that it could
32. The Credentials Committee submits the present report to the Conference in order that the Conference may take note of it.


(Signed) J. A. BARDOZIO-CARNEIRO, (Chairman).

J. A. T. PERERA.

A. SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA.

(2) Second Report of the Credentials Committee.

Communication concerning the Workers' Delegation of Cyprus.

1. The Credentials Committee took note of a letter dated 8 June 1963 from the Cyprus Turkish Trade Unions' Federation concerning the nomination of the Workers' delegation of Cyprus to the present session of the Conference. This communication does not request invalidation of the credentials of the delegate in question but asks that the observations in the letter be placed in the records of the Conference.

2. It appears from the letter, and the document annexed to it, that an agreement has been reached between the two principal trade union federations of Cyprus (the Pan-Cypriot Federation of Labour and the Cyprus Workers' Federation) concerning the problem of a Workers' delegate to the conference. The objecting organisation did not respond to this approach, on the ground that it should be included with the two major federations in a rotation of the post of delegate.

3. It seems to be quite clear that these two organisations are acting in the best interests of the workers of Cyprus in the country, and in view of the agreement between them it appears appropriate that it should be the representatives of the two which should occupy the post of delegate. In approaching the objecting organisation concerning a post of adviser, the delegation appears to have discharged its responsibilities. Under these circumstances the Credentials Committee can only consider that the Government of Cyprus has appeared to act in full accordance with the provisions of article 3, paragraph 5, of the Constitution.

4. The Committee can only regret that the objecting organisation, representing an important group in Cyprus, did not respond to the approach concerning a post of adviser when the opportunity was offered to it. The Committee feels certain that the Government will continue to approach these organisations concerned each time that it composes the Workers' delegation of Cyprus to sessions of the Conference.

5. The Committee noted from the documents annexed to the communication that it appears that the Government may have to incur travel expenses of advisers. The Committee in this regard draws the attention of governments to article 13, paragraph 2 (d), of the Constitution, under which each of the States Members is obliged to pay the travelling and subsistence expenses of its delegation to the Conference, or to other persons who are attending sessions of the Conference.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegation of Spain.

6. By a letter dated 6 June 1963 the World Federation of Trade Unions objected to the nomination of the Workers' delegation from Spain to the present session of the Conference.

7. Since Spain rejoined the Organisation in 1956 the Committee has had analogous objections to the Spanish Workers' delegation on four occasions. In consequence the Credentials Committee was obliged to consider whether the present objection was receivable, in view of the requirement of article 26, paragraph 4 (d), of the Standing Orders of the Conference that an objection is not receivable if it "... is based upon facts or allegations which the Conference, by a debate and a decision referring to identical facts or allegations, has already found to be recognised as irrelevant or devoid of substance."

8. The first occasion on which such an analogous objection was made was in 1956. In that year objections were made by the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions and the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions. These objections were based on the following allegations:

(a) that the delegate and advisers concerned were not appointed in agreement with the Standing Orders of the workers' organisations;
(b) that there were no free trade union organisations in Spain, the only trade union organisations being state controlled and that accordingly there could be no agreement with an organisation, since agreement had been given to that term by the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention of 1961.
(c) that a person chosen from the Spanish trade union organisation could not be representative of the workers, (i) the workers within it could not freely choose their leaders and representatives, and were compelled to choose those nominated by the Ministry of Labour;
(ii) the Workers' delegate was not a representative of the workers;
(iii) the Workers' Organisations which were state-controlled, and therefore its representative was not a representative of the workers.

9. In 1956 the Chairman of the Credentials Committee submitted a report in which—after having carefully examined the relevance of the various points raised in the objections—he expressed the opinion that he could not come to the conclusion that the objections were receivable. Since the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions had consulted the existing trade union organisations in Spain and his advisers were not appointed in conformity with paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Constitution, the Standing Orders of the Conference had consulted the existing trade union organisations in Spain and the Committee considered that it was this organisation which had chosen the representatives designated. The Workers' member of the Committee, on the other hand, considered that the allegations in the objections were relevant and recommended to the Conference that it invalidate the nomination of the delegates in question. The Employers' member of the Committee considered that the objections raised complex problems concerning the standing of Spain in law and in fact, and that the documentation submitted to the Committee was not sufficient for it to be able to rule or permit the adoption of firm conclusions. In consequence, he declared that he would abstain. The Conference, after discussion, rejected the Workers' member's recommendation to invalidate. Forty-eight votes were cast in favour of invalidation and 59 abstentions.

10. Subsequently, in 1958, 1961 and 1962, analogous objections were made to the credentials of the Spanish Workers' delegation. On each occasion the Committee was of the opinion that the objection was irre receivable under article 26, paragraph 4 (d), of the Standing Orders of the Conference. In each conclusion the Committee stated that it wished to emphasise most strongly that it did so only because it considered itself bound by the statutory provisions dealing with the receivability of objections. The Committee added that in finding the objection irre receivable, it was not intending to determine the question whether the Spanish Government had converged to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of the I.L.O. in making the nominations in question. The Committee stated that, in the statement it had made in 1958; and the Employers' and Workers' members stated that they considered that the views which appeared to have been arrived at the conclusion of irre receivability with extreme regret, because, in their firm opinion, the essence of democratic labour organisation is that it is independent of the state and is not only free of governmental control should be recognised. At the last session of the Conference, in 1962, the Committee found that the circumstances had remained in essence the same since the first time the objection was raised. In conclusion, the Committee added that it was unanimous in opinion that the objection was irre receivable and must be regarded as having been withdrawn.

11. The objection this year again states that the nomination could not have been made in agreement with the Standing Orders of the I.L.O. since these organisations as exist in Spain. The objection also alleges, as in prior years, that the freedom of association does not exist in Spain and that the organisations that do exist in Spain have, in fact, slowed down trends within the country aimed at securing social rights, because they have openly supported the policy and measures of repression and terror of employers and the Government.

12. The Committee feels that the circumstances still do not exist in 1963, when the Conference was first called upon to examine the question. The objection is once again based substantially on the non-existence of free trade union organisations and on the assertion that freedom of association does not exist in Spain.

13. The Committee therefore finds that the objection is irre receivable under article 26, paragraph 4 (d), of the Standing Orders. In so doing the Committee is, in a way, expressing its approval of the trade union situation prevailing in Spain.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegation of Portugal.

14. By a letter dated 7 June 1963 the World Federation of Trade Unions objected to the nomination of the delegation of Portugal to the present session of the Conference.

15. Analogous objections to the nomination of the Workers' delegation of Portugal were made at the last two sessions of the Conference, in 1959 and 1962, based on grounds essentially similar to those which gave rise to the current objection.

(a) that trade unions in Portugal cannot be considered as industrial organisations representing the workers, since there are no independent Trades Union Congresses as such bodies are, in fact and in law, quasi-governmental institutions under the control of the Government;
(b) that, independent workers in the Portuguese overseas provinces are denied their elementary democratic rights in all but a few exceptional circumstances.

16. In 1962 the Credentials Committee decided that it was unable to examine the important and extensive questions of fact that were contained in the objections because the questions rather be examined and decided by means of the machinery existing in the I.L.O. and, for that purpose, such as the Governing Body, the Committee on Freedom of Association. It therefore decided that it could...
not recommend invalidation of the credentials of the Workers’ delegation of Portugal on that occasion.

17. In 1962 the Credentials Committee again noted that the questions of fact raised by the objections fell rather within the competence of the I.L.O. freedom of association machinery. The Committee concluded that it could not recommend invalidation of the credentials of the Workers’ delegation.

18. This year the objection is based on essentially the same grounds as those cited in support of the objections made in 1961 and 1962. The objecting organisation refers principally to facts which are cited to show that trade unions in Portugal are quasi-governmental institutions which control the Government, and that there are no true trade unions in the sense of the Constitution of the I.L.O., the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87).

19. Under these circumstances, and having regard to the earlier unanimous decisions of the Credentials Committee in 1961 and 1962, the Committee finds that the objection is irreceivable under article 26, paragraph 4 (d), of the Standing Orders of the Conference as to which the Conference, by a debate and a decision referring to identical facts or allegations, has already ruled that the objection is irrelevant or devoid of substance.

20. The Committee wishes, however, to make it clear that the disclosure of any way involve a finding on the allegations made in the objection in relation to the status of trade unions in Portugal.

21. The Credentials Committee submits the present report to the Conference in order that the Conference may take note of it.


(Signed) J. A. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO, Chairman.
J. A. T. PEBEBA, A. SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA.


Objective to the Nomination of the Workers’ Delegation of the Republic of South Africa

Introduction.

1. The Credentials Committee had before it an objection to the nomination of the Workers’ delegation of the Republic of South Africa contained in a letter dated 7 June 1963 from the Workers’ Trade Unions.

2. The objecting organisation invokes the South African policy of racial segregation and the intensification of measures relating to apartheid and recalls in this connection that at its 45th Session the Conference adopted a resolution requesting the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization to ensure that the Republic of South Africa withdraw from membership of the Organisation until such time as the Government abolished all ramifications of apartheid. The objecting organisation refers in addition to a memorandum concerning the withdrawal of the Republic of South Africa from membership of the International Labour Organisation from the South African Congress of Trade Unions dated 13 May 1963, a copy of which is annexed to the objection.

3. A memorandum on the same subject was annexed to the objection to the entire delegation submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions at the last session of the Conference. That memorandum also stated that the Congress was not making any formal objection to the credentials of the Workers’ delegation, but submitted that member States should not re-elect the delegation of the Republic of South Africa to the present session of the Conference, expressly stated that the facts concerning the Congress of Trade Unions is not making any formal objection to the credentials of the Workers’ delegation.

4. The objecting organisation alleges that the South African Congress of Trade Unions, stated to be the only multi-racial trade union organisation in South Africa, was not consulted by the Government on the nomination of the Workers’ delegation to the present session of the Conference.

5. In a written statement that he was good enough to supply to the Committee at the latter’s request, the Head of the delegation of the Republic of South Africa informed the Committee that the South African Congress of Trade Unions was not consulted in connexion with the nomination of the Workers’ delegation for the reasons stated in reply to previous objections by the Congress.

6. In 1961 the Credentials Committee also had before it an objection to the nomination of the Workers’ delegation of the Republic of South Africa. The objection on that occasion came from the South African Congress of Trade Unions, which claimed to have the South African Congress of Trade Unions as a violation of the Constitution of the I.L.O. Therefore, its report on the objection in 1961 the Committee considered it meritoriously have been expected that the Congress would have been consulted in connexion with the nomination of the Workers’ delegation.

2. However, the Committee noted that the organisations in agreement with which this delegation was nominated were incontestably the largest from the numerical point of view. Therefore, while appealing to the South African Congress of Trade Unions to re-examine the situation and to include the objecting organisation among those which it would consult in the future, the Committee considered that it could not recommend the invalidation of the credentials to which objection had been taken.

7. In 1962 a similar objection was lodged against the entire delegation of the Republic of South Africa by the World Federation of Trade Unions. The Committee considered that the only part of the complaint which had any substance was the part concerning the Workers’ delegation.

8. The Committee noted that the situation concerning the Workers’ representation remained the same in 1962 as it was in 1961. The Committee therefore felt that it was not in a position to go further than in 1961 in its conclusions concerning the validity of the credentials of the Workers’ delegation at the 46th Session of the Conference. At the same time the Committee indicated that it remained to be fully aware of the gravity of the problem raised by the policy of apartheid in South Africa and considered that it was an absolute contradiction to the principles of the I.L.O.

9. In particular, the Committee stated that it was impossible to accept on a basis, which had been clarified to the satisfaction of the Committee, that the representation of its members, was not consulted by the Government in consultation with the composition of the Workers’ delegation.

8. Last year the Committee noted that one of the two majority organisations in agreement with the policy of apartheid was nominated—the South African Trade Union Council, which had previously claimed to represent as much as 90% of the Congress through the African trade unions in alliance with it—amended its rules in March 1962 so as to enable African trade unions to change their representation and different countries to be elected. The Committee also noted that the Workers’ delegate and his adviser at the present session of the Committee was agreed in agreement with the said South African Trade Union Council and as well as in agreement with the South African Congress of Labour. The Workers’ adviser was good enough to make a statement to the Committee in which he indicated that the results of this Congress represented through its affiliated unions only a small number of African workers in comparison with the membership of the Union. He also said that the Committee had affiliated to it a number of unions with Asian and other non-European members.

Report by the Chairman and Employers’ Member.

As this situation remains essentially the same as last year, the Committee’s report in 1962 of the Workers’ delegation in connexion, the Chairman and the Employers’ Member will be made. The Committee considered that they are unable to go further than in their conclusions than the Committee did in previous years. In so doing, they fully associate themselves with the views which have been expressed in this connection by the Committee in previous years. In particular, the Committee regret that once again the Government of South Africa has not consulted the South African Congress of Trade Unions with the nomination of the Workers’ delegation, in view of the very special character of this organisation.


(Signed) J. A. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO, Chairman.
J. A. T. PEBEBA.

Report by the Workers’ Member.

10. The Workers’ member of the Committee considers that the situation which is prevailing in South Africa, which is evident in the statement of the Committee, is such as to make it impossible for him to assume a different attitude from previous years. There has been little, if any, improvement in the situation prevailing in South Africa. In fact, the Government of the Republic of South Africa has initiated new legislation which carries racial discrimination to a new extreme. In addition to the General Assembly of the United Nations, at its 17th Session, on 6 November 1962, in which it is indicated in paragraphs 2 and 3 as follows:

2. Strongly deplores the continued and total disregard by the Government of South Africa of its obligations under the Constitution of the Organization and to the extent that such disregard is, in accordance with the principles of the Constitution of the Organization, law is not acceptable to the Committee, it is further deploring the determined aggravation of racial issues by specifically referring to the recent developments of violence and bloodshed.

11. In previous years, the Committee has asked the Government of South Africa to consult the Congress of Trade Unions on the nomination of the Workers’ delegation. It should be noted that these requests have been completely disregarded by the Government of South Africa. Furthermore, it is not possible to accept that the resolution calling for the withdrawal of the Republic of South Africa, adopted by the Committee in 1961, should continue to be not given effect to by the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

12. The Workers’ member of the Committee, on the basis of the foregoing, regrets that this year no challenge has been made to the entire South African delegation, which includes representatives of the Government that is in fact responsible for the present situation in South Africa; and for the failure to comply with the 1961 resolution. The objection before the Committee is limited to the Workers’ delegation only.

13. As a result the Workers’ member is obliged to limit his own recommendation to a possible INVALIDATION of the Workers’ delegation should the Government of South Africa not consult the South African Congress of Trade Unions with the nomination of the Workers’ delegation, in view of the very special character of this organisation.


(Signed) A. SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA.
not recommend invalidation of the credentials of the Workers’ delegation of Portugal on that occasion.

17. In 1962 the Credentials Committee again noted that the questions of fact raised by the objections fell rather within the competence of the LLO, freedom of association machinery. The Committee concluded that it could not recommend invalidation of the credentials of the Workers’ delegation.

18. This year the objection is based essentially on the same grounds as those cited in support of the objections made in 1961 and 1962. The objecting organization refers principally to facts which are cited to show that trade unions in Portugal are quasi-governmental institutions with the control of the Government, and that there are no trade unions in the territory of the Federation of the LLO, the Declaration of Philadelphia, the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Rights Organising, 1948 (No. 87).

19. Under these circumstances, and having regard to the earlier unanimous decisions of the Credentials Committee in 1961 and 1962, the Committee finds that the objection is inadmissible under article 26, paragraph 4 (f), of the Standing Orders of the Conference as it is based on a ground on which the Conference, by a debate and a decision referring to identical facts or allegations, has already found that it was irrevocable or devoid of substance.

20. The Committee wishes, however, to make it quite clear that in no way do the above objections involve a finding on the allegations made in the objection in relation to the status of trade unions in Portugal.

21. The Credentials Committee submits the present report to the Conference in order that the Conference may take note of it.

(Signed) J. A. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO, (Chairman).
J. A. T. PEREIRA.
A. SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA.


Objection to the Nomination of the Workers’ Delegation of the Republic of South Africa.

1. The Credentials Committee had before it an objection to the nomination of the Workers’ delegation of the Republic of South Africa contained in a letter dated 7 June 1963 from the Workers’ Trade Unions.

2. The objection ing on the issue of South African policy of racial segregation and the intensification of measures relating to apartheid and recalls in this connection that at its 45th Session the Conference adopted a resolution requesting the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization to examine the situation of the Republic of South Africa to withdraw from membership of the Organization until such time as the Government of South Africa recognised the position apartheid. The objecting organisation refers in addition to a memorandum concerning the withdrawal of the Republic of South Africa from membership of the International Labour Organization from the South African Congress of Trade Unions dated 13 May 1963, a copy of which is annexed to the objection. This memorandum, while submitting that member States should examine the question of South Africa from the point of view of the Declaration of Philadelphia, the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Rights Organising, 1948 (No. 87).

3. A memorandum on the same subject was annexed to the objection to the entire delegation submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions at the last session of the Conference. That memorandum also stated that the Congress was not making any formal objection to the credentials of the Workers’ delegation, but submitted that member States should refuse to recognize the delegation of the Republic of South Africa to that session of the Conference. In 1962 the Committee considered that the issue was not sufficient to justify an objection to the credentials of the Committee this year takes the same view.

4. The objecting organisation argues that the South African Congress of Trade Unions, stated in the objection to be the “only” multi-racial trade union organisation in South Africa, was not consulted by the Government on the nomination of the Workers’ delegation to the present session of the Conference.

5. In a written statement that he was good enough to supply to the Committee at the latter’s request, the General Secretary of the Federation of the Congress for South Africa, in its report for the present session of the Conference informed the Committee that the South African Congress of Trade Unions was not consulted in connection with the nomination of the Workers’ delegation for the reasons indicated in reply to previous objections by the Congress.

6. In 1961 the Credentials Committee had before it an objection to the nomination of the Workers’ delegation for the South African Congress of Trade Unions, which contained a letter from the Chairman of the South African Congress of Trade Unions to the effect that the Congress had not been consulted in connection with the nomination of the Workers’ delegation. However, the Committee noted that the organisation’s agreement with which this delegation had been nominated were incontestably the largest from the numerical point of view. Therefore, while appealing to the South African Congress of Trade Unions to examine the situation and to include the organisation among those which it would consult in future, the Committee considered that it could not recommend invalidation of the credentials to which objection had been taken.

7. In 1962 a similar objection was lodged against the entire delegation of the Republic of South Africa by the World Federation of Trade Unions. The Committee considered that the only part of the complaint which had any substance was the part concerning the Workers’ delegation, and noted that the situation concerning the Workers’ representatives remained the same in most relevant aspects as in the previous year.

8. Last year the Committee noted that one of the two majority organisations in agreement with the objection was the South African Trade Union Council which had previously claimed to represent as many as 340,000 workers in 120 trade unions and which is referred to in the present report on the question of South African policy of racial segregation and the intensification of measures relating to apartheid in South Africa open to workers of all races. The Committee had previously had occasion to draw attention to the very special character of this organisation and to state that it could not accept racial discrimination in trade union matters, as it would be a violation of the Constitution of the ILO. Therefore, in its report on the objection in 1961 the Committee considered that the objection could reasonably have been expected that the Congress would have been consulted in connection with the nomination of the Workers’ delegation. However, the Committee noted that the organisation’s agreement with which this delegation had been nominated was the largest from the numerical point of view. Therefore, while appealing to the South African Congress of Trade Unions to examine the situation and to include the organisation among those which it would consult in future, the Committee considered that it could not recommend invalidation of the credentials to which objection had been taken.

(Signed) J. A. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO, Chairman.
J. A. T. PEREIRA.

Report by the Workers’ Member.

10. The Workers’ member of the Committee considers that this year there exist new facts which make it possible for him to assume a different position. It is true that apartheid has also been a worsenng of the social situation prevailing in South Africa. In fact, the Government of the Republic of South Africa has introduced new legislation which carries racial discrimination to a new extreme. In addition the General Assembly of the United Nations, at its 17th Session, took a clear position when it adopted resolution No. 1761 (XVII) on 6 November 1962 which had been indicated in paragraphs 2 and 3 as follows:

2. Strongly deplores the continued and total disregard by the Government of South Africa of its obligations under the International Labour Organization, furthermore, its determined aggravation of racial issues by undermining the possibility of its representatives being to represent South Africa at the Conference.

3. Expresses the necessity for the continuance of those policies seriously endangering international peace and security.

11. In previous years, the Committee has asked the Government of South Africa to consult the Congress of South Africa in connection with the nomination of the Workers’ delegation. It should be noted that these requests have been completely ignored. The Congress of South Africa has not been consulted, and it cannot be accepted independently; a more definite position must now be taken so as to ensure the participation of the Workers’ organisation. Furthermore, it is not possible to accept that the resolution calling for the withdrawal of the Republic of South Africa from the Conference was adopted by the Conference in 1961 should continue not to be given effect to by the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

12. The Workers’ member of the Committee, on the basis of the foregoing, regrets that this year he cannot in the context of the South African delegation, which includes representatives of the Government that is in fact responsible for the present situation in South Africa and for the failure to comply with the 1961 resolution. The objection before the Committee is limited to the Workers’ delegation only.

13. As a result the Workers’ member is obliged to limit his own recommendation to a position (ii) to admit the Workers’ delegation of the Republic of South Africa to the present session of the Conference.

(Signed) J. A. SANCHEZ MADARIAGA.
Appendix II: Credentials

(3) Final Report of the Credentials Committee.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of Pakistan.

1. The Credentials Committee had before it a telegram sent from Dacca by the East Pakistan Federation of Labour on 8 June 1963 objecting to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Pakistan and adding that a detailed letter would follow.

2. The name of the Workers' delegate of Pakistan was first published in the Supplement 3 to the Provisional Record, No. 3, which appeared on Thursday, 6 June. The letter referred to in the telegram from the objecting organisation was received on 14 June 1963 at 12 noon, that is to say after the expiration of the time limit provided for the lodging of objections in paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

3. The letter, which was sent from Dacca on 10 June, contains no statement indicating any reason why it was dispatched after the expiry of the time limit of 72 hours. From information supplied to the Committee by the Government of Pakistan it appears that the objecting organisation was aware of the composition of the delegation on or about 25 May. The Committee therefore felt that it was not able to take the letter into account. If the Committee were to take account of communications arriving without explanation many days after the expiry of the time limit, the purpose of paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 would be defeated.

4. The telegram sent from Dacca on 5 June was received prior to the expiry of the time limit of 72 hours. However, the telegram stated only that the delegate in question had been nominated "in violation of the relevant provision of the I.L.O. Constitution" and did not contain any matter on which the Committee could act. The Committee accordingly is unanimously of the opinion that the telegram cannot serve as a basis for consideration of the invalidation of the credentials of the delegate in question, and decides that the objection is receivable under the provisions of paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 of the Standing Orders.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of Uruguay.

5. By a letter dated 29 May 1963 the Trade Union Confederation of Uruguay objected to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Uruguay to the present session of the Conference.

6. The names of the Workers' delegation of Uruguay were first published in the Supplement 3 to the Provisional Record, No. 2, which appeared on 5 June 1963. The letter of objection, which appeared to be postmarked on 11 June 1963, was received on 15 June 1963, i.e., after the expiration of the time limit of 72 hours provided for in paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 of the Standing Orders.

7. The Credentials Committee therefore unanimously decides that the objection is irreceivable under paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 of the Standing Orders.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of Burundi.

8. By letter dated 10 June 1963 the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions objected to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Burundi to the present session of the Conference and also transmitted a letter dated 4 June 1963 from its affiliate, the Christian Trade Unions of Workers and Farm workers of Burundi (S.G.B.) also objecting to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Burundi.

9. The Committee communicated the objection to the head of the Government delegation of Burundi and the Workers' delegate in question. The head of the Government delegation was good enough to submit a number of comments to the Committee concerning the trade union situation in his country.

10. However, before the Committee had concluded its examination of the question the delegation of Burundi withdrew from the Conference. In the circumstances the Committee saw no purpose in continuing its examination of the objections.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of Morocco.

11. By a telegram dated 7 June 1963 and a letter dated 11 June 1963, the Moroccan General Federation of Labour (U.G.T.M.) objected to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Morocco to the present session of the Conference.

12. The Committee communicated the objection to the head of the Government delegation of Morocco and the Workers' delegate in question. The head of the Government delegation was good enough to submit a number of comments to the Committee concerning the trade union situation in his country.

13. However, before the Committee had concluded its examination of the question the delegation of Morocco withdrew from the Conference. In the circumstances the Committee saw no purpose in continuing its examination of the objection.

General Observations.

14. In its first report the Committee referred to the fact that some delegations were incomplete. The Committee notes that there is one delegation which includes a Workers' delegate but not an Employers' delegate, and that there are four delegations present at the Conference which contain no non-governmental delegates. Of the latter, three (Afghanistan, Nicaragua and Thailand) have for several years not been complete. The Committee draws the attention of the Conference to the fact that these practices are contrary to the obligations undertaken by member States under the Constitution and that they violate the fundamental tripartite structure of the Conference. It once again appeals to the governments concerned to comply in the future with the peremptory obligations placed on them by article 3, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, which requires that delegations shall include two delegates representing employers and workers respectively.

15. The Committee also notes that the following countries did not send delegations to the Conference this year: Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Iceland, Paraguay and Somalia.

16. The Committee thinks it is opportune to re-state the principles relevant to the examination of objections to credentials. Article 3, paragraph 5, of the Constitution requires States Members to nominate non-governmental delegates and advisers chosen in agreement with the industrial organisations, if such organisations exist, which are most representative of employers and workers respectively. Furthermore, one of the fundamental principles on which the International Labour Organisation is based is that the representatives of employers and workers should enjoy equal status with the government representatives. In the view of the Committee equality of status is incompatible with dependence, and the Committee reaffirms the opinion expressed by the Credentials Committee in 1961 that non-governmental delegations should be independent both of their governments and of one another. Further, the spirit of article 3, paragraph 5, of the Constitution requires both that organisations of employers and workers should be allowed to exist and that they should enjoy freedom of action.


(Signed)  J. A. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO,
Chairman.

J. A. T. PEBBIA,
A. SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA.
Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of Pakistan.

1. The Credentials Committee had before it a telegram sent from Daesa by the East Pakistan Federation of Labour on 8 June 1963 objecting to the nomination of the Workers' delegates of Pakistan and adding that a detailed letter would follow.

2. The name of the Workers' delegate of Pakistan was first published in the Supplement 2 to the Provisional Record, No. 3, which appeared on Thursday, 6 June. The letter referred to in the telegram from the objecting organisation was received on 14 June 1963 at 12 noon, that is to say after the expiration of the time limits provided for the lodging of objections in paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

3. The letter, which was sent from Daesa on 10 June, contains no statement indicating any reason why it was dispatched after the expiry of the time limit of 72 hours. From information supplied to the Committee by the Government of Pakistan it appears that the objecting organisation was aware of the composition of the delegation on or about 25 May. The Committee therefore felt that it was not able to take the letter into account. If the Committee were to take account of communications arriving without explanation many days after the expiry of the time limit, the purpose of paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 would be defeated.

4. The telegram sent from Daesa on 8 June was received prior to the expiry of the time limit of 72 hours. However, the telegram stated only that the delegate in question had been nominated "in violation of the relevant provision of the I.L.O. Constitution" and did not contain any matter on which the Committee could act. The Committee accordingly is unanimously of the opinion that the telegram cannot serve as a basis for consideration of the invalidation of the credentials of the delegate in question, and decides that the objection is irreceivable under the provisions of paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 of the Standing Orders.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of Uruguay.

5. By a letter dated 29 May 1963 the Trade Union Confederation of Uruguay objected to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Uruguay to the present session of the Conference.

6. The names of the Workers' delegation of Uruguay were first published in the Supplement 3 to the Provisional Record, No. 2, which appeared on 5 June 1963. The letter of objection, which appeared to be postmarked on 11 June 1963, was received on 15 June 1963, i.e. after the expiration of the time limit of 72 hours provided for in paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 of the Standing Orders.

7. The Credentials Committee therefore unanimously decides that the objection is irreceivable under paragraph 4 (a) of article 26 of the Standing Orders.

Objections to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of Burundi.

8. By letter dated 10 June 1963 the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions objected to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Burundi to the present session of the Conference and also transmitted a letter dated 4 June 1963 from its affiliate, the Christian Trade Unions of Workers and Farmworkers of Burundi (S.G.B.), also objecting to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Burundi.

9. The Committee communicated the objections to the head of the Government delegation of Burundi and the Workers' delegate in question. The head of the Government delegation was good enough to submit a number of comments to the Committee concerning the trade union situation in his country.

10. However, before the Committee had concluded its examination of the question the delegation of Burundi withdrew from the Conference. In the circumstances the Committee saw no purpose in continuing its examination of the objections.

Objection to the Nomination of the Workers' Delegate of Morocco.

11. By a telegram dated 7 June 1963 and a letter dated 11 June 1963, the Moroccan General Federation of Labour (U.G.T.M.) objected to the nomination of the Workers' delegate of Morocco to the present session of the Conference.

12. The Committee communicated the objection to the head of the Government delegation of Morocco and the Workers' delegate in question. The head of the Government delegation was good enough to submit a number of comments to the Committee concerning the trade union situation in his country.

13. However, before the Committee had concluded its examination of the question the delegation of Morocco withdrew from the Conference. In the circumstances the Committee saw no purpose in continuing its examination of the objection.

General Observations.

14. In its first report the Committee referred to the fact that some delegations were incomplete. The Committee notes that there is one delegation which includes a Workers' delegate but not an Employers' delegate, and that there are four delegations present at the Conference which contain no non-governmental delegates. Of the latter, three (Afghanistan, Nicaragua and Thailand) have for several years not been complete. The Committee draws the attention of the Conference to the fact that these practices are contrary to the obligations undertaken by member States under the Constitution and that they violate the fundamental tripartite structure of the Conference. It once again appeals to the governments concerned to comply in the future with the peremptory obligations placed on them by article 3, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, which requires that delegations shall include two delegates representing employers and workers respectively.

15. The Committee also notes that the following countries did not send delegations to the Conference this year: Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Iceland, Paraguay and Somalia.

16. The Committee thinks it is opportune to re-state the principles relevant to the examination of objections to credentials. Article 3, paragraph 5, of the Constitution requires States Members to nominate non-governmental delegates and advisers chosen in agreement with the industrial organisations, if such organisations exist, which are most representative of employers and workers respectively. Furthermore, one of the fundamental principles on which the International Labour Organisation is based is that the representatives of employers and workers should enjoy equal status with the government representatives. In the view of the Committee equality of status is incompatible with dependence, and the Committee reaffirms the opinion expressed by the Credentials Committee in 1961 that non-governmental delegations should be independent both of their governments and of one another. Further, the spirit of article 3, paragraph 5, of the Constitution requires both that organisations of employers and workers should be allowed to exist and that they should enjoy freedom of action.


(Signed) J. A. BARBOZA-CARNEIRO,
Chairman.
J. A. T. PEBSA.
A. SÁNCHEZ MADARIAGA.
APPENDIX III : Standing Orders Questions

Standing Orders Questions

(1) Note concerning Standing Orders Questions
Placed by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office before the Conference at its 47th Session.

The Governing Body has referred to the Conference amendments to articles 17, 25, 62 and 64 of the Standing Orders of the Conference concerning the procedure for the examination of resolutions relating to matters not included in an item on the agenda.

RESOLUTIONS PROCEEDURE

On the recommendation of the Committee to Consider the Improvement of the Practical Methods of Working of the International Labour Conference, the Governing Body has expressed itself in favour of a number of proposals designed to expedite the consideration of resolutions relating to matters not included in an item on the agenda. Some members of the Governing Body, in particular the Government member of the U.S.S.R., placed on record the view that recommendations on these proposals were premature until the Conference had had an opportunity to consider the matter in the discussion on the Director-General's Report. The proposal to specify, in paragraph 1, subparagraph (1) of article 17 of the Standing Orders, that resolutions must be deposited at least 15 days before the opening of the session of the Conference "by a delegate accredited to the Conference". The Committee to Consider the Improvement of the Practical Methods of Working of the Conference made this proposal with a view to giving formal authority to the practice which the Director-General has followed in this regard. The language is intended to refer effectively to titular delegates, and not to substitute delegates who are able to act only in the absence of a titular delegate. Moreover, the proposal implies that the delegate concerned must be formally accredited by the time at which the time-limit for the deposit of resolutions ends; in the view of the Governing Body this constitutes a reasonable compromise between the rights of delegate and the need for the orderly conduct of the Conference as a whole in knowing sufficiently in advance what resolutions are likely to come before it. The Governing Body accordingly recommends to the Conference the following amendment of paragraph 1, subparagraph (1) of article 17 of the Standing Orders:

1. (1) No resolution relating to a matter not included in an item on the agenda of the Conference shall be moved at any sitting of the Conference unless a copy of
the resolution has been deposited with the Director. Ordinarily the International Labour Office at least 18 days before the opening of the session of the Conference, by a delegate accredited to the Conference.

The second proposal is designed to incorporate, in article 17 of the Standing Orders language making provision only for the determination of the order in which resolutions which have been declared receivable will be considered and, secondly, for a term date for the work of the Resolutions Committee. Subject to reservations expressed by some of its members, in particular the Government member of the U.S.S.R., the Governing Body recommends to the Conference that it should insert the following new paragraphs 5 and 6 in article 17 of the Standing Orders of the Conference:

5. The Resolutions Committee shall determine the order in which resolutions which have been declared receivable shall be examined, as follows:

(a) The Committee shall, without discussion, determine and hold the first five resolutions to be considered, in the following manner:

(i) Each member of the Committee shall receive a ballot paper on which the title of all the resolutions to be considered are appear, and shall indicate therein the number of resolutions which he will vote for discussion first, his first preference being marked "+", his second "++", and so forth; a ballot paper which does not indicate preferences for five resolutions by the opening of the session of the Conference shall be rejected.

(ii) Whoever a resolution is indicated as a first preference, it shall be allotted five points, whatever it is indiciated as a second preference, and so forth; resolutions for which no preference is indicated will receive no points.

(iii) Where the Government member of the Committee is entitled to cast more than one vote, the points are calculated separately for each group and multiplied by the multiplier applicable to the votes of the group.

(iv) The resolution obtaining the largest number of points, as determined in accordance with (ii) and (iii), shall be discussed first, the resolution obtaining the second largest number of points shall be discussed second, and so forth for five resolutions; if the voting results in an equal number of points for each of two or more of the first five resolutions, priority shall be decided by lot in one or more castings, as appropriate.

(b) The Committee shall set up a Working Party composed of three Government members, three Employers' members and three Workers' members to make recommendations as to the order in which the resolutions which were not included in the first five as a result of the procedure set forth in (a) should be examined.

6. The Resolutions Committee shall terminate its work by submitting the diagram of the session of the Conference. If any resolution has not been considered by that date, the Conference shall not discuss or act upon that resolution.

If this proposal is adopted, existing paragraphs 5 to 8 of article 17 would be renumbered accordingly.

The third proposal is designed to adapt certain provisions of the Standing Orders for Conference committees, namely those relating to the time limits and to the right to speak after the closure has been voted, to the needs of the Resolutions Committee. The Governing Body recommends to the Conference that it should make the following additional to articles 55, 62 and 64 of its Standing Orders:

ARTICLE 55
4. These Standing Orders apply to the Resolutions
Committee subject to special provisions contained in articles 62, paragraph 4, and 64, paragraph 4.

ARTICLE 62
4. In the case of the Resolutions Committee the Chairperson may, after consultation with the two Vice-Chairmen, submit to the Committee for decision within a debate a proposal to reduce the time limit for speeches on a specific topic to five minutes.

ARTICLE 64
4. In the case of the Resolutions Committee only the sponsor of the motion, resolution or amendment under discussion, or one of the sponsors if there were several, shall have the speech on the question under discussion after the closure has been voted.

(2) Report of the Standing Orders Committee.

1. The Standing Orders Committee was composed of 63 members (48 Government members, 6 Employers' members, and 9 Workers' members). To achieve equality of voting strength among the groups each Government member had three votes, each Employers' member had 24 votes, and each Workers' member had 16 votes.

2. The Committee elected as Chairman and "Reporters Mr. Vlaschov (Government member, Greece) and as Vice-Chairmen Mr. Kun (Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Abo, Government member, Austria). Mr. Vlaschov having been compelled to leave the Conference at the termination of the work of the Committee, Mr. Abo (Government delegate, Italy) was elected Chairman and "Reporters ".

3. The Committee had before it proposed amendments to articles 17, 55, 62 and 64 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, concerning the order of consideration of resolutions relating to matters not included in an item on the agenda. These various proposals were to be found in the Standing Orders Questions Placed by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office before the Conference at its 47th Session.1

DEPOSIT OF RESOLUTIONS

5. The first proposal was designed to specify, in paragraph 1, subparagraph (1) of article 17 of the Standing Orders, that resolutions must be deposited "by a delegate accredited to the Conference". It was made clear that this proposal corresponded to the practice which the Director-General had for years followed in this regard, and that the deposit was to be given formal authority to that practice.

6. A number of members of the Committee, from the Employers' and Workers' sides, expressed concern lest the proposed amendment deprive of the right to submit resolutions delegates in particular the Employers' and Workers' delegates—whose credentials, through no fault of their own, had not been distinguished by the International Labour Office prior to the expiry of the time limit for the submission of resolutions. It was agreed, with a view to meeting this problem, to delete the word "accredited" from the proposed amendment in a manner to make possible the acceptance of resolutions submitted within the prescribed time limit by persons ultimately appointed to the Conference as delegates, but whose formal accreditation was somewhat delayed. It was emphasized at the same time that article 17 of the Standing Orders required accreditation to take place prior to the expiry of the time limit for the submission of resolutions.

7. A few members of the Committee suggested that the submission of resolutions by industrial organizations and by advisers should be permitted, on the condition that by that such a possibility already existed under the present Standing Orders. Other members pointed out that the proposals represented the view that the committee which is the great deal of personal responsibility on delegates.

8. The proposal, with the deletion of the word "accredited", was adopted by 294 votes to 56, with 6 abstentions, and the Committee accordingly recommends to the Conference

GENERAL DISCUSSION

4. A number of members of the Committee expressed the view that, at a time when the structure of the Organisation in general was being reviewed in plenary sitting, it was inappropriate for the Committee to formulate concrete proposals on one limited aspect of that structure. They accordingly suggested that the Committee limit itself to a general examination of the procedure governing the examination of resolutions. The majority of the members of the Committee considered, however, that it was its duty to study the proposals referred to the Conference by the Governing Body after careful consideration and to report to the Conference, particularly as it was clear that the existing procedure in the matter had to be revised if the Resolutions Committee was to function adequately.

Note: p. 476.
6. The Resolutions Committee shall terminate its work on the Saturday preceding the closing of the session of the Conference. If any resolution has not been considered by the Committee by that date, the Conference shall not discuss or act upon that resolution.

If this proposal is adopted, existing paragraphs 5 to 8 of article 17 would be renumbered accordingly.

The third proposal is designed to adapt certain provisions of the Standing Orders for Conference committees, namely those relating to the time limit for speeches and to the right to speak after the closure has been voted, to the needs of the Resolutions Committee. The Governing Body recommends to the Conference that it should make the following additions to articles 55, 62 and 64 of its Standing Orders:

**ARTICLE 55**

4. These Standing Orders apply to the Resolutions Committee subject to the special provisions contained in articles 62, paragraph 4, and 64, paragraph 4.

**ARTICLE 62**

4. In the case of the Resolutions Committee the Chairmen, after consultation with the two Vice-Chairmen, shall have the right to speak on the question under discussion, or to vote if the proposal under discussion were several, shall have the right to speak on the question under discussion after the closure has been voted.

(2) Report of the Standing Orders Committee.

1. The Standing Orders Committee was composed of 63 members (48 Government members, 6 Employers' members, and 9 Workers' members). To achieve equality of voting strength amongst the groups each Government member had three votes, each Employers' member had 24 votes and each Workers' member had 16 votes.

2. The Committee elected as Chairman and Reporter Mr. Vlachos (Government member, Greece) and as Vice-Chairmen Mr. Kuntschen (Employers' member, Switzerland) and Mr. Kaplansky (Workers' member, Canada). Mr. Vlachos having been compelled to leave the Conference before the termination of the work of the Committee, Mr. Ago (Government delegate, Italy) was elected Chairman and Reporter in his place.

3. The Committee had before it proposed amendments to articles 17, 55, 62 and 64 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, concerning the procedure for the examination of resolutions relating to matters not included in an item on the agenda. These various proposals were set forth in the Note concerning Standing Orders Questions Placed by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office before the Conference at its 47th Session.²

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

4. A number of Government members of the Committee expressed the view that, at a time when the structure of the Organisation in general was being reviewed in plenary sitting, it was inappropriate for the Committee to formulate concrete proposals on one limited aspect of that structure. They accordingly suggested that the Committee limit itself to a general examination of the procedure governing the examination of resolutions. The majority of the members of the Committee considered, however, that it was its duty to study the proposals referred to the Conference by the Governing Body after careful consideration and to report thereon to the Conference, particularly as it was clear that the existing procedure in the matter had to be revised if the Resolutions Committee was to function adequately.

**DEPOSIT OF RESOLUTIONS**

5. The first proposal was designed to specify, in paragraph 1, subparagraph (1), of article 17 of the Standing Orders, that resolutions must be deposited "by a delegate accredited to the Conference". It was made clear that this proposal corresponded to the practice which the Director-General had for years followed in this regard, and was intended merely to give formal authority to that practice.

6. A number of members of the Committee, from the Government, Employers' and Workers' sides, expressed concern lest the proposed amendment deprive the right to submit resolutions delegates—and in particular Employers' and Workers' delegates—whose credentials, through no fault of their own, had not been deposited with the International Labour Office prior to the expiry of the time limit for the submission of resolutions. It was agreed, with a view to meeting this problem, to delete the word "accredited" from the proposed amendment, and in this manner to make possible the acceptance of resolutions submitted within the prescribed time limit by persons ultimately appointed to the Conference as delegates, but whose formal accreditation was somewhat delayed. It was emphasised at the same time that article 26 of the Standing Orders required accreditation to take place prior to the expiry of the time limit for the submission of resolutions.

7. A few members of the Committee suggested that the submission of resolutions by industrial organisations and by advisers should be permitted; one of them expressed the view that such a possibility already existed under the present Standing Orders. Other members pointed out that only delegates possessed standing in the Conference, and that this was in conformity with the particular structure of the Organisation, which laid a great deal of personal responsibility on delegates.

8. The proposal, with the deletion of the word "accredited", was adopted by 294 votes to 56, with 6 abstentions, and the Committee accordingly recommends to the Conference...
that it amend paragraph 1, subparagraph (1), of article 17 of the Standing Orders to read as follows:

1. (1) No resolution relating to a matter not included in an item on the agenda of the Conference shall be moved at any sitting of the Conference unless a copy of the resolution has been deposited with the Director-General of the International Labour Office at least 15 days before the opening of the session of the Conference, by a delegate to the Conference.

**DETERMINATION OF ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS**

9. The second proposal before the Committee provided for the insertion in article 17 of the Standing Orders of a new paragraph 5 requiring the Resolutions Committee—

(a) to determine the first five resolutions to be considered by ballot, without discussion; and

(b) to set up a working party to make recommendations as to the order in which all other resolutions should be examined.

10. Some members of the Committee felt that the procedure of choosing the first five resolutions by ballot was too mechanical, that it did not give delegates the possibility of fully evaluating the relative importance of resolutions, that it might deprive the authors of certain resolutions of the possibility of presenting them, and that it was preferable to determine all priorities by negotiation. Other members pointed out that the main purpose of the ballot was to allow the Resolutions Committee to have substantive discussions from the outset of its proceedings, avoiding loss of time on procedural discussions, and that the order of priority of discussion of all resolutions but the first five would be decided by negotiation.

11. With a view to meeting some of the preoccupations which had been expressed, two modifications of the proposal were agreed. The first enables the author or one of the authors of each resolution to present it prior to the ballot on the first five resolutions. In this connection, a number of members considered that five minutes was ample for such presentation; however, with a view to giving some latitude for the presentation of complex resolutions, and on the understanding that, if the need should arise, recourse could be had to new paragraph 4 of article 62 of the Standing Orders, a time limit of ten minutes was finally accepted. The second modification expressly requires the Working Party, which is to determine the order of priority of discussion of all other resolutions, to be set up as soon as the Resolutions Committee begins its work.

12. The proposal, with these modifications, was adopted subject to reservations by some members as specified in paragraph 4 and subject to the dissent of one Workers' member, and the Committee accordingly recommends to the Conference that it insert in article 17 of the Standing Orders a new paragraph 5 as follows:

5. The Resolutions Committee shall determine the order in which resolutions which have been declared receivable shall be examined, as follows:

(a) After having given the author, or one of the authors, of each resolution the possibility of moving it in a speech which shall not exceed ten minutes, the Committee shall, without discussion, determine by ballot the first five resolutions to be considered, in the following manner:

(i) each member of the Committee shall receive a ballot paper on which the titles of all the resolutions to be considered appear, and shall indicate thereon the five resolutions which he wishes to be discussed first, his first preference being marked " 1 ", his second " 2 ", and so forth; a ballot paper which does not indicate preferences for five resolutions shall be void;

(ii) whenever a resolution is indicated as a first preference, it shall be allotted five points, whenever it is indicated as a second preference, four points, and so forth; resolutions for which no preference has been indicated will receive no points;

(iii) where the Government, Employers' or Workers' members of the Committee are entitled to cast more than one vote, to take account of the unequal representation of the group on the Committee, the total number of points secured by each resolution shall be calculated separately for each group and multiplied by the multiplier applicable to the votes of members of the group;

(iv) the resolution obtaining the largest number of points, as determined in accordance with clauses (ii) and (iii), shall be discussed first, the resolution obtaining the second largest number of points shall be discussed second, and so forth for five resolutions; if the voting results in an equal number of points for each of two or more of the first five resolutions, priority shall be decided by lot in one or more castings, as appropriate.

(b) The Committee shall, at the beginning of its proceedings, set up a Working Party composed of three Government members, three Employers' members, and three Workers' members to make recommendations as to the order in which the resolutions which were not included in the first five as a result of the procedure set forth in subparagraph (a) should be examined.

**TERMINAL DATE FOR WORK OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE**

13. A further proposal before the Committee was to insert in article 17 of the Standing Orders a new paragraph 6, to the effect that the work of the Resolutions Committee should terminate not later than the Saturday preceding the closing of the session of the Conference, and that the Conference should not discuss or act upon any resolution not considered by the Committee by that date. It was pointed out in the Committee that the terminal date so fixed was the latest consistent with the needs of the plenary Conference during the last four days of each session.

14. Several speakers drew attention to the fact that, while the various proposals before the Committee were all concerned to save time in the Resolutions Committee, it had nowhere been provided that the Resolutions Committee should have more time at its disposal. They referred to devices such as regular morning and afternoon sittings, night sittings, etc. The Committee agreed to modify the proposed paragraph 6 to provide, in addition, that the Resolutions Committee would begin work as soon as possible after the opening of the session of the Conference with a view to enabling it to complete its agenda.
15. The proposal, as amended, was adopted subject to reservations by some members as specified in paragraph 4 and subject to the dissent of one Workers' member, and the Committee accordingly recommends to the Conference that it insert in article 17 of the Standing Orders a new paragraph 6, as follows:

6. The Resolutions Committee shall begin its work as soon as possible after the opening of the session of the Conference, in order to enable it to complete its agenda, and shall terminate its work not later than the Saturday preceding the closing of the session. If, nevertheless, any resolution has not been considered by the Committee by the date on which it terminates its work, the Conference shall not discuss or act upon that resolution.

ADAPTATION OF THE STANDING ORDERS FOR COMMITTEES OF THE CONFERENCE TO THE NEEDS OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

16. The final proposal was designed to adapt to the needs of the Resolutions Committee, certain provisions of the Standing Orders for Committees of the Conference, namely those relating to the time limit for speeches and to the right to speak after the closure has been voted.

17. The proposal was adopted and the Committee accordingly recommends to the Conference that it add the following paragraphs to articles 55, 62 and 64 of the Standing Orders:

**ARTICLE 55**

4. These Standing Orders apply to the Resolutions Committee, subject to the special provisions contained in article 62, paragraph 4, and article 64, paragraph 4.

**ARTICLE 62**

4. In the case of the Resolutions Committee the Chairman may, after consultation with the two Vice-Chairmen, submit to the Committee for decision without debate a proposal to reduce the time limit for speeches on a specific topic to five minutes.

**ARTICLE 64**

4. In the case of the Resolutions Committee only the sponsor of the motion, resolution or amendment under discussion, or one of the sponsors if there were several, shall have the right to speak on the question under discussion after the closure has been voted.


(Signed) ROBERTO AGO,
Chairman and Reporter.
APPENDIX IV

Second Item on the Agenda: Financial and Budgetary Questions

(1) Further Proposals Submitted by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to the 47th Session of the Conference.

1. The Governing Body of the International Labour Office decided at its 155th Session (May-June 1963) to submit to the Conference certain proposals on financial and budgetary matters supplementing those made at its 154th Session (March 1963) which have been submitted to the Conference in Report II: Financial and Budgetary Questions.

I. AUDITED ACCOUNTS FOR 1962

2. The following is an extract from the first report of the Financial and Administrative Committee submitted to the Governing Body at its 155th Session:

The Committee took note of the Audited Accounts for the 44th financial period (1962) and the Auditor's report thereon, and proposes to the Governing Body that it recommend that the Conference adopt the Audited Accounts for 1962.

3. The Governing Body adopted this report on 1 June 1963 and therefore recommends to the Conference to adopt the Audited Accounts for 1962.

II. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE CONTRIBUTIONS PAYABLE TO THE I.L.O. STAFF PENSIONS FUND IN 1964

4. The following is an extract from the first report of the Financial and Administrative Committee submitted to the Governing Body at its 155th Session:

The Committee took note of the report of the Administrative Board of the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Fund on the work of its 56th Session, held in Geneva on 8 April 1963.

The Committee recommends that the Governing Body submit to the Conference the following draft resolution concerning the contributions payable to the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Fund for 1964, which the Board submits in accordance with article 7 of the Regulations of the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Fund:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—
Decides that, for the year 1964, the officials mentioned in article 4, paragraph (a) (i), of the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Regulations shall continue to pay an additional 1 per cent. of their pensionable emoluments (making a total of 7½ per cent.) and those mentioned in article 4, paragraph (a) (ii), an additional ½ per cent. (making a total of 5¼ per cent.) if their pensionable emoluments exceed the equivalent of Swiss francs 6,500 per annum, and an additional ¼ per cent. (making a total of 5¾ per cent.) if their emoluments are the equivalent of Swiss francs 6,500 or less;

Resolves that, in continuation of the arrangement approved in previous years, the whole budgetary vote for 1964 in respect of the contributions of the Organisation to the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Fund should be paid to the Fund.

5. The Governing Body adopted this report on 1 June 1963 and therefore submits to the Conference the above resolution for adoption.

III. REVISED 1964 EXPENDITURE BUDGET: PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE GOVERNING BODY

6. Report II: Financial and Budgetary Questions contains the budget estimates for 1964 as proposed by the Governing Body at its 154th Session. In that report (paragraphs 21-27), the Conference was informed of the likelihood that the Governing Body would wish to submit further proposals regarding the 1964 budget.

7. At its 155th Session (May-June 1963) the Governing Body took a series of decisions involving the inclusion of additional amounts under the appropriate items of the draft 1964 budget. These decisions may be summarised as follows:

(a) Salary Scales of General Service Category Officials in Geneva.

Part A of Report II: Financial and Budgetary Questions contains in paragraph 23 a statement to the effect that developments regarding General Service category salaries in Geneva would be put before the Governing Body at its 155th Session. The following is a relevant extract from the first report of the Financial and Administrative Committee to the Governing Body at its 155th Session:

The Committee noted that, in accordance with the arrangements approved at the 152nd Session of the
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The Governing Body for the adjustment of General Service category salary scales in Geneva, and on the basis of the index of the Office Fédéral de l'Industrie, des Arts et Métiers et du Travail (O.F.I.A.M.T.) for October 1962, which had become available on 19 March 1963, the Director-General had approved with effect from 1 March 1963 an increase in salary scales of General Service category officials in Geneva amounting to 4.6 per cent. of the January 1962 net scales. In addition, extrapolated values for the index established for the months up to and including March 1964, on the basis of the average monthly increase in the index during the three years up to and including October 1962, indicated that a further increase of a similar amount in the General Service category salary scales for Geneva would fall due as from 1 September 1963.

The Governing Body adopted this report on 1 June 1963 and in so doing decided to add to the appropriate items in the draft 1964 budget the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Estimated cost U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Conference: salaries of temporary staff</td>
<td>6,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Salaries, wages and fees: established posts</td>
<td>182,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>Temporary assistance</td>
<td>14,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>Overtime and other allowances</td>
<td>3,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>Repatriation grants</td>
<td>1,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>Service benefit</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>United Nations Joint Staff Pensions Fund</td>
<td>28,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>Swiss Old-Age and Invalidity Insurance Schemes</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>Part-time Maintenance Personnel Retirement Scheme</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>Sickness Insurance Fund</td>
<td>1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>Other staff insurance</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>Cleaning and removal staff: salaries</td>
<td>11,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>254,489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(h) Review of Grading of General Service Category Staff.

Part A of Report II: Financial and Budgetary Questions contains in paragraph 22 information regarding a general review of the grading of General Service category staff in Geneva. Following this review, the Director-General submitted detailed proposals to the Financial and Administrative Committee at the 155th Session of the Governing Body. On 1 June 1963 the Governing Body, in adopting the second report of its Financial and Administrative Committee, approved these proposals and decided to add to the appropriate items of the draft 1964 budget: (a) provision for one post of Principal Member of Division as from 1 January 1964, at a cost of $8,930, to provide for the appointment of a Classification Officer; and (b) amounts to provide for the proposed regradings, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Additional cost of up-gradings, U.S. dollars</th>
<th>Savings from down-gradings, U.S. dollars</th>
<th>Net additional cost, U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Salaries: established posts</td>
<td>28,838</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>27,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>Overtime and other allowances</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund</td>
<td>4,562</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>Sickness Insurance Fund</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>Other staff insurance</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>Cleaning and removal staff</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,833</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>32,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schedule of established posts in the draft 1964 budget, revised in accordance with the above decisions, is as follows:
## SCHEDULE OF ESTABLISHED POSTS

### Abbreviations

- **P.C.D.** = Principal Chief of Division
- **C.D.** = Chief of Division
- **Cn.** = Counsellor
- **P.M.D.** = Principal Member of Division
- **M.D.** = Member of Division
- **A.M.D.** = Assistant Member of Division

### I. POSTS ON SUB-ITEM 7.00 (ESTABLISHED POSTS)

#### 1963 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director-General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director-General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Directors-General and Treasurer and Financial Comptroller</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Special Assistants to the Director-General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1964 Estimate</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>61,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Director-General's Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1964 Estimate</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>125,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Deputy Director-General's Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1964 Estimate</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65,453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Office for Co-ordination of Women's and Young Workers' Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1964 Estimate</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Secretaries to Assistant Directors-General, Treasurer and Financial Comptroller and Special Assistants to the Director-General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1964 Estimate</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>75,211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Legal Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1964 Estimate</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### International Organisations Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1964 Estimate</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63,263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.

* One post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.
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#### Liaison Office with the United Nations (New York)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Director of the Liaison Office (P.C.D.)**
2. **M.D.**
3. **A.M.D.**
4. **Clerks (G.4)**
5. **Stenographers (G.3)**
6. **Clerk (G.3)**
7. **Receptionist-Switchboard Operator (G.2)**

#### Liaison Office with United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America

1. **Director (Special Post—C.D.)**
2. **Secretary (G.5)**

#### Liaison Office with United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East

1. **Director (Special Post—C.D.)**
2. **Secretary (G.5)**

#### Official Relations Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief of Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Assistant Chief of Division (Cn.)**
2. **Assistant (Cn.)**
3. **P.M.D.**
4. **M.D.**
5. **A.M.D.**
6. **Clerk (G.6)**
7. **Secretaries (G.5)**
8. **Clerks (G.6)**
9. **Secretaries (G.5)**
10. **Stenographers (G.3)**

#### Employers' Relations Division

1. **Chief of Division**
2. **M.D.**
3. **Secretary (G.5)**

#### Workers' Relations Division

1. **Chief of Division**
2. **P.M.D.**
3. **M.D.**
4. **Secretary (G.5)**

#### International Labour Standards Division

1. **Chief of Division**
2. **Cn.**
3. **P.M.D.**
4. **M.D.**
5. **A.M.D.**
6. **Clerk-Secretary (G.7)**
7. **Secretary (G.5)**
8. **Clerks (G.5)**
9. **Secretaries (G.5)**
10. **Clerks (G.4)**
11. **Secretary (G.4)**
12. **Stenographer (G.3)**

#### Freedom of Association Unit

1. **Cn.**
2. **P.M.D.**
3. **M.D.**
4. **Secretary (G.4)**

#### Public Information Division

1. **Chief of Division**
2. **P.M.D.**
3. **M.D.**
4. **A.M.D.**
5. **Clerk (G.6)**
6. **Secretary (G.5)**
7. **Secretary (G.4)**
8. **Clerk (G.4)**
9. **Clerks (G.3)**
10. **Stenographer (G.3)**
11. **Clerks (G.2)**

---

1 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.
2 One post earmarked for downgrading to G.2.
### Appendix IV: Financial and Budgetary Questions

#### Administrative and General Services Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief of Division (Ch.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Internal Administration and Travel Section

| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Chief of the Section (M.D.) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| M.D.        |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| A.M.D.      |      |      |             |
| 2 2         |      |      |             |
| Clerks (G.7) |      |      |             |
| 2 2         |      |      |             |
| Clerks (G.6) |      |      |             |
| 4 1*        |      |      |             |
| Head Messenger (G.8) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Secretary (G.5) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Head Messenger (G.4) |      |      |             |
| 4 1         |      |      |             |
| Doorkeepers (G.4) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Clerk (G.4)  |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Assistant Head Messenger (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 4 1         |      |      |             |
| Doorkeepers (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 3 2         |      |      |             |
| Clerks (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 1 1*        |      |      |             |
| Head Chauffeur (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Motorcyclist (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 2 2         |      |      |             |
| Senior messengers (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 4 1         |      |      |             |
| Chauffeurs (G.2) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Motorcyclist (G.2) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Park-keeper (G.2) |      |      |             |
| 9 2         |      |      |             |
| Senior Messengers (G.2) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Messengers (G.2) |      |      |             |
| 15 11       |      |      |             |
| Messengers (G.1) |      |      |             |
| 3 1         |      |      |             |
| Nightwatchmen (G.1) |      |      |             |

(b) Maintenance Section

| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| P.M.D.     |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Clerk (G.7) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Electrician (G.6) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Carpenter (G.5) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Plumber (G.5) |      |      |             |
| 3 1         |      |      |             |
| Electricians (G.4) |      |      |             |
| 1 2         |      |      |             |
| Carpenters (G.4) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Secretary (G.4) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Gardener (G.4) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Gardener (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 2 2         |      |      |             |
| Clerks (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Carpenter (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Painter-plasterer (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Plumber (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Electrician (G.2) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Gardener (G.2) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Gardener (G.1) |      |      |             |

(c) Purchasing Section

| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| A.M.D.     |      |      |             |
| 2 2         |      |      |             |
| Clerks (G.6) |      |      |             |
| 3 1         |      |      |             |
| Clerks (G.5) |      |      |             |
| 4 5         |      |      |             |
| Clerks (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 2 1         |      |      |             |
| Clerks (G.2) |      |      |             |

(d) Stenographic Section

| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Chief of the Section (Special Post-P.2) |      |      |             |
| 3 3         |      |      |             |
| Supervisors (A.M.D.) |      |      |             |
| 9 2         |      |      |             |
| Verbatim Reporters (A.M.D.) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Supervisor (G.7) |      |      |             |
| 1 1         |      |      |             |
| Clerk (G.4)  |      |      |             |
| 5 17        |      |      |             |
| Senior Stenographers (G.4) |      |      |             |
| 63 55       |      |      |             |
| Stenographers (G.3) |      |      |             |
| 1 10        |      |      |             |
| Clerk (G.3)  |      |      |             |
| 26 16       |      |      |             |
| Copyists (G.2) |      |      |             |

1 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.
2 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.
3 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.2.
### Appendix IV: Financial and Budgetary Questions

#### Number of posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1964 Estimates U.S. dollars

- 1,29,293
- 78,608
- 106,856
- 226,986
- 228,388

---

**Duplicating Section**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of the Section (Special Post—P.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Duplicating Branch (G.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Duplicating Branch (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Offset Operator (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Multigraph Operator (G.4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset Operators (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multigraph Operators (G.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roneo Operators (G.2)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembler (G.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Registry and Despatch Section**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of the Section (Registrar) (M.D.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.7)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.6)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Switchboard Operator (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchboard Operators (G.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personnel Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Personnel (C.D.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographers (G.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget and Control Division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief of Division (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.7)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.6)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.5)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finance and Accounts Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of the Service (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants (G.5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. One post earmarked for downgrading to G.1.
2. One post earmarked for downgrading to G.2.
3. Posts earmarked for downgrading to G.3.
5. One post earmarked for downgrading to G.5.
Appendix IV: Financial and Budgetary Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</td>
<td>91,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pensions Fund Secretariat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Cn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clerk (G.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerks (G.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clerks (G.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48,007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editorial and Translation Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Chief of Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assistant Chief of Division (Cn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stenographers (G.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79,007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Editorial Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Chief of the Section (Cn.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Secretaries (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Translation Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Chief of the Section (Cn.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263,714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Legislative Series Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Chief of the Section (P.M.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Printing Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Chief of the Section (P.M.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assistant Chief of the Section (M.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senior Proofreaders (Special Post—P.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Proofreaders (Special Post—P.1-P.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proofreader (A.M.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Copyholders (G.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124,773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Sales Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Chief of the Section (Special Post—P.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerks (G.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) Distribution Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Chief of the Section (Special Post—P.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assistant Chief of the Section (G.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerks (G.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clerks (G.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clerks (G.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library and Periodicals Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Librarian (Cn.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant Librarians (A.M.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Library Assistants (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Secretaries (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerks (G.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clerks (G.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clerk (G.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134,885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.
### Appendix IV: Financial and Budgetary Questions

#### Economic Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Adviser (C.D.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Economic Adviser (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Management Development Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Statistical Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Statistician (C.D.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief of Division (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.6)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Manpower Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Manpower Planning and Organisation Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of the Section (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Vocational Training Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of the Section (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Migration Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of the Section (P.M.D.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Vocational Rehabilitation Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Documentation Branch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.
2 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.2.
### Appendix IV: Financial and Budgetary Questions

#### Co-operation and Small-Scale Industries Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief of Division (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128,464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Industrial Workers Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographers (G.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Industrial Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Section and Assistant Chief of the Division (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Conditions of Work Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of the Section (P.M.D.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61,687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Workers' Education Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Maritime Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41,914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Manual Workers Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Labour-Management Relations Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>1964 Estimates U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115,326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.5.
2 Post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.
## Rural Workers Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Indigenous and Tribal Populations Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of the Service (Cn.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Social Security Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief of Division (Cn.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>179,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks (G.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Occupational Safety and Health Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (G.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Non-Governmental Organisations Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographers (G.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Special Research and Reports Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Posts for Action as Regards Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of posts</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>174,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries (G.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk (G.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (G.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographers (G.3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Post earmarked for downgrading to G.4.
* One post earmarked for downgrading to G.5.
* Post earmarked for downgrading to G.5.
### Appendix IV : Financial and Budgetary Questions

#### Number of Posts 1963 1964

| Field Offices | | |
|----------------|------------------|
| **(a) Asian Field Office (Colombo)** | | |
| 1 1 Director (Special Post—C.D.) | | |
| 1 1 P.M.D. | | |
| 4 4 M.D. | 84,915 |
| 2 2 A.M.D. | | |
| 1 Secretary (G.5) | | |
| 3 3 Stenographers (G.3) | | |
| 1 1 Clerk (G.2) | | |
| **(b) Field Office for South America (Lima)** | | |
| 1 1 Director (Special Post—C.D.) | | |
| 1 1 P.M.D. | | |
| 3 3 M.D. | 69,365 |
| 2 2 A.M.D. | | |
| 1 1 Secretary (G.5) | | |
| 3 3 Stenographers (G.3) | | |
| 2 2 Clerks (G.2) | | |
| **(c) Near and Middle East Field Office (Istanbul)** | | |
| 1 1 Director (Special Post—C.D.) | | |
| 1 1 P.M.D. | | |
| 3 3 M.D. | | |
| 2 2 A.M.D. | | |
| 1 1 Secretary (G.5) | 74,174 |
| 1 1 Clerk (G.4) | | |
| 2 3 Stenographers (G.3) | | |
| 1 1 Clerk (G.2) | | |
| 1 1 Clerk (G.1) | | |
| **(d) Field Office for Central America, Mexico and the Caribbean (Mexico)** | | |
| 1 1 Director (Special Post—C.D.) | | |
| 1 1 P.M.D. | | |
| 2 2 M.D. | 58,666 |
| 1 1 A.M.D. | | |
| 1 1 Secretary (G.5) | | |
| 1 1 Clerk (G.4) | | |
| 2 1 Stenographers (G.3) | | |
| 1 1 Clerk (G.2) | | |
| **(e) West African Field Office (Lagos)** | | |
| 1 1 Director (Special Post—C.D.) | | |
| 1 1 P.M.D. | | |
| 3 3 M.D. | 58,544 |
| 1 1 A.M.D. | | |
| 1 1 Secretary (G.6) | | |
| 1 1 Stenographer (G.3) | | |
| 1 1 Clerk (G.2) | | |
| 1 1 Clerk (G.1) | | |
| **(f) East African Field Office (Dar-es-Salaam)** | | |
| 1 1 Director (Special Post—C.D.) | | |
| 1 1 P.M.D. | | |
| 1 2 M.D. | 59,931 |
| 1 1 A.M.D. | | |
| 1 1 Secretary (G.5) | | |
| 1 1 Stenographer (G.3) | | |
| 2 2 Clerks (G.2) | | |
| 1 1 Chauffeur (G.1) | | |
| 1 1 Messenger (G.1) | | |
| **Total** | 6,748,104 |

**Add :**

(a) Provision for future special increments and increases under articles 3.6, 3.7, 3.15, 6.3 and 6.5 of the Staff Regulations ........................................... 13,000

(b) Provision for additional cost of General Service category salaries resulting from increases granted as of 1 March and 1 September 1963 ........................................... 182,762

Grand total ........................................... 6,943,866

**Deduct :** Retardation of three months on recruitment for new posts ........................................... 38,000

Grand total ........................................... 6,905,866

At its 155th Session the Governing Body, on the proposal of its Financial and Administrative Committee, approved proposals regarding I.L.O. participation in the preparation of a report to the United Nations General Assembly on the role of the United Nations in training national technical personnel for the accelerated industrialisation of the developing countries. In approving these proposals, the Governing Body decided to add to the draft 1964 budget the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Estimate U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>Temporary assistance</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>Per diem allowances for short-term</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The Governing Body therefore recommends to the Conference that the amounts given under paragraph 7 above, totalling $307,303, be added to the appropriate items in the 1964 expenditure budget.

9. As a consequence of the above changes the gross expenditure budget for 1964 now recommended by the Governing Body amounts to $16,977,156 and the net expenditure budget to $16,388,799. The draft resolution for the adoption of the budget for the 46th financial period (1964) and for the allocation of expenses among the Members for 1964 appearing in paragraph 28 on page 3 of Report II: Financial and Budgetary Questions is therefore now amended to read as follows:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

In virtue of the Financial Regulations passes for the 46th financial period, ending 31 December 1964, the net budget of expenditure of the International Labour Organisation amounting to $16,388,799 and the net budget of income amounting to $16,388,799 and resolves that the budget of income from member States shall be allocated among them in accordance with the scale of contributions recommended by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

10. A summary of the proposed expenditure budget for 1964, as thus revised by the Governing Body on 1 June 1963, is reproduced on the next page.
### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED EXPENDITURE BUDGET FOR 1964

(As Adopted by the Governing Body on 8 March 1963 and Revised by the Governing Body on 1 June 1963)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I — ORDINARY BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ordinary Session of the Conference</td>
<td>271,021</td>
<td>343,666</td>
<td>358,741</td>
<td>377,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<td>117,148</td>
<td>109,836</td>
<td>123,148</td>
<td>131,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conferences, committees and other meetings</td>
<td>513,327</td>
<td>521,868</td>
<td>448,998</td>
<td>503,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of Part I</td>
<td>901,496</td>
<td>975,370</td>
<td>930,887</td>
<td>1,012,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Operational activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Operational activities</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>640,558</td>
<td>1,278,000</td>
<td>1,398,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Special programmes and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Special programmes and projects</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>104,432</td>
<td>114,500</td>
<td>199,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Contributions to extra-budgetary programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contributions to extra-budgetary programmes</td>
<td>212,500</td>
<td>212,861</td>
<td>340,500</td>
<td>469,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Staff and related costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salaries and allowances</td>
<td>6,074,890</td>
<td>7,019,550</td>
<td>7,516,078</td>
<td>8,415,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social security charges</td>
<td>1,151,049</td>
<td>1,235,748</td>
<td>1,380,038</td>
<td>1,486,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Travel and removal expenses</td>
<td>466,300</td>
<td>428,083</td>
<td>542,770</td>
<td>447,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other staff costs</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>87,919</td>
<td>80,085</td>
<td>87,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of Part I</td>
<td>7,732,239</td>
<td>8,771,800</td>
<td>9,518,971</td>
<td>10,436,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Travel on official business:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Travel on official business</td>
<td>163,650</td>
<td>147,439</td>
<td>155,800</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Representation and hospitality:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Representation and hospitality</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>41,698</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. External collaboration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>External collaboration</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>53,415</td>
<td>92,500</td>
<td>51,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. General office expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>General office expenses</td>
<td>570,823</td>
<td>644,550</td>
<td>641,353</td>
<td>743,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Library, printing and public information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>45,970</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>265,412</td>
<td>229,069</td>
<td>224,047</td>
<td>231,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Public information</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>75,967</td>
<td>82,500</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of Part I</td>
<td>387,412</td>
<td>350,966</td>
<td>352,547</td>
<td>367,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Capital expenditure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Land and buildings</td>
<td>75,791</td>
<td>76,983</td>
<td>57,791</td>
<td>80,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>107,500</td>
<td>157,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of Part I</td>
<td>191,791</td>
<td>184,483</td>
<td>215,291</td>
<td>212,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Branch offices and national correspondents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Branch offices</td>
<td>480,330</td>
<td>495,068</td>
<td>618,588</td>
<td>584,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>National correspondents</td>
<td>120,563</td>
<td>86,777</td>
<td>100,161</td>
<td>105,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of Part I</td>
<td>600,893</td>
<td>581,845</td>
<td>627,749</td>
<td>690,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Other charges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Inter-agency administrative co-ordination</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>18,061</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unpaid liabilities</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>External audit costs</td>
<td>10,234</td>
<td>10,942</td>
<td>10,234</td>
<td>13,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unforeseen expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of Part I</td>
<td>19,234</td>
<td>29,063</td>
<td>26,234</td>
<td>29,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of Part I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,618,838</td>
<td>12,737,507</td>
<td>14,356,132</td>
<td>15,812,806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART II — WORKING CAPITAL FUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Working Capital Fund</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>241,702</td>
<td>1,164,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Gross Expenditure Budget (Parts I and II)</td>
<td>11,618,838</td>
<td>12,737,507</td>
<td>14,577,834</td>
<td>16,977,156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See note on the following page.
### MISCELLANEOUS INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>1962 Budget</th>
<th>1962 Income</th>
<th>1963 Budget</th>
<th>1964 Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Receipts from Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance Special Account</td>
<td>383,400</td>
<td>383,400</td>
<td>444,000</td>
<td>453,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous receipts</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>129,984</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>503,400</td>
<td>523,384</td>
<td>571,000</td>
<td>588,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Net Expenditure Budget</td>
<td>11,115,438</td>
<td>12,214,123</td>
<td>14,006,834</td>
<td>16,388,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To facilitate comparison, these figures include amounts that were not charged to the 1962 budget, being met under supplementary credits by withdrawal from the Working Capital Fund, as authorised by the Governing Body. These amounts are:

#### Ordinary Session of the Conference:

1.00 Temporary staff: salaries and allowances .......................... 24,892
1.01 Temporary staff: travelling expenses ................................ 2,033
1.02 Accommodation, transport and supplies .......................... 522
1.03 Special printing .................................................. 34,033
1.04 Appeals Board ..................................................... 726

Sub-total .................................................. 64,468

#### Conference, Committees and Other Meetings:

3.44 Commission to examine the complaint filed by the Government of Ghana concerning the observance by Portugal of the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 .......................... 35,669
3.45 Commission to examine the complaint filed by the Government of Portugal concerning the observance by Liberia of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 .......................... 19,847

Sub-total .................................................. 48,516

#### Special Programmes and Projects:

5.03 Special projects .................................................................. 15,911

#### Salaries and Allowances:

7.00 Established posts .................................................................. 584,743
7.03 Temporary assistance ............................................................... 50,179
7.04 Post adjustments .................................................................. 161,496
7.05 Family allowances .................................................................. 70,900
7.07 Overtime and other allowances .............................................. 4,759
7.09 Education grants .................................................................. 15,000

Sub-total .................................................. 856,168

#### Social Security Charges:

8.02 United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund .............................. 62,871
8.05 Special Payments Fund ....................................................... 20,958
8.07 Sickness Insurance Fund ................................................... 8,543

Sub-total .................................................. 92,314

#### Other Staff Costs:

10.04 Special housing arrangements .............................................. 41,392

Sub-total .................................................. 41,392

Total .................................................. 1,118,669
INCOME BUDGET FOR 1964

11. At the 155th Session of the Governing Body (May-June 1963) the Allocations Committee submitted proposals to the Governing Body for recommendation to the Conference concerning the assessment of the contributions of new member States of the I.L.O. and concerning the scale of contributions to the budget for the year 1964.

12. These proposals are contained in the report of the Allocations Committee to the 155th Session of the Governing Body, the text of which is as follows:

REPORT OF THE ALLOCATIONS COMMITTEE

1. The Allocations Committee of the Governing Body met on 30 May 1963 under the chairmanship of Mr. S. W. Zaman (India).

Assessment of the Contributions of New Members of the International Labour Organisation

2. The Committee noted that the undermentioned States became members of the International Labour Organisation on the dates indicated below:

- Rwanda: 18 September 1962.
- Algeria: 19 October 1962.
- Trinidad and Tobago: 24 May 1963.

3. In giving consideration to the percentage assessments to be fixed in respect of the contributions of the above States, the Committee recalled that the general policy of the Governing Body in recent years had been to bring the I.L.O. scale of contributions more into line with the United Nations scale and, where possible, in conformity with this policy, the recent practice of the Committee with regard to the assessment of new member States had been to align their I.L.O. percentage with the percentage of their contribution to the United Nations budget for the year in which they joined the I.L.O., except that in cases where the United Nations assessment had been lower than 0.12 per cent. (the minimum rate in the I.L.O. scale), the contributions of the States concerned had been assessed at 0.12 per cent. of the I.L.O. budget.

4. It was noted that each of the above States was a member of the United Nations, but that the United Nations Committee on Contributions had not yet given consideration to the rate of assessment to be fixed for the contribution of each of them. However, on the basis of the most recently available economic data concerning Rwanda, Jamaica, Burundi, Uganda and Trinidad and Tobago respectively, compared with similar data relating to various other member States of the I.L.O., it had been estimated that an appropriate assessment of each of their contributions to the budget of the I.L.O. would be at the minimum rate of 0.12 per cent.

5. The Committee decided—

(a) to authorise its Chairman to consult on this basis with representatives of the Governments of Rwanda, Jamaica, Burundi, Uganda and Trinidad and Tobago respectively at the first suitable opportunity; and

(b) with a view to avoiding the need to hold a further meeting or meetings of the Committee during the forthcoming session of the International Labour Conference, to include assessments of 0.12 per cent. each for Rwanda, Jamaica, Burundi, Uganda and Trinidad and Tobago in the draft scale of assessments for 1964 that it had under consideration, on the understanding that, if the representatives of the Governments of any of those States should not agree to the proposed assessment of their State's contribution, the Chairman should report back to the Committee.

6. In the case of Algeria, the Committee noted that the Director-General was in possession of sufficiently up-to-date economic data to enable him to estimate the probable percentage assessment of Algeria's contribution to the budget of the United Nations. In the circumstances, and in the light of the recent policy and practice of the Committee and of the Governing Body as described in paragraph 3 above, the Committee decided to authorise its Chairman to consult with representatives of the Government of Algeria at the first suitable opportunity on the matter of an assessment of Algeria's contribution to the budget of the International Labour Organisation at the same percentage as that which will be determined at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly for the contribution of Algeria to the United Nations, except that if the United Nations assessment should be lower than 0.12 per cent. (the minimum rate in the I.L.O. scale of contributions), the contribution of Algeria should be assessed at the minimum rate of 0.12 per cent. of the budget of the International Labour Organisation.

7. Accordingly, the Committee recommends to the Governing Body that it recommend that, upon certification by the Chairman of the Allocations Committee that the representatives of the Government of Algeria are in agreement with the proposed basis of assessment of the contribution of Algeria, the Conference adopt the following resolution:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

Decides that the financial contribution of Algeria to the budget of expenses of the International Labour Organisation for the financial years 1962, 1963 and 1964 respectively shall be assessed at such rate as the Committee of the Conference shall determine at its session for the forthcoming year and that which will be determined at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly for the contribution of Algeria to the United Nations, except that if the United Nations assessment should be lower than 0.12 per cent. (the minimum rate in the I.L.O. scale of contributions), the contribution of Algeria shall be assessed at the minimum rate of 0.12 per cent. of the budget of the International Labour Organisation.

Scale of Contributions to the Budget for the Financial Year 1964

8. The Committee recalled that the scale of contributions for 1963 had been established on the basis of the 1962 scale, modified to take into account the increased membership in accordance with the following criteria:

(a) States previously assessed at the minimum to receive no relief;
(b) the States assessed at the maximum to receive no relief;
(c) States assessed at or below their United Nations assessment to receive no relief;
(d) the aggregate assessment of new member States to be divided among the remaining member States (i.e. those assessed at higher than their United Nations assessment) pro rata to the amounts by which their individual I.L.O. assessments exceed their United Nations assessment, the previous I.L.O. assessments of these States being reduced accordingly.

9. The Committee had before it a draft scale of assessment of contributions for 1964 prepared on the basis of the same principles. This draft scale included assessments of the contributions of the new member States of Rwanda, Jamaica, Burundi, Uganda and Trinidad and Tobago at the rate of 0.12 per cent. of the budget of the International Labour Organisation in each case, in accordance with the Committee's decision recorded in paragraph 5 above.

10. The Uruguayan Government member stated that several member States, mainly economically less developed States, had at the present time fallen so far behind in the payment of their contributions to the Organisation as to have lost the right to vote in its various organs, and that there was a likelihood that some more States might soon find themselves in this unenviable situation.

11. The Allocations Committee should bear in mind that the present situation stemmed from the grave financial difficulties that many of the less developed States in particular were having to combat. These difficulties were in many cases due to circumstances entirely beyond the control of the States themselves, especially in the case of countries whose economies were almost entirely dependent on the fluctuations of world commodity markets and terms of trade.

1 Documenta G.B. 151/11/28, paras. 15, 16 and 19 and G.B. 152/11/28, paras. 5 and 6.
12. Such States were finding it increasingly difficult to meet their external debts, including their contributions to the various international organisations. While not questioning the legalities of the situation, he felt that the I.L.O. ought not in equity to deprive its members who were in such difficult financial situations of the right to vote in the organs of the Organisation.

13. He pointed out that the individual assessments of the contributions of many member States of the I.L.O. differed from their percentage assessments in the United Nations scale of contributions. The United Nations scale was undoubtedly fairer than that of the I.L.O., as it was based on national income, total population, income per capita and so on. He expressed the hope that the Committee would be able to find a way of assessing the contributions of member States of the I.L.O. in accordance with the financial possibilities of the individual members, and that the I.L.O. scale of contributions could be adjusted accordingly. He emphasised the importance of this problem, especially to the less developed countries who had lost or were in danger of losing their right to vote in the Organisation.

14. The representative of the Director-General recalled that the rates of contribution of new member States were fixed by negotiation in agreement with the representatives of the governments of the States concerned. The present structure of the I.L.O. scale of contributions had been in existence for many years, and had been adjusted only on the admission of new member States in accordance with the criteria referred to in paragraph 8 above.

15. It was, of course, within the Committee's competence, if it wished to do so, to make a further comprehensive examination of the whole of the I.L.O. scale of contributions. It was also open to the Committee to propose changes in the criteria used at present to adjust the I.L.O. scale of contributions following the admission of new member States.

16. The existing criteria had, however, been in force for many years, and the minimum rate of assessment of 0.12 per cent. had, in effect, remained virtually unchanged since before the Second World War. At the time of the change-over from assessment according to a number of units to a percentage scale, in 1949, 0.12 per cent. had been equivalent to the minimum number of units payable by any member State at that time.

17. The French Government member said that this problem had been under study by the Committee on numerous occasions for many years past. During all these years the Committee had remained firmly attached to the principle that the I.L.O. scale of assessments should approach as nearly as possible to the United Nations scale. However, a number of practical considerations had stood in the way of bringing the I.L.O. scale completely into line with that of the United Nations. In the first place, the maximum rate in the I.L.O. scale was 25 per cent., compared with more than 32 per cent. in the United Nations scale. The Committee had on many occasions sought the agreement of the State assessed at the maximum rate, the United States, to increase its I.L.O. contribution to a rate nearer to its rate of assessment in the United Nations scale. The State concerned had not found this possible because of legislative and other difficulties. Furthermore, when the U.S.S.R. had been admitted to membership of the I.L.O., it had insisted on paying not more than 10 per cent., whereas its United Nations assessment was at a higher level. Finally, the Committee had felt it neither desirable nor appropriate that the assessment of any Member's contribution should be lower than the present minimum of 0.12 per cent.

18. These factors had constituted barriers in the way of aligning the I.L.O. scale of contributions with that of the United Nations. Within these barriers, the criteria by which the I.L.O. scale had been adjusted following the admission of new member States had brought this scale progressively more into line with that of the United Nations. In the present circumstances he felt that little more than this could be achieved.

19. The U.S.S.R. Government member acknowledged the difficulties facing the less developed countries in regard to the payment of their contributions, especially the difficulties arising from world terms of trade. However, the I.L.O. scale of contributions had been the subject of much study in the past by the Committee, and he felt that this study showed that it would be inappropriate to reopen the question at the present time, especially on the eve of the International Labour Conference, where all member States would have an opportunity to raise the question of the rate of their financial contribution to the Organisation, if they so desired. If this question were raised at a later stage, due account should be taken of the Allocations Committee's past work in studying the scale of contributions and of the conclusions that had been reached in the past.

20. The Uruguayan Government member reserved the right to raise this question again in the Governing Body and the Conference. He appreciated the fact that the situation was fraught with delicate issues, and that barriers stood in the way of the I.L.O.'s adopting a scale of contributions similar to that of the United Nations. Nevertheless, these barriers could not hide the truth of the matter. He expressed the hope that in the Governing Body and the Conference the view would prevail that the I.L.O. scale of contributions should be based on the same fair and equitable considerations that governed the United Nations scale.

21. The Committee recommends to the Governing Body that it recommend to the Conference approval of the scale of assessment of contributions for 1964 as set out in the Appendix, subject to such adjustments as might be necessary following the assessment of new member States.

Procedure for the Possible Continuation of the Work of the Allocations Committee during the Conference

22. It was recalled that in recent years circumstances had necessitated the holding of meetings of the Committee during the annual session of the International Labour Conference. Although at its present session the Committee has adopted a procedure (recorded in paragraph 5 above) which will, in all probability, avoid the need for it to hold a further meeting or meetings during the forthcoming session of the Conference, it is still possible, in certain circumstances referred to in paragraph 5 above, that the Chairman of the Committee might be required to report back to the Committee, which would necessitate the holding of a further meeting or meetings of the Committee during the Conference.

23. Accordingly, the Committee recommends to the Governing Body that it be authorised to continue its work if necessary after the meetings of the Governing Body on 1 June 1963 and to submit its reports direct to the Finance Committee of Government Representatives of the Conference.


(Signed) S. W. ZAMAN,
Chairman and Reporter.
13. On 1 June 1963 the Governing Body adopted the above report and the recommendations contained in paragraphs 7 and 21 thereof. These recommendations will become effective upon certification by the Chairman of the Allocations Committee that the representatives of the governments of each of the new member States are in agreement with the proposed percentage assessments of the contributions to the budget of the I.L.O. of their respective countries.
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#### (2) Statements Showing the Status of Collection of Annual Contributions.

**I. STATUS OF COLLECTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS ASSESSED FOR 1963 AS AT 5 JUNE 1963**

*(In United States dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (French alphabetical order)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Gross contribution for 1963</th>
<th>Amount paid in 1963</th>
<th>Balance due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Federal Republic of</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>607,287</td>
<td>303,430</td>
<td>303,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>52,226</td>
<td>52,226</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>197,497</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>196,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>259,127</td>
<td>129,564</td>
<td>129,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>49,024</td>
<td>49,024</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>191,804</td>
<td>191,804</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>63,031</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>63,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>191,804</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>141,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>26,013</td>
<td>26,013</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>474,832</td>
<td>474,832</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>47,625</td>
<td>37,637</td>
<td>9,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>285,740</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>285,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>63,226</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>44,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Loebolville)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>42,021</td>
<td>42,021</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>100,849</td>
<td>100,849</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>149,573</td>
<td>149,573</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>3,501,709</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,501,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>42,021</td>
<td>42,021</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>863,016</td>
<td>863,162</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>29,414</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>65,829</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>64,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>425,808</td>
<td>425,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>60,230</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>60,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>39,219</td>
<td>39,219</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>33,617</td>
<td>33,617</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>321,962</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>321,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>280,137</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>280,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>15,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>29,414</td>
<td>29,414</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy Republic</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>106,452</td>
<td>106,452</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>29,414</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>29,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>72,836</td>
<td>72,836</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>85,442</td>
<td>85,442</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>25,212</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>51,255</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>51,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>173,885</td>
<td>173,885</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>30,219</td>
<td>30,219</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>63,031</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>63,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>1,311,040</td>
<td>1,311,040</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 See note at the end of the table.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (French alphabetical order)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Gross contribution for 1963</th>
<th>Amount paid in 1963</th>
<th>Balance due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81. El Salvador</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Senegal</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Somalia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Sudan</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Republique of South Africa</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>110,654</td>
<td>110,654</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Sweden</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>226,911</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>226,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Switzerland</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>180,688</td>
<td>180,688</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Syria</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Tanganyika</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Chad</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>128,863</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>98,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Thailand</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>28,014</td>
<td>28,014</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Togo</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Tunisia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>16,808</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Turkey</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>99,440</td>
<td>99,449</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Ukraine</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>140,069</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>140,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1,400,684</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,400,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Uruguay</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>23,812</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Venezuela</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>70,034</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>70,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Viet-Nam</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>29,414</td>
<td>29,414</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Yugoslavia</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>56,027</td>
<td>56,027</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td><strong>14,066,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,362,614</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,644,220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Including credits allocated to States Members in respect of their shares of 1952, 1959 and 1960 cash balances and taken in deduction of their 1963 contributions under article 27 of the Financial Regulations.
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#### II. ARREARS OF CONTRIBUTIONS FOR YEARS PRIOR TO 1963 AS AT 5 JUNE 1963

*(In United States dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (French alphabetical order)</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total arrears due</th>
<th>Contributions 1961-62 *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>139,784</td>
<td>297,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>157,839</td>
<td>307,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>29,926</td>
<td>24,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>22,634</td>
<td>85,667 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>243,463</td>
<td>425,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>86,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>4,329</td>
<td>25,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>25,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>12,959</td>
<td>23,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>11,745-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>13,339</td>
<td>25,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>13,265</td>
<td>25,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>25,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>18,218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>22,825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>46,684</td>
<td>87,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>87,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>25,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>13,339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>11,755</td>
<td>25,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>25,059 $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1920-27</td>
<td>23,188</td>
<td>25,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1956-61</td>
<td>54,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>13,339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>25,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>35,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,030,289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figures in the last column are included in this table in pursuance of article 13, paragraph 4, of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, the text of which is as follows:

"A Member of the Organisation which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contribution to the Organisation shall have no vote in the Conference, in the Governing Body, in any committee, or in the elections of members of the Governing Body, if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years: Provided that the Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast by the delegates present permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member."

* Bolivia: Contributions due for the period ending 31 December 1957 ($35,057.57) payable in eight equal annual instalments of $4,382.201 commencing in 1959, in accordance with the arrangement approved by the International Labour Conference at its 40th Session (1957). The instalment for 1959 and an amount of $750 on account of the instalment due for 1960 have been paid.

* China: Contributions due for the period ending 31 December 1957 ($883,871.80) payable by annual instalments of $30,000, in accordance with the arrangement approved by the International Labour Conference at its 37th Session (1954). Instalments for 1956-63, amounting to $300,000, and an additional amount of $340,408 have been paid.

* It will be noted that amounts due from Bolivia, Panama and Paraguay respectively equal or exceed the amount of their contributions due for the preceding two full years, as shown in the right-hand column of the table, and that article 13, paragraph 4, of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation is therefore applicable.

* Hungary: Contributions due for the period ending 31 December 1953 ($145,740.93) payable in eight annual instalments of $18,217.62, commencing in 1955, in accordance with the arrangement approved by the International Labour Conference at its 37th Session (1954). Instalments for 1955-61 have been paid.

* Mauritania was admitted to membership on 20 June 1961.

* Paraguay: The International Labour Conference decided at its 45th Session (1961) that the arrears of contributions of $140,038 due from Paraguay in respect of the International Labour Organisation ($23,186) and other League of Nations organisations ($116,852) for the period prior to 1939 shall be cancelled, such cancellation to become effective on the payment by Paraguay of all its arrears of contributions due in respect of the more recent periods since 5 September 1956, the date when Paraguay rejoined the Organisation.
Report of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.1

1. The Finance Committee of Government Representatives met on 14 and 18 June 1963 with Mr. Mehta (India) as Chairman and Reporter and the Hon. Mr. Newland (Jamaica) as Vice-Chairman.

I. AUDITED ACCOUNTS FOR 1962

2. The Committee had before it the audited accounts for the 44th financial period (1962) and the reports thereon by Mr. Uno Brunskog, auditor. The Committee noted that the Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Financial and Administrative Committee, had taken note of the auditor’s reports and recommended that the Conference adopt the audited accounts for 1962. The Committee recommends, under article 26 of the Financial Regulations, that the Conference adopt the audited accounts for 1962.

II. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE CONTRIBUTIONS PAYABLE TO THE I.L.O. STAFF PENSIONS FUND IN 1964

3. The Committee had before it a resolution submitted by the Governing Body on the recommendation of the Administrative Board of the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Fund, under article 7 of the Regulations of the Staff Pensions Fund, concerning the contributions payable to the Fund in 1964. The Committee recommends the adoption by the Conference of this resolution, which is in the following terms:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

Decides that the contribution of the International Labour Organisation to the Pensions Fund for 1964 under article 7, paragraph (a), of the Staff Pensions Regulations shall be 14 per cent. of the pensionable emoluments of the members of the Fund;

Decides that, for the year 1964, the officials mentioned in article 4, paragraph (a) (i), of the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Regulations shall continue to pay an additional 1 per cent. of their pensionable emoluments (making a total of 17½ per cent.) and those mentioned in article 4, paragraph (a) (ii), an additional ¾ per cent. (making a total of 5¾ per cent.) if their pensionable emoluments exceed the equivalent of Swiss francs 6,500 per annum, and an additional ¼ per cent. (making a total of 5¼ per cent.) if their emoluments are the equivalent of Swiss francs 6,500 or more;

Resolves that, in continuation of the arrangement approved in previous years, the whole budgetary vote for 1964 in respect of the contributions of the Organisation to the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Fund should be paid to the Fund.

III. RESOLUTION CONCERNING APPOINTMENT TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF THE I.L.O. STAFF PENSIONS FUND AND THE I.L.O. STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE (UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION FUND)2

4. The Committee had before it a resolution submitted by the Governing Body concerning an appointment to the Administrative Board of the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Fund and the I.L.O. Staff Pension Committee (United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund). The Committee recommends the adoption by the Conference of this resolution, which is in the following terms:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

Appoints to the Administrative Board of the I.L.O. Staff Pensions Fund for the period until 8 October 1965, and to the I.L.O. Staff Pension Committee (United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund) for the period until 10 July 1965, as a substitute member of these bodies, Mr. A. C. M. van de Ven (Netherlands), Director-General for Social Provisions and Industrial Relations in the Netherlands Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health.

IV. RESOLUTION CONCERNING APPOINTMENT TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL OF THE I.L.O.1

5. The Committee had before it a resolution submitted by the Governing Body concerning the extension of the term of office of two judges of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organisation. The Committee recommends the adoption by the Conference of this resolution, which is in the following terms:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

In accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal, extends the term of office of Lord Forster of Harraby, K.B.E., Q.C. (United Kingdom), and of Mr. André Griesel (Switzerland) as judges of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organisation for a further period of three years.

V. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 29, PARAGRAPH 2, AND ARTICLE 18, PARAGRAPH 3, OF THE FINANCIAL REGULATIONS3

6. The Committee had before it proposals submitted by the Governing Body to amend articles 29, paragraph 2, and 18, paragraph 3, of the Financial Regulations. The amendment to article 29, paragraph 2, had been proposed because the existing provisions of this article had in many cases proved too rigid to permit the use of satisfactory purchasing procedures, due to the great increase in recent years in the volume of purchasing operations under the regular budget and other programmes. The amendment to article 18, paragraph 3, had been proposed as part of a series of efforts that had been made recently, in the interest of economy, to reduce the volume of documentation submitted to the Financial and Administrative Committee of the Governing Body.

7. The Committee recommends that the Conference adopt the following resolutions:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

Decides to amend article 29, paragraph 2, of the Financial Regulations to read as follows:

"2. Whenever a single purchase of goods or services is likely to exceed U.S. $2,500 or the equivalent, tenders from at least three suppliers shall be sought by invitations to bid or by newspaper advertisement, except where the Director-General decides in the interest of the Organisation to waive this requirement."

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

1 See Second Part, p. 242.
2 See Appendix XIII, p. 639.
3 See Appendix XIII, p. 640.
Decides to amend article 18, paragraph 3, of the Financial Regulations by deleting the following sentence:

"All payments under the above provisions of this paragraph shall be reported by the Director-General to the Governing Body."

VI. EXPENDITURE BUDGET FOR 1964

8. The Committee had before it (a) Report II: Financial and Budgetary Questions, containing the budget estimates for 1964 as originally proposed by the Governing Body; and (b) the revised budgetary estimates submitted by the Governing Body.1

9. The Director-General made a statement introducing the budgetary estimates for 1964. This was followed by statements made by members of a tripartite delegation from the Governing Body who attended the meeting in accordance with the Financial Regulations.

10. The Director-General said that the revised gross expenditure budget that had been recommended by the Governing Body amounted to approximately $16,977,000; this was an increase of some $2,400,000, or just under 16½ per cent., over the 1963 budget. However, almost 6½ per cent. of this increase was required to reimburse the withdrawal made in 1962 from the Working Capital Fund to finance supplementary expenditure authorised by the Governing Body and incurred during that year; approximately 6 per cent. of the increase resulted from automatic and statutory increases in staff costs and other increases involved in running the Office at its present level. Thus the true net increase available for meetings, operational activities and other programme activities and for a limited number of new staff posts amounted to approximately $640,000, which was less than 4½ per cent. over the total 1963 budget.

11. While he believed that this increase was insufficient to cope with the huge requirements which faced the Organisation and which were highlighted in his Report to the present Conference, the Director-General had recognised, as had the Governing Body, that it might be unreasonable to go further until the guide lines for the future action and structure of the Organisation had been set. He hoped that these guide lines would emerge from the Conference discussion on his Report and from his and the Governing Body's consideration of the recommendations of the outside experts who had examined the organisation and structure of the Office.

12. Thus the 1964 budget was one of stock-taking, pending the outcome of the major reviews that might be expected to bring substantial shifts in emphasis. At the same time the budget presentation had been changed in an attempt to make it easier to examine and analyse, and in response to comments that had been made by members of the Committee last year.

13. The one entirely new programme provided for in the budget was for activities in the field of automation and technological change, the cost of which in 1964 had been estimated at $74,000 spread over various items of the budget. This amount would provide, for the first steps towards improving the function of the I.L.O. as an international clearing-house for information on new legislation, operational measures, research and other experience in this field; and also for convening a meeting of experts on problems of improving methods of foreseeing and analysing the impact of automation, with a view to enabling governments, industry and trade unions to plan effective measures in sufficient time. The financial provision for work in this field in subsequent years would have to be based on the programme of action for long-term needs that might be expected to emerge following the present discussion at the Conference.

14. Increases of $70,000 and $50,000 respectively were proposed for Labour and Social Assistance and the Workers' Education Programme. For both of these programmes the demand in recent years had exceeded the funds available; some increase was indispensable even to maintain the programmes at present levels, taking into account the needs of new member States. No increase was proposed in the credits for the Management Development and Rural Programmes.

15. In the light of the hope expressed by the Conference last year that it would be possible to consider an increase in the level of the Career Trainee Programme, he had just reported to the Governing Body on the first year of operation of this programme and on possible future developments. The Governing Body had endorsed his view that the programme should be considered primarily as a means of recruitment to established posts in the Professional category from countries with no nationals, or not enough nationals, on the staff. In the light of this approach the Governing Body has asked him to consider, in connection with the 1965 budget, provision for arrangements which would enable him to offer all suitable trainees long-term appointments on completion of their one-year appointments as trainees, even if at that time a suitable post was not available in one of the divisions of the Office. Such arrangements would provide a good basis for continuing the programme. In the meantime, the 1963-64 arrangements provided for a number of new career traineeships from French-speaking countries in Africa.

16. At its last session the Governing Body has taken a number of decisions involving additions to the draft budget contained in Report II. First, it had approved the regradings that had been proposed by the Director-General following the general review of the grading of General Service staff in Geneva. One hundred and sixty-five upgradings and 34 downgradings had been proposed, leaving 287 posts unchanged. These regradings represented a major step towards a satisfactory outcome of the thorough review of General Service conditions of employment which had been carried out over the past two years. He believed that the Governing Body had now established both a grading structure and a salary system for this category of staff in Geneva which would provide a sound working instrument for many years to come. The Governing Body had also proposed the estab-

1 See point 1 of this Appendix, p. 482.
lishment of a post of Classification Officer, which would be a key element in the necessary continuing machinery for the classification of new posts and for reviewing the grading of existing posts when circumstances warranted it.

17. The second item involving an increase was the rise in General Service category salaries, which was occurring in two stages in 1963 as a result of applying the system approved by the Governing Body based on the Swiss Federal Index of Wages. The total increase in these salaries in 1963 amounted to 9.2 per cent. and the additional cost in 1964 had been estimated at $254,489. Finally, $11,000 had been added to the draft 1964 budget to meet the expense that would arise in that year in preparing the I.L.O.'s contribution to a comprehensive report to the United Nations General Assembly on the role of the United Nations in training national technical personnel for the accelerated industrialisation of developing countries.

18. The Governing Body had also considered what continuing arrangements should be made for the International Vocational Training Information and Research Centre, which had been established in 1961 in conjunction with the Council of Europe and in collaboration with other European regional organisations. Members of the Governing Body had endorsed the Director-General's view that the Centre should be continued and that it should become a truly world-wide operation for which the I.L.O. would be responsible. However, pending further examination of the exact scope of the technical activities of the Centre and the financial and administrative arrangements that would be most appropriate for it, especially in the light of the present over-all review of programmes and structure, the Governing Body had proposed that the financial arrangements for the Centre in 1964 should be finally determined only at its November 1963 Session. In the meantime the provision in the draft 1964 budget was limited to the payment of a cash contribution by the I.L.O. of $25,000. This amount would fall far short of what would be needed even to maintain activities at the present level. Any additional funds that the I.L.O. had to find would therefore have to be provided by way of a supplementary credit after the adoption of the budget.

19. Referring to the cash position of the Organisation, the Director-General said that, notwithstanding his appeal to the Conference last year for prompt payment of contributions and an early liquidation of outstanding arrears, in the first quarter of 1963 only 20.4 per cent. of the current year's contributions had been received. Early in 1963 no fewer than ten member States had been in arrears to such an extent that they had lost the right to vote in any of the I.L.O. organs. Fortunately, payments made subsequently had reduced the number of States without voting rights to two; but even so, no fewer than 16 member States still owed arrears of contributions. The total amount outstanding was $1,005,230.

20. It was hardly surprising, with outstanding arrears at these levels, and in view of the fact that the Governing Body found it necessary from time to time to authorise substantial expenditure over and above the budget to meet urgent needs, that the external auditor should have raised in his 1962 report the question of a review of the Working Capital Fund. The auditor had suggested, in order to safeguard the Organisation and particularly in view of the steady increase in the budget level, that there was an urgent need to increase the level of the Working Capital Fund to a figure more commensurate with the size of the budget. This matter had been mentioned in the Financial and Administrative Committee of the Governing Body in relation to the problem of financing unforeseen expenditure, and the Director-General had agreed to review the whole matter and make proposals to the Governing Body at an early session.

21. The Director-General next referred to the increasing number of activities that the Organisation was fortunately able to carry on without increasing the assessed contributions of its member States. First, there was the great volume of technical assistance work carried out under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, the Special Fund and Trust Funds. The Organisation's total resources in 1964 would be not far short of $30 million. Approximately $14 million would be spent by the Organisation in 1964 on direct technical assistance, and $12 million of this would come from the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. Much of this technical assistance was possible only because the regular budget provided the necessary support and direction from Headquarters, which was the only means of ensuring that the requesting governments would get the best possible assistance from the extra-budgetary funds available for technical assistance.

22. A significant new venture being developed outside the regular budget was the establishment of the International Centre for Advanced Training in Turin. At its last session the Governing Body had unanimously adopted the statute of this Centre, which would enable the I.L.O. to provide for people at various levels, up to and including management, the type of advanced training which was not available in their own countries. Because this was the first attempt ever to create a truly international training centre of this kind, the Governing Body had given much energy and thought to elaborating the details of the organisation and programmes of the Centre and of its relationship to the I.L.O. The Director-General and his colleagues would spare no effort to make this Centre a success in every way.

23. As regards finance, it was intended that the Centre should be financed entirely by voluntary contributions. Its operations would not start until cash contributions sufficient to cover six months' activity had been received and until firm commitments of funds to cover the first four years' operations had been made. The Italian Government had already made available a first-class site and buildings in Turin and had pledged very generous contributions in cash. After allowing for these, the initial cash needs had been estimated at an average of rather more than a million dollars a year for the first four years of operations. The
Director-General expressed the hope that the governments of all member States would very soon be able to pledge contributions to the first four years' operations.

24. Turning to the question of accommodation for the Headquarters staff in Geneva, the Director-General said that the unavoidable delay in the purchase of the property "Les Fougères", authorised by the Governing Body and the Conference in 1958 but only recently completed, had given rise to acute accommodation problems. The Governing Body had now agreed that plans should be drawn up rapidly for an extension to the present building which would cover foreseeable needs for many years ahead. Even so, several years would elapse before this extension could be completed. Two problems therefore had to be faced: first, the need to find long-term finance to cover the capital costs of a major extension; and second, the need for substantially increased payments for temporary accommodation until the extension was completed. Some reflection of the latter need was found in the draft 1964 budget, and further provisions would no doubt have to be made in the budgets for later years.

25. Much discussion had taken place in recent years on the subject of co-ordination. There was a special item in the I.L.O. budget for inter-agency administrative co-ordination. In his Report to the present Conference the Director-General had pointed out that the world-wide development of technical assistance programmes in all fields of life and work had gradually brought about a completely new concept of co-ordination in the United Nations family of organisations. While each agency retained its own identity and had a definite and clear responsibility for its own policy, representatives of the major organisations worked side by side, co-operated with one another, carried out joint missions, made joint recommendations, advised one another and developed common programmes in every region and in nearly every country. Furthermore, these efforts had to be geared to those made by the governments in each country; extreme care had to be taken to avoid duplication with bilateral aid programmes and the work of regional organisations in the same or related fields. The occasions on which the I.L.O. collaborated with regional organisations, or carried out projects specifically at their request, were now so numerous as to be almost commonplace; yet this situation was in itself a remarkable development that was quite new in world history.

26. In this connection the Director-General welcomed particularly the new Organisation for African Unity; he looked forward to a period of most fruitful collaboration with this new body. Such collaboration would be the logical consequence of the extensive development of the I.L.O.'s work in Africa over the past few years.

27. In conclusion the Director-General said that the net budget of expenditure and income proposed by the Governing Body for 1964 amounted $16,388,799. The Conference was being asked to adopt it at a time when changes of historical importance in the strategy and tactics, the structure and organisation of the I.L.O. were under discussion. While it was too soon to speculate on the possible budgetary implications of these changes he believed that the existing structure and the resources provided for in the 1964 budget would provide a firm foundation for at least a beginning with the new programmes and the new approaches that would emerge from the discussions of the present Conference.

28. Mr. Parodi, the Chairman of the Governing Body, said that the Governing Body had endorsed the Director-General's view that the minimum expansion in the activities of the Organisation provided for in the 1964 draft budget was appropriate, and that the Conference debate on the Director-General's Report and the receipt of the report of the independent management consultants who had examined the organisation and structure of the Office. The Governing Body had welcomed the inclusion in the draft budget of financial provision to cover the beginning of the I.L.O.'s work in the field of automation and technological change, which was the only entirely new activity envisaged for 1964. He expressed the hope that the Committee would be able to endorse the almost unanimous opinion of the Governing Body that the draft 1964 budget was both sound and realistic in the light of the major reviews of the Organisation's work and structure now in progress.

29. Mr. Waline, Employers' Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body, said that the Employers in the Governing Body supported the budget as amended in the Financial and Administrative Committee. The Employers members shared the Director-General's concern at the high level of arrears of contributions; although these had recently been reduced, they remained a serious problem. The Employer members, for whom he spoke, unanimously supported the 1964 budget: there were two particular reasons for this support—first, they felt that the regular budget provided the basis for the operations and activities which they considered to be of special importance to many of the developing countries; second, as an objective survey of the Office had been carried out by outside experts they felt that they could hope for practical conclusions which would lead to greater efficiency and improved organisation, thus enabling the I.L.O. to keep to a minimum the heavy burden on the financial resources of its member countries and their taxpayers.

30. Mr. Collison, who spoke on behalf of the Workers' Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body, said that the budget was the result of tripartite consideration and discussions in the Financial and Administrative Committee and the Governing Body. He was happy to note that recently the three groups had appeared to come closer in their approach to the principles that should underlie the budget and their discussions had become more concerned with details of particular activities for which the budget was to provide. The Worker members regretted that the International Institute for Labour Studies, which they wholeheartedly supported, had not received greater support from outside the budget and that it had thus
become necessary to provide a high subsidy for it in the regular budget. As regards the proposed Turin Centre, they fully supported this but were anxious that it should never become a burden on the regular budget; they hoped that the governments who had voted against it would now make generous contributions to it. He paid tribute to the broad vision and generosity of the Italian authorities which had made this Centre possible.

31. While the Worker members felt that standard-setting continued to be of great importance, they welcomed the increased emphasis on operational activities, as they felt the I.L.O. was the best body to give practical aid to the developing countries. The new arrangements for the Career Trainee Programme should assist in obtaining more staff from areas which had so far sent few of their nationals to work in the I.L.O.; he was confident that competent and able staff could be found from such areas. He noted that much of the increase was due to past decisions of the Conference and the Governing Body; part of it was to provide for salary increases which were necessary to prevent a feeling of frustration on the part of the staff. The increase of $640,000 in programme activities was small. The Workers shared the Director-General's view that this was acceptable in a stocktaking year, but could not support the proposed allocation of 20 per cent of the total 1962 budget, and the proposal that the Governing Body be compelled to object to the Governing Body's authorising increases in programme activities which were necessary to prevent a feeling of frustration on the part of the staff. The increase of $640,000 in programme activities was small. The Workers shared the Director-General's view that this was acceptable in a stocktaking year, but could not support the proposed allocation of 20 per cent of the total 1962 budget, and the proposal that the Governing Body be compelled to object to the Governing Body's authorising increases in programme activities which were necessary to prevent a feeling of frustration on the part of the staff. The increase of $640,000 in programme activities was small.

32. The representative of Bulgaria referred to the constant increase in the budget which had occurred in recent years and said that the 1964 budget showed an increase of 76 per cent. over that for 1961; this was disquieting. He wondered whether the I.L.O.'s activities had increased commensurately. He thought that most of the increase related to staff and administrative costs, leaving too little for a true increase in the activities of the Organisation. This situation should be corrected through increased efficiency and concentration on objectives of high priority. His Government was not opposed to a normal budgetary development, but could not support the proposed increase of some 16 per cent. for 1964.

33. His Government had indicated in the past how increases in work output could be achieved by the I.L.O. without unduly increasing the budget; for example, the fullest possible use should be made of facilities available to the Office from national organisations —this would reduce the present heavy travel costs. Finally, not only the Governing Body, but also the Finance Committee of Government Representatives, should be given the opportunity to make a thorough examination of the draft budget.

34. The Committee then adopted each of the budget items numbered 1 to 25 in the amounts corresponding to those listed in the extreme right-hand column on page 494 above.

Item 26: Working Capital Fund

35. The representative of the U.S.S.R. said that his Government had objected both in the Governing Body and at the Conference last year to the misuse of the Working Capital Fund. Withdrawals from the Working Capital Fund in order to finance expenditure not foreseen at the time the annual budget was drawn up had become a regular practice in the I.L.O. This was harmful, and contrary to the provisions of article 19, paragraph 1, of the Financial Regulations, which stipulated that the purpose of the Working Capital Fund was to finance budgetary appropriations pending receipt of contributions or other income, and in exceptional circumstances to meet contingencies and emergencies. The Fund was clearly not being used in accordance with the above stipulations.

36. The fact had to be faced that the Members of the Organisation were now being called upon to pay some $1,160,000 through the 1964 budget in reimbursement of the withdrawal made in 1962 from the Working Capital Fund to finance supplementary expenditure authorised for that year; this was 10 per cent. of the total 1962 budget. He was compelled to oppose the adoption of this item in the 1964 budget, to mark his Government's disapproval of this practice.

37. The representative of Belgium deplored the need to provide for such a large amount in the 1964 budget to cover the reimbursement of the amount withdrawn from the Working Capital Fund in 1962. He said that the strain on the Fund would be much less severe if the many countries in arrears in the payment of their contributions, including countries represented in the Governing Body, paid their contributions promptly.

38. The representative of Canada said that by far the greater part of the proposed credit under this item was to cover the supplementary expenditure voted by the Governing Body after the budget for 1962 had been approved, and which had not been foreseen when the budget had been established. His Government was also concerned at the size and frequency of these withdrawals from the Working Capital Fund. Of course, no reasonable person would object to the Governing Body's authorising supplementary expenditure to meet really unavoidable and urgent additional needs and activities. However, such expenditure should be financed as far as possible from savings and from transfers within the budget. He agreed with the view that it was dangerous to use the Working Capital Fund as a convenience rather than in emergencies only. However, the Director-General had said that the whole question of the Fund would be re-examined. The Canadian Government looked forward to having this question discussed by the Governing Body, and had requested that a paper be submitted to the Financial and Administrative Committee which would show the extent to which supplementary expenditures had been financed in recent years by (a) savings; (b) inter-item transfers; and (c) withdrawals from the Working Capital Fund. He hoped that the examination of this question would result in the setting up of a rational basis for financing expenditures unforeseen at the time when the budget was drawn up.
30. The representative of Italy wished to place on record that the only reason why his Government had not yet paid its 1963 contribution was because Italy's fiscal year ran from 1 July to 30 June, whereas the I.L.O.'s financial year began on 1 January. He hoped, however, that it would be possible in future to make arrangements for payment at an earlier stage in the year.

40. The representative of Byelorussia expressed his support of the views that had been put forward by the representatives of Bulgaria and the U.S.S.R.

41. The Committee then adopted the total gross expenditure budget (Parts I and II), amounting to $16,977,156, by 34 votes to 8, with no abstentions. It also adopted the total net expenditure budget, which, after deduction of the estimated miscellaneous income of $588,357, amounted to $16,388,799.

42. The representative of Venezuela expressed his Government's interest in two of the meetings which had been considered for 1964 but for which the draft budget contained no financial provision. He still hoped that it might later be found possible to arrange for these meetings to be held during 1964. First, he hoped that the Meeting of Experts on Employment Objectives in Economic Development could be held at an early date, thereby making it possible to take stock of the valuable experience gained in this field and to draw appropriate conclusions therefrom; second, his Government attached great importance to vocational training, and hoped that arrangements could be made in 1964 to hold the Technical Meeting on a Research Programme relating to Technical Change in Vocational Training.

VII. INCOME BUDGET FOR 1964

43. The Committee had before it the report of the Allocations Committee submitted to the 155th Session of the Governing Body and which had been adopted by the Governing Body on 1 June 1963. Annexed to the Allocations Committee's report was a draft scale of assessment of contributions to the budget for 1964, based on the 1963 scale as approved by the Conference, varied in accordance with the established criteria to take account of the inclusion in the scale of the proposed assessments of Rwanda, Jamaica, Burundi, Uganda, and Trinidad and Tobago.

44. The Committee noted that the Chairman of the Allocations Committee had consulted with representatives of the Governments of the above-mentioned new member States respectively, in accordance with the authorisation given by the Allocations Committee, and that the representatives of the Government of each of these States had signified that they were in agreement with the proposed percentage assessment (0.12 per cent. in each case) of the contributions to the budget of the I.L.O. of their respective countries.

45. The representative of Uruguay drew the Committee's attention to the arguments he had put forward in the Allocations Committee at the 155th Session of the Governing Body, as recorded in the report of the Allocations Committee, which was now before the Committee. While not wishing to expatiate on these views, he wished to emphasise with figures the fact that many of the developing countries found it difficult to meet their financial obligations not only to the I.L.O. but also to the other international organisations, because of their individual financial situations, which in most cases were governed by factors entirely beyond their own control.

46. The Latin American countries had suffered a loss of income of $7,000 million in the period 1955-61 as compared with the period 1950-54 owing to a deterioration in their balance of payments position, which, in turn, was due to unfavourable terms of trade. The President of the World Bank had recently stated that the combined foreign debts of 34 countries, representing 70 per cent. of the world's population, had more than doubled since 1954 while the value of their exports had increased by only 15 per cent. The difference between the import needs of these developing countries and the value of their anticipated receipts from exports for the next six or seven years had been estimated at some $15,000 million.

47. The assessments of the contributions of these countries in the I.L.O. scale should therefore be brought into line with the capacity of the countries concerned to pay, i.e. they should be aligned with their assessments in the United Nations scale. He realised that this was not a simple problem and that even wealthy countries had difficulties in this connection. Nevertheless, the Committee should take his request into account and ask the Governing Body to consider working out a more appropriate scale of contributions to the budget of the I.L.O., within the limits of the possibilities of the industrially highly developed countries.

48. The Committee adopted the scale of assessments for 1964 recommended by the Governing Body.

VIII. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ADOPTION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE 46TH FINANCIAL PERIOD (1964) AND THE ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES AMONG MEMBER STATES FOR 1964

49. The Committee then adopted by 34 votes to 8, with no abstentions the resolution set forth below for submission to the Conference for the adoption of the budget for the 46th financial period (1964) and for the allocation of expenses among member States for 1964:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

In virtue of the Financial Regulations, passed for the 46th financial period, ending 31 December 1964, the net budget of expenditure of the International Labour Organisation amounting to $16,388,799 and the net budget

1 See point 1 of this Appendix, p. 496.
2 See p. 498.
of income amounting to $16,388,799 and resolves that the budget of income from member States shall be allocated among them in accordance with the scale of contributions recommended by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

50. A table showing the expenditure and income budgets for 1964 is appended to this report. A statement showing the scale of assessments for 1964 and the gross and net contributions due from each member State in 1964 as recommended by the Committee for the approval of the Conference is also appended. A summary of the items contained in the proposed expenditure budget appears in the further proposals submitted by the Governing Body to the 47th Session of the Conference. 1

51. The representative of the U.S.S.R. said that he had been compelled to vote against the 1964 budget for three basic reasons. Firstly, his Government considered that the proposed increase in the budget was unjustifiably high. This increase of approximately 16 per cent., although less than that for 1963, could not be considered normal. His Government favoured stability in the budget, and had understood that this had been the Director-General's intention for 1964. This intention did not appear to have been carried through. In a stable budget the increase should be comparable with the rate of growth of national incomes throughout the world. In the light of the large increases in the I.L.O.'s 1962 and 1963 budgets, a reasonable increase for 1964 would have been of the order of 5 or 6 per cent., although even this was greater than the rise in total national incomes. The Director-General had pointed out that the true net increase to provide for additional programme activity amounted to only 4 1/2 per cent. over the budget for 1963. This confirmed the U.S.S.R. Government's view that the increase in the budget was not commensurate with the increase in the work output of the Office; it corresponded merely to the increase in administrative expenses.

52. The right approach to the budget was to determine what the member States could afford to pay and fix the budget accordingly, rather than to set the budget level independently of capacity to pay and then ask Members to accept it. In national administrations an increase in the volume of work did not automatically lead to an increase in the budget. The financing of new activities should be offset by reducing other less essential activities, by a redeployment of staff within the existing establishment and by making other savings on administrative expenses. There should be a considerable reduction in the staff of the I.L.O., and other savings should be made wherever this was possible without harming the work of the Organisation.

53. His Government supported the Director-General's recourse to independent surveys in order to seek more efficient and economical working within the Office, but it could not approve of the form of the current survey, nor of its being undertaken by a commercial firm of management consultants. The terms of reference for this survey had not been clearly defined and he had no illusions as to its outcome. The object of all such surveys in the I.L.O. should be clearly defined as being to seek ways of carrying out the tasks of the Office more effectively and more economically.

54. Secondly, he had voted against the budget for the reasons he had stated earlier in connection with the Working Capital Fund item.

55. Finally, as had been demonstrated by the recent Governing Body elections, a fair geographical distribution had not yet been achieved in the various organs of the I.L.O. In particular, not a single Employer or Worker member from the socialist countries had been elected to the new Governing Body. This was bound to affect the attitude of those countries towards the Organisation and its budget.

IX. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ASSESSMENT OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF ALGERIA TO THE BUDGET OF THE I.L.O. 1

56. The Committee had before it the report of theAllocations Committee 2 submitted to the 155th Session of the Governing Body, and which had been adopted by the Governing Body on 1 June 1963. Paragraph 7 of this report contained a recommendation by theAllocations Committee concerning the assessment of the contribution of Algeria to the budget of the I.L.O.

57. The Committee noted that the Chairman of theAllocations Committee had consulted with the representative of the Government of Algeria in accordance with the authorisation given by theAllocations Committee, and that the representative of the Government of Algeria had signified that he was in agreement with the proposed basis of assessment of the contribution of Algeria to the budget of the I.L.O., as set out in paragraph 6 of the aforementioned report of theAllocations Committee.

58. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the Conference adopt the following resolution:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

Decides that the financial contribution of Algeria to the budget of expenses of the International Labour Organisation for the financial years 1962, 1963 and 1964 respectively shall be assessed at the same percentage as that which will be determined at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly for the contribution of Algeria to the budget of the United Nations, except that if the United Nations assessment should be lower than 0.12 per cent. (the minimum rate in the I.L.O. scale of contributions), the contribution of Algeria shall be assessed at the minimum rate of 0.12 per cent. of the budget of the International Labour Organisation.

59. The representative of Canada drew the Committee's particular attention to the fact that it was proposed to align the percentage contribution of Algeria with her United Nations assessment. The question of the differences between the United Nations and I.L.O. scales

---

1 See Appendix XIII, p. 640.
2 See point 1 of this Appendix, p. 496.
had been discussed on numerous occasions. Despite the difficulties inherent in his question, the Committee should bear in mind the full discussion that had taken place in the Allocations Committee at the 155th Session of the Governing Body, and remember that the question was still open.

(Signed) R. L. MEHTA, Chairman and Reporter.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>U.S.$</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>U.S.$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I. Ordinary Budget</td>
<td>15,812,806</td>
<td><strong>Credits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balances at close of financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>years 1959 and 1960; proportion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be taken in deduction of contributions of States which contributed to balances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II. Working Capital Fund</td>
<td>1,164,350</td>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cash Receipts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Net contributions from Members</td>
<td>16,388,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Income from Members</td>
<td>16,388,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receipts from E.P.T.A. Special Account</td>
<td>453,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous receipts</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,977,156</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,977,156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STATEMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS DUE FROM MEMBERS FOR 1964

*In United States dollars*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (French alphabetical order)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Gross contribution</th>
<th>Credit in respect of 1959 and 1960 balance</th>
<th>Net contribution 1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>711,273</td>
<td></td>
<td>711,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>60,638</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>225,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>226,165</td>
<td></td>
<td>226,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>301,554</td>
<td></td>
<td>301,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>57,360</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>222,887</td>
<td></td>
<td>222,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>73,749</td>
<td></td>
<td>73,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>22,944</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>54,083</td>
<td></td>
<td>54,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>334,331</td>
<td></td>
<td>334,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>60,638</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Leopoldville)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>47,527</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>116,360</td>
<td></td>
<td>116,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>172,082</td>
<td></td>
<td>172,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>4,097,199</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,097,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>49,166</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>996,439</td>
<td></td>
<td>996,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>34,416</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>65,533</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>435,108</td>
<td></td>
<td>435,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>70,471</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>44,249</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>37,694</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>386,776</td>
<td></td>
<td>386,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>327,776</td>
<td></td>
<td>327,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>32,777</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy Republic</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>22,944</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>124,354</td>
<td></td>
<td>124,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>34,416</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>83,529</td>
<td></td>
<td>83,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>77,027</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>98,332</td>
<td></td>
<td>98,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STATEMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS DUE FROM MEMBERS FOR 1964 (concl.)

*(In United States dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (French alphabetical order)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Gross contribution</th>
<th>Credit in respect of 1959 and 1960 balance</th>
<th>Net contribution 1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77. Netherlands</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>186,832</td>
<td></td>
<td>186,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Peru</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>29,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Philippines</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>60,638</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Poland</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>203,221</td>
<td></td>
<td>203,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Portugal</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>44,249</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Rumania</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>72,110</td>
<td></td>
<td>72,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. United Kingdom</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>1,611,047</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,611,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Rwanda</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. El Salvador</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Senegal</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Somalia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Sudan</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>126,193</td>
<td></td>
<td>126,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Sweden</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>230,582</td>
<td></td>
<td>230,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Switzerland</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>209,498</td>
<td></td>
<td>209,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Syria</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Tanganika</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Chad</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>150,777</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Thailand</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>32,777</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Togo</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Tunisia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Turkey</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>113,082</td>
<td></td>
<td>113,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Ukraine</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>163,888</td>
<td></td>
<td>163,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1,638,880</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,638,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Uruguay</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>27,861</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Venezuela</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>81,344</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Viet-Nam</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>34,416</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Yugoslavia</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>65,555</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,388,799</strong></td>
<td><strong>555</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,388,244</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

Third Item on the Agenda: Information and Reports on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

Report of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.¹

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In accordance with article 7 of the Standing Orders the Conference set up a Committee to consider and report on item III of its agenda: "Information and Reports on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations." This Committee was composed of 101 members: 60 from the Government group, 11 from the Employers' group and 30 from the Workers' group. There were also 10 Government deputy members, 11 Employers' deputy members, 19 Workers' deputy members, and four Government observers, one Employers' observer and five Workers' observers. The increase in the membership of the Committee compared with last year is proof of the growing interest in the question of the application of Conventions and Recommendations. The Committee appointed its officers as follows:

Chairman: Mr. Chelly, Government member, Tunisia.

Vice-Chairmen: Mr. Poulsen, Employers' member, Denmark; and Mr. Cool, Workers' member, Belgium.

Reporter: Mr. Igbo, Government member, Nigeria.

In the absence of the Chairman and the Reporter, the Committee later elected Mr. Lagergren, Government member, Sweden, as Vice-Chairman and Acting Reporter.

The Committee held 17 sittings.

2. Following the decision of the Appeals Board to add two Employers' members to the voting section of the Committee, the Employers' Vice-Chairman stated that, in the view of the other Employers' members, these two members were not independent of their respective governments and could consequently not be considered as representing employers in the Committee, and that thereafter all statements made by the Employers' spokesman would be made only on behalf of those members who had been regularly appointed by the Employers' group. The two Employers' members concerned (Cuba, Czechoslovakia) stated that the decision of the Appeals Board should be accepted, that employers of socialist countries had the same rights as other employers and wanted to participate in the Committee and contribute to its work, and that they hoped such a problem would not arise in future. Certain Government members (Bulgaria, U.S.S.R.) stated that the decisions of the Appeals Board were binding and had to be observed by everyone, that the members designated by the Appeals Board should be included in the Employers' group of the Committee on an equal footing, and that the chairman of that group should speak in its name and indicate to the Committee any differences of opinion within the group.

3. In accordance with its terms of reference the Committee examined the following questions: reports on ratified Conventions supplied by Members in pursuance of article 22 of the Constitution; reports on the application of Conventions in non-metropolitan territories supplied by Members in pursuance of articles 22 and 35 of the Constitution; information on the submission to the competent authorities of the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the Conference at its 31st to 45th Sessions, supplied in pursuance of article 19 of the Constitution; reports on the application of Conventions in non-metropolitan territories supplied by Members in pursuance of articles 22 and 35 of the Constitution; information on the submission to the competent authorities of the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the Conference at its 31st to 45th Sessions, supplied in pursuance of article 19 of the Constitution.

II. GENERAL QUESTIONS

4. During its general discussion the Committee reviewed a number of questions regarding its work, which had been raised either by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, or by members of the present Committee. Two basic facts inspired these discussions. Firstly, the increase in the volume and complexity of the Committee's work; this results from the expanding membership of the I.L.O., which comes from the various regions of the world, and from the continued steep rise in the number of ratifications, which has more than doubled during the past decade and now approaches 2,800. Secondly, a general recognition of the essential place which the adoption and the implementation of international labour standards holds in the activities of the Organisation.

¹ See Second Part, p. 417.
Certain Government members stated, moreover, that the Committee's work also increases in complexity because the various Members of the Organisation have differing economic and social systems. All members of the Committee agreed that the machinery set up to supervise implementation should operate with a maximum of efficiency.

5. The Committee warmly welcomed, therefore, the initiative taken by the Committee of Experts to explore the possibilities open to it and to the Conference Committee in examining the practical application of Conventions. The Committee concurs with the Committee of Experts' view that there must be application not only in law but also in fact, and that both these aspects must be pursued with equal vigour, nationally and internationally. Speakers from the three groups strongly supported the principles which, according to the Committee of Experts, should govern the incorporation in internal law of standards contained in ratified Conventions: (a) ratification itself is not sufficient in the case of provisions which require special measures to make them effective; (b) special measures are, in any case, called for where a law adopted after ratification introduces standards contrary to those laid down in a ratified Convention; (c) special measures are also necessary to fix penalties for the violation of the standards laid down in a ratified Convention; (d) even when earlier legislation has been implicitly repealed or amended through the automatic incorporation of a ratified Convention in internal law, it is essential to bring the legislation nationally into harmony with the Convention so that all the persons concerned are aware of these amendments and any uncertainty as to the position in law is avoided.

6. The Committee endorses these principles, which spell out its own attitude on the matter, and which should help to promote the implementation of ratified standards in practice. It also agrees with the Committee of Experts on the need for further action by governments so as to facilitate an assessment of the extent of practical application, such as the inclusion in the reports of judicial decisions which have a significant bearing on the effect given to a ratified Convention, the existence of labour inspection services which are adequately staffed and independent and possess the necessary powers, and the collection and publication by these services of comparable statistical data on the scope and results of inspection. Full implementation of the Labour Inspection Convention, 1947 (No. 81), is of special value in this respect.

7. The Committee also noted with particular interest the importance which the Committee of Experts attaches, in its evaluation of practical application, to any observations made by employers' and workers' organisations on the fulfilment of the provisions of ratified Conventions in their countries. The Committee shares the surprise expressed by the Committee of Experts that so few such comments are received each year from these organisations. It was of course possible that the organisations had seen copies of the reports and had no comments to make. Several speakers from the three groups referred to the governments' obligation, under article 23, paragraph 2, of the I.L.O. Constitution, to communicate copies of their reports to the representative employers' and workers' organisations. Although this requirement formed an important aspect of the I.L.O.'s tripartite structure, many organisations were unaware of it, and the Workers' members in particular requested the assistance of the Office in informing trade union organisations in all countries of their rights and obligations in connection with the information and reports to be supplied by their governments on the effect given to I.L.O. standards. In addition to communicating observations to their governments the representatives of employers and workers in the Conference Committee are, of course, able to raise questions concerning the effect given to Conventions in their own countries and elsewhere. During the Committee's present session advantages were, in fact, taken of this possibility not only in cases where the Committee of Experts had made observations but also in a few other cases, in so far as the limited time available permitted such discussion.

8. The receipt of full particulars on practical application both from governments and from employers' and workers' organisations should enable the Committee of Experts and the Conference Committee to gain an increasingly complete and accurate picture of the implementation of ratified Conventions in law and in practice, wherever such Conventions are in force. The Committee is convinced, therefore, that the availability of such information constitutes a material contribution towards improving the work of supervision.

9. This same concern for improving the efficiency and quality of the work of supervision was cited by several members as motivating their proposals for defining more precisely the approach and procedure to be followed by the Committee of Experts. These members (Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Czechoslovak, Rumanian, Ukrainian and U.S.S.R. Government members and the Byelorussian and Ukrainian Workers' members) considered that the work of this Committee had become steadily more complicated and involved, that its reports revealed omissions and inaccuracies and were lacking in impartiality and objectivity, and that in the absence of clear criteria there existed a danger of discrimination against certain countries. They stated that many years had passed since 1947, when the powers of the Conference Committee and of the Conference Committee had been fixed. With the changes having occurred since then, these powers had proved to be too narrow; during the last three years, for example, the Conference Committee had had to occupy itself with questions which were outside its terms of reference, such as the elaboration and adoption of the Final Articles Revision Convention (No. 116), and the revision of the Convention (No. 82) concerning social policy (non-metropolitan territories). Thus, it was logical to want to define the competence of these Committees. For all these reasons these members suggested that the Committee of
Experts should, as all other permanent bodies, have definite rules which should determine the composition and organisation of the Committee. These rules should be adopted by the Conference as the supreme organ of the I.L.O., the International Labour Conference. The Iraqi Government member, while not questioning the independence or competence of the Committee of Experts, was also in favour of such rules. The U.S.S.R. Government member suggested that once a decision had been taken to adopt rules, it would be possible to agree on certain principles to be incorporated in them. These should, first of all, provide for an objective appraisal of formal and actual facts, and the Committee of Experts itself had already in 1957 referred to its spirit of independence and objectivity. A second proposed principle, also referred to by the Committee of Experts in its survey of freedom of association, but somewhat departed from since, was that the economic and social conditions of each country should be taken into consideration. Thirdly, as stated by the Committee of Experts the same year, all relevant legislation should be taken into account in examining the application of Conventions. Among the suggested principles was, moreover, the equitable representation in the Committee of Experts of different social and economic systems and geographic regions as well as the replacement of its members at regular intervals, as was the case in such other important international bodies as the International Court of Justice and the International Law Commission. In the view of the above-mentioned speakers, adoption of rules including these and possibly other points would facilitate the work of the Committee of Experts and of the Conference Committee and improve the supervision of the application of Conventions and Recommendations by ensuring equality of treatment for all countries. The Czechoslovak Government member also received support from the above members for his proposal that important surveys by the Committee of Experts, such as those on forced labour or discrimination, should be communicated in advance to the governments for comment before being submitted to the Conference.

10. A large number of Government members, the Employers' members and the great majority of the Workers' members did not agree on the need to establish such formal rules. They considered that these proposals were inspired by a lack of confidence in the Committee of Experts and they expressed their faith in the impartiality, objectivity and integrity of the Committee of Experts, a quasi-judicial body whose professional competence was beyond question. The Committee of Experts had functioned well for many years without any rules of procedure, nor had it asked for such rules, so that their imposition at this stage would be an indication of distrust. Objectivity could not be guaranteed by rules of procedure but depended upon the personal qualities of the members of the Committee; detailed rules might, on the contrary, lead to subjective appraisals. In any case, only the Governing Body or the Committee of Experts itself would be competent to adopt such rules. As to the additional tasks entrusted to the Conference Committee, they had been given to it against its wishes, by the Conference, at the suggestion of the Selection Committee. Several speakers pointed out that the Committee of Experts had its conclusions on all the documentation available and that their countries readily accepted its observations and acted on them. The Committee of Experts' report for 1963 had, in fact, been unanimous except for a dissenting opinion regarding freedom of association which was easy to explain; if certain members of the Committee of Experts had considered that their colleagues were not objective, they would certainly have said so. Economic and social conditions should be taken into account in formulating Conventions but not in their application and it was for the Conference Committee rather than for the Committee of Experts to have regard to non-judicial factors such as the political and economic circumstances prevailing in a given country. There had been a steady trend in recent years towards a more widespread representation of all regions and social systems in the Committee of Experts' membership which had therefore been far from static. Thus new members from Japan, Nigeria and the U.S.S.R. had participated in its most recent session and the Governing Body was well able to appoint other competent persons of high standing from all parts of the world. On the other hand, some continuity of membership was essential because it helped to ensure the Committee's long experience and the independence of its members. Finally, the suggestion for prior communication of the surveys of the Committee of Experts to governments only was objected to as a departure from the tripartite system. If employers' and workers' organisations were also to receive these surveys in advance, there would be a danger of serious delays in their submission to the Conference.

11. One Government member stated that the best way to improve the work of the Committee should be found. This was a question of efficiency and not objectivity. If one limited oneself to rejecting proposals which had been made, the work of the Committee would become more negative. Countriproposals should be made so that the best method of improving the structure and operations of the I.L.O. could be found.

12. The Employers' members considered that two specific measures might be taken to facilitate the work of supervision. First, as suggested in the Report of the Director-General, Conventions which had proved a failure should be removed from the International Labour Code. Secondly, members of technical committees undertaking the examination of new draft instruments should be informed in detail of the essential differences between Conventions and Recommendations and of the relevant obligations under these instruments and the Constitution.

13. The Committee had again before it, as in previous years, the tables originally presented by Sir John Forbes Watson showing the position of ratification and votes cast by Government delegates. These tables form Appendix V of the present report.
III. SPECIAL PROBLEMS

14. The Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations has, for a number of years now, included in its report a separate section informing the Conference, in as succinct a manner as possible, of cases where special problems appear to prevent member States from discharging certain of their obligations under the Constitution or under Conventions they have ratified. These cases deserve special mention, in the opinion of the Committee, because their disclosure by the supervision procedures of the I.L.O. has not succeeded so far in bringing them closer to a solution.

15. The criteria and methods adopted in selecting these special cases are as follows:

(a) the special list should only include cases where basic undertakings under the Constitution or under Conventions have been persistently disregarded;

(b) all governments at the Conference should have an opportunity to state what measures they had taken or intended to take in fulfilment of their obligations;

(c) the Committee should base its decision in each specific case on all the evidence made available in the reports or during the session.

16. In accordance with these principles the Committee enumerates below the cases it has decided to include in the special list:

A. The following countries failed to supply any reports on ratified Conventions, even in time for consideration by the Conference or failed for more than one year to supply any reports on the application of ratified Conventions in time for examination by the Committee of Experts: Bolivia, Central African Republic, Cuba, Dahomey, Ecuador, Iceland, Nicaragua, Panama, Somali, Sudan.

B. In the following cases first reports have been overdue for more than one year: Costa Rica: Accommodation of Crews Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 92); Weekly Rest (Commerce and Offices) Convention, 1957 (No. 108); Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention, 1957 (No. 107); Cuba: Plantations Convention, 1958 (No. 110); Panama: Maternity Protection Convention, 1919 (No. 3); Workmen’s Compensation (Agriculture) Convention, 1921 (No. 12); Workmen’s Compensation (Accidents) Convention, 1925 (No. 17); Hours of Work (Commerce and Offices) Convention, 1930 (No. 30); Workmen’s Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention (Revised), 1934 (No. 42); Underground Work (Women) Convention, 1935 (No. 45); Holidays with Pay Convention, 1936 (No. 52); Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87); Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100); United Arab Republic: Weekly Rest (Industry) Convention, 1921 (No. 14).

C. In the following cases no progress has been noted over a number of years towards the elimination of a serious breach in the application of one or several basic provisions of ratified Conventions: Albania: Night Work (Women) Convention, 1919 (No. 4); Chile: Right of Association (Agriculture) Convention, 1921 (No. 11); Mexico: Unemployment Indemnity (Shipwreck) Convention, 1920 (No. 8); Nicaragua: the Committee particularly regrets the Government’s repeated failure to reply to the observations of the Committee of Experts and to eliminate long-standing discrepancies between the national legislation and many ratified Conventions; Pakistan: Fee-Charging Employment Agencies Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 96).

D. During the past five years the following countries have supplied none of the reports required under article 19 of the Constitution: Jordan, Panama, Paraguay.

E. The following countries have not indicated that they have submitted to their competent national authorities the Conventions and Recommendations adopted since the 40th Session of the Conference (1957), from which session they were required to discharge this obligation, in accordance with article 19 of the Constitution: Nicaragua, Paraguay.

17. The Committee expresses the earnest hope that the Governments mentioned above will do all in their power to overcome the obstacles which have thus far prevented them from complying with certain of their obligations. The Committee feels confident that such progress will be possible because both the Committee of Experts and the present Committee have been able again this year to note with great satisfaction that in a number of cases, some of which had been included among the special cases last year, governments have been able to move towards full compliance with their obligations. The Committee hopes that its present session will lead to further progress in other cases.

18. The Committee must point out that it was unfortunately unable to discuss the observations of the Committee of Experts regarding States which were not represented at the present session of the Conference (Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Iceland, Paraguay, Somalia), or which abstained from participating further in the deliberations of this session (Central African Republic, Dahomey, Libya, Niger, United Arab Republic).

IV. REPORTS ON RATIFIED CONVENTIONS

19. To date, 1,121 detailed reports have been received, representing 85.6 per cent. of the 1,309 reports requested. It will, however, be noted from the tables appearing in Appendix I (C and D) that a number of these reports were received only after the Committee of Experts had met; the Committee decided to refer such late reports to the Committee of Experts for examination at its next session. The Committee recalls that all reports should be submitted by 15 October, and it views with concern that the percentage of reports received by this date, which was 83.4 per cent. last year, dropped further this year to 15.5 per cent. The Committee of Experts indicated in its
report that two-and-a-half months after the prescribed date, 35 States had not yet supplied even half the reports requested from them. The Committee wishes therefore to emphasise once again that, with the growing volume and complexity of the Committee of Experts' work, it is more essential than ever for the effective working of supervision of the application of Conventions that all reports be supplied in due time.

20. To enable the Committee of Experts and the Conference Committee to discharge their functions, it is equally important that, wherever observations or direct requests have been addressed to governments concerning the application of particular Conventions, their reports should reply fully to the points raised. Since 1961, at the request of the Committee of Experts, the International Labour Office has communicated with governments which had not taken account in their reports of comments made by the Committee of Experts or the Conference Committee, to request them to supply the necessary information. This year, such requests for further information had been addressed to 22 governments which had not replied to observations or direct requests; as a result half of them submitted additional information on the questions raised. It is a matter for regret that the other governments concerned did not respond to the Office's letters of reminder. The Committee considers that persistent failure by a government to deal fully in its reports with comments made by the Committee of Experts or by the present Committee impedes the work of supervision no less than failure to submit the reports.

21. The Committee noted from the general observations addressed to particular countries that, in a considerable number of cases, governments' reports did not contain information on practical application of ratified Conventions. In the light of the special study made by the Committee of Experts this year on this question and the explanations provided by it (see paragraphs 5 to 8 above), it is to be hoped that a considerably greater amount of such information will in future be given.

22. The Committee took note of further developments in the two matters which had been the subject of complaints under article 26 of the I.L.O. Constitution. As regards the first complaint, relating to the application by Portugal of the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105), the Committee of Experts is now following up, as recommended by the Commission which examined the complaint, the effect given to that Commission's recommendations. The Committee of Experts' comments on this case were considered by the Conference Committee; a summary of its discussion will be found in Appendix I B.

23. As regards the second complaint, relating to the application by Liberia of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), the Committee noted that the report of the Commission appointed for its examination had been presented in March 1963 and had been accepted by both parties (as in the case of the preceding Commission). In this case also the Committee of Experts and the Conference Committee will follow up the effect given to the Commission's recommendations.

24. As in previous years, the Committee based its examination of individual cases primarily on the observations contained in the report of the Committee of Experts, selecting for this purpose those cases which appeared to it, or had been represented to it, to be of the greatest importance and urgency.

25. It was recalled in this connection that, under the procedure for the two-yearly examination of reports, the Conference Committee, as well as the Committee of Experts, may decide, in important cases, that governments should be requested to supply a detailed report on a ratified Convention even in an off-year.

26. The Committee discussed the application of the freedom of association Conventions by certain countries (Albania, Byelorussia, Cuba, Hungary, Poland, Ukraine and U.S.S.R.). In this connection, the spokesman of the Workers' members recalled the discussions concerning these Conventions last year, which had clearly indicated that there was a difference of opinion concerning the manner in which the Conventions should be applied; one report of the Committee of Experts indicated that no new elements which would justify modification of the conclusions which the Committee had reached in previous years had been supplied by the governments concerned. Under these circumstances, and as the various members of the Committee who had opinions different from those of the representatives of the countries in question maintained their position, the Workers' group proposed that the discussion should not be renewed, that additional information concerning the Conventions should not be requested, and that it be indicated in the report that the Committee noted the absence of any new elements in this regard in the report of the Committee of Experts and in the position of the Governments concerned (Albania, Byelorussia, Cuba, Hungary, Poland, Ukraine and U.S.S.R.); it was not necessary, in this connection, to renew the discussion and to request additional information on the application of the said Conventions. The U.S.S.R. Government member stated that the Committee of Experts had this year made very short observations on the application by the U.S.S.R. of the Conventions on freedom of association; in its numerous reports submitted under article 22 of the Constitution, as well as in the statements of its Government representatives in recent years before the Committee, the Government had supplied detailed explanations concerning the questions raised by the Experts; it was regrettable that these explanations had not changed the opinion of those members of the Committee of Experts who considered that Soviet legislation was not in conformity with these Conventions. The U.S.S.R. Government maintained its point of view; the Experts' remarks were due to a non-objective interpretation of the legislation, which distorted it. In these conditions, and since all parties maintained their position, the Soviet delegation agreed with the proposal of the
Workers’ group not to reopen the debate and not to ask for additional information. The Employers’ members stated that there existed a fundamental difference of opinion concerning the interpretation of the manner in which these Conventions should be applied; the task of the present Committee was not to criticise economic and social systems, but to indicate whether the Conventions under consideration were applied; the Experts had indicated year after year that there was a difference of interpretation between them and the Soviet Government; this should be reported to the Conference. The proposal made by the Workers’ members was accepted by the Committee.

27. The information submitted to the Committee by governments, as well as any discussion thereon and conclusions reached by the Committee, are summarised in Appendix I (A and B). This part of the report thus provides a detailed picture of the Committee’s work: its procedures, the response of governments to observations, the difficulties which they may encounter, the help which the Committee’s discussions may provide in overcoming such difficulties, and the effects of the supervision machinery in the enforcement of standards in individual countries. In a number of the cases under discussion the government was not able at this stage to provide detailed information as to the measures which it proposed to adopt to eliminate particular discrepancies or on the time which would be required to take them. The Committee hopes that in all these cases the governments’ next reports will be able to indicate that the necessary measures to ensure the full application of the Convention have been taken.

V. APPLICATION OF CONVENTIONS IN NON-METROPOLITAN TERRITORIES

28. In accordance with its usual procedure the Committee devoted a part of its general discussion to questions concerning non-metropolitan territories, which were dealt with in paragraphs 75 to 82 of the Committee of Experts’ report.

Article 35 of the I.L.O. Constitution

29. The Workers’ members stated that article 35 of the Constitution, which deals with the application of Conventions ratified by member States to non-metropolitan territories for whose international relations they are responsible, favoured colonialism and involved discrimination against the workers of such territories. They considered that the article should be deleted from the Constitution. They welcomed that, as noted by the Committee of Experts in its report, this question was now under consideration by a special committee of the Governing Body, and expressed the hope that this Committee would finish its work rapidly and would recommend the deletion of article 35. These views were supported by most of the Government members who expressed a view on the subject (Byelorussia, Central African Republic, Cuba, Iraq, Mali, Ukraine, U.S.S.R.), some of whom pointed out that provisions based on article 35 were contained in certain Conventions (such as the Conventions on freedom of association—Nos. 11, 87 and 98—and the discrimination Convention (No. 111)), and should likewise be deleted. These members considered that article 35 was an anachronism and constituted an obstacle to the application of Conventions, as was shown by the fact that almost half of the declarations which had been registered pursuant to the article reserved a decision of that nature. In view of the question in question was inapplicable to the territory concerned. They also doubted whether, as had sometimes been suggested to explain the non-application of Conventions to non-metropolitan territories, climatic conditions could ever constitute an obstacle to applying a Convention. They pointed out that, when article 35 was adopted in 1919, 69 per cent. of the world population lived in non-metropolitan territories, that the Constitution must be revised to take account of the profound changes which the world had witnessed since then, and that, short of, article 35 would no longer have any substance, with the completion of decolonisation. It was also stated that Conventions applicable specifically to non-metropolitan territories should be revised.

30. One Government member (Canada) and the Employers’ members, while welcoming that article 35 was being reviewed by the Governing Body, considered that in these circumstances the Committee should not take a position on the matter. This was also the view of certain other Government members (Australia, United Kingdom), who further considered that article 35 had served a progressive purpose in the past and had been the means of raising standards in non-metropolitan territories, as was shown by the large numbers of declarations of application which had been made and by the fact that new members of the I.L.O. had been able automatically to accept a considerable number of Conventions. The Employers’ members considered that article 35 was of value, not so much because it concurred in the considerations in favour of this view which had been noted in the Conference Committee’s report of 1962 (paragraph 29) were still valid.

Information Received in respect of Non-Metropolitan Territories

31. To date, 1,348 detailed reports, representing 95.9 per cent. of the 1,405 reports requested, have been received. A number of these reports arrived only after the Committee of Experts’ session (see Appendix II C). As in the case of member countries, the Committee selected the observations relating to non-metropolitan territories on which it desired to receive information from the governments concerned. This information and the Committee’s discussions thereon are summarised in Appendix II (A and B).

32. The Employers’ members referred to the chart on the application of Conventions in non-metropolitan territories which had been appended to the Committee of Experts’ report in 1961, and suggested that it might be of interest to bring this chart up to date. They also
stressed the importance of making available to
the populations of the territories concerned
material explaining in plain language the
nature of Conventions and Recommendations
and the system for supervising their applica-
tion. The Committee noted that a booklet on
these questions had already been published by
the I.L.O. in a number of languages.

VI. SUBMISSION TO THE COMPETENT
AUTHORITIES OF THE CONVENTIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

33. The Committee regretted that the num-
ber of States which had, during the period
under review, submitted the instruments adopt-
ed by the Conference to the competent national
authorities had declined as compared with pre-
vious years. It was unanimous in emphasising
the importance of the submission by govern-
ments to the competent authorities, in accord-
ance with article 19 of the Constitution of the
I.L.O., of the Conventions and the Recom-
 mendations adopted by the Conference, within
the prescribed time limits. The Committee neverthe-
less observed with satisfaction during its discus-
sions that the scope of the obligations
arising in this respect under article 19 of the
Constitution is more clearly understood by
States Members. The statements made by a
number of Government representatives give
grounds for expecting an encouraging progress
in the fulfilment of the obligation to submit
Conventions and Recommendations to the
competent authorities.

34. It appeared to the Committee that gov-
ernments have fully realised that Conventions
and Recommendations must normally be sub-
mitted to the legislative authorities, and that
they must be submitted in all cases, whether or
not the government intends to ratify a Conven-
tion or to take measures to implement a Recom-
mendation. The confusion between ratifica-
tion and the obligation to submit Conventions
and Recommendations to the competent
authorities, which the Committee had noted in
previous years, appears to have been largely
dispelled.

35. An exchange of views nevertheless took
place as to the precise nature of the legislative
authorities to which Conventions and Recom-
 mendations ought to be submitted. Several
members of the Committee pointed out in
particular that submission to the competent
authorities was aimed, inter alia, at informing
public opinion of the contents of the instru-
ments adopted by the Conference and that,
to achieve this end, it was desirable that Conven-
tions and Recommendations be submitted to
the most representative legislative body provided
for under the national Constitution of each
country. Other members of the Committee,
while agreeing that the widest publicity should
be given within member States to instruments
adopted by the Conference and indicating that
such measures had been taken in their own
countries, considered that this question was
distinct from that of submission to the com-
 petent authorities. They recalled in this con-
 nection that in 1962 the Committee had agreed
(paragraph 39 of its report) to take the view
that the competent authority was the authority
which, under the Constitution of each State,
had power to legislate or to take other action
in order to implement Conventions and Recom-
mendations.

36. Clarification was provided concerning
the time within which the instruments adopted
by the Conference should be submitted to the
competent authorities. The Committee recogn-
ised that in certain cases Conventions, because
of their subject-matter, required thorough
technical study which it might not be possible
to complete within the prescribed period of 12
or 18 months. In such cases it was considered
that it would be a satisfactory practice to place
the Conventions and Recommendations before
the competent authorities within the prescribed
time limit, with an indication that proposals or
comments as to the action to be taken thereon
would be made subsequently. It was considered
essential, however, that such comments or
proposals be made within a reasonable period
from the expiration of the time limits laid down
in the Constitution.

37. The information submitted to the Com-
mittee with regard to the submission of Conventions and Recommendations to the
competent authorities, and the Committee's
observations thereon, will be found in Appendix
III to this report.

VII. REPORTS ON AN UNRATIFIED CONVENTION
AND ON A RECOMMENDATION

Discrimination (Employment and Occupation)

38. The Committee devoted a considerable
proportion of its time to the Committee of
Experts' General Conclusions on the reports
relating to the Convention (No. 111) and Recom-
mendation (No. 111) concerning discrimi-
nation in respect of employment and occu-
pation, 1958 (Part III of the report of the
Committee of Experts).

39. As did the survey of the Committee of
Experts, the discussion in the Conference Com-
mittee covered the situation both in countries
which have ratified and in those which have
ever ratified the above-mentioned Convention.

40. The Committee noted with satisfaction
that reports that had been received from a very large
number of countries and that the percentage of
reports received in virtue of article 19 of the
I.L.O. Constitution had been considerably
higher than in previous years. However, it
expressed particular regret that, on such a
question as discrimination in employment and
occupation, the Committee of Experts had not
received reports from 13 States. It noted that
one of these had since forwarded its report.

41. This was the first occasion since their
recent adoption that the Convention and Re-
 commendation were the subject of such a study.
Several members noted that the particular in-
terest of this first survey by the Committee of
Experts resided in the detailed analysis of the
provisions of the Convention and Recommenda-
tion and the clarification of their effect. In this connection several Government members indicated that the explanations given by the Committee of Experts in its survey would enable their Governments to consider, or reconsider, the ratification of the Convention.

42. Additional information and the exchanges of views concerning the situation in certain countries are contained in Appendix I (B) for countries which have ratified the Convention (Federal Republic of Germany, Liberia, Portugal) and in Appendix IV for other countries (Belgium, Ceylon, Cuba, Cyprus, France, Nigeria, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States).

43. Referring in particular to the cases of the United States and Portugal, certain members expressed the view that the Committee of Experts' survey did not provide an objective picture of the situation. The exchanges of views on these two cases are reproduced in the above-mentioned appendices. Certain members also stated that the Committee of Experts had adopted this year a method different from that followed the previous year regarding the question of forced labour, in singling out especially the positive measures taken in the countries rather than making critical comments.

44. Many members stated that the value of the Committee of Experts' survey could not be called into question and that it was to be congratulated on it. Several members pointed out that the purpose of the survey had been mainly to show the kind of measures which could be taken to combat discrimination and that the Committee of Experts had worked on the basis of the information available to it at this time. It was emphasised that, as the Committee of Experts had remarked at the outset of the conclusion to its survey, it is still too early to evaluate fully the measures taken on the national level and their adequacy under varying national situations.

45. Regarding the situation in various countries, the Workers' members expressed their regret that the content of government reports had generally been very inadequate, as was apparent from the published summaries. Workers' and Employers' members, in particular, expressed the hope that in future all governments would supply very detailed information on the factual situations and existing practices, in the sphere of discrimination. Several members said that in all countries there was discrimination in one form or another and that governments had to face facts as they were; the Workers' members stressed the importance of enabling the persons concerned and their organisations to express themselves freely on the subject.

46. Many members emphasised that racial discrimination raised the most pressing problems and called urgently for action. The Workers' members described it as a particularly serious offence to the dignity of mankind in general. They pointed to one country (Republic of South Africa) which, contrary to the Convention and the basic principles of the I.L.O., overtly continued to base its policy upon the segregation of the races, whereas other countries had taken positive steps to combat racial discrimination. Several members deplored that the latter measures seemed yet again not to have had the desired effect, while the representatives of the countries concerned stressed the magnitude of their action (see the above-mentioned appendices for the situation in certain countries). Regarding the problems arising in non-metropolitan territories, several members stated that the differential treatment in the application of Conventions authorised by article 35 of the I.L.O. Constitution (see paragraph 29 above) should be eliminated.

47. The Workers' members, in particular, pointed out that there was another important form of discrimination, which affected women, not only in matters of remuneration but also in their educational, occupational and employment opportunities. The Committee noted with interest that the general question of women in employment was to be on the agenda of the next session of the Conference.

48. The Workers' members recalled that other forms of discrimination on grounds such as religion, political opinion, social origin, etc., should not be overlooked, especially as they were frequently more indirect and subtle and might be attributable to the governments themselves. Certain Government members (Albania, U.S.S.R.) said that the Experts' comments on various forms of discrimination were of a hypothetical nature and that, in their opinion, effort should be concentrated on concrete problems such as racial discrimination.

49. The diversity of the forms of inequalities and preferences to be eliminated was another point raised by the Workers' members; they referred to the danger inherent in the emergence of privileged groups in the higher administrative and economic ranks, on the basis of political, social, religious and other affinities, especially when no real opportunities for training and advancement were open to the rest of the population. Several Government members from African countries declared their countries' determination to abolish all forms of inequality between the various categories of the population which had often been accentuated under the colonial régimes.

50. Many members emphasised that in considering the practical manifestations of discrimination, attention should be paid not merely to direct arbitrary acts, which were the most obvious, but also to the inequalities due, for instance, to the fact that the vocational training and the promotion possibilities so essential to effective equality were not being made available to certain categories of the population. It was recognised that equality before the law was not enough, and that the Convention required the application of a positive policy to promote equal opportunity and treatment for all social groups not only in law, but also in practice. The Workers' members strongly emphasised how essential it was, in order to permit effective equality of opportunity, to guarantee in fact to all categories of persons the practical means of obtaining the vocational education and training which
open the way to all levels of employment; as indicated by the Committee of Experts, these measures constitute the starting point for all progress in this matter. Emphasis was placed moreover on the importance of viewing the implementation of this Convention primarily in terms of its practical application.

51. The Committee strongly underlined the need to eliminate as a matter of urgency all forms of discrimination in employment and occupation covered by the Convention.

52. A Workers' member (Italy) expressed regret that Convention No. 111 was deemed not to cover discrimination on grounds of foreign nationality, since, as pointed out by the Committee of Experts in its survey (paragraph 27), the term "national extraction" did not cover foreign nationality. He stated that the concern of the I.L.O. with the problem of discrimination had not found expression solely in Convention No. 111; the protection of migrant workers had been of constant concern to the I.L.O., as shown by the preamble to the Constitution and particularly Conventions Nos. 48, 97 (referred to in Recommendation No. 111), 102 (Part XII) and 118. This member also suggested that the I.L.O. should draw up a charter of the rights of migrant workers.

53. Many members expressed their surprise that only 39 States should so far have ratified the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), despite its fundamental human rights aspect and its flexibility. The Workers' members suggested that the survey of the Committee of Experts might eliminate certain doubts where the possibility of ratification was concerned, particularly in regard to equal remuneration (paragraph 39 of the survey), national extraction (paragraphs 27, 42 and 92), special arrangements to ensure fair representation of different population groups (paragraph 39), free collective bargaining (paragraphs 60, 74, 109) and the division of powers in federal States (paragraphs 61 to 63, 109). The Committee noted, in particular, that the ratification of this Convention should not present the same difficulties for federal States as other international labour Conventions because it expressly provides that the State shall act "by methods appropriate to national conditions and practice ".

54. On the proposal of the Workers' and Employers' members the Committee unanimously suggested that, in adopting the present report, the Conference should address a particularly urgent appeal to all countries which have not yet ratified the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), to examine carefully the above-mentioned explanations and conclusions of the Committee of Experts and, having in mind the basic importance of the question, to give prompt consideration to the possibility of ratification.

55. The Committee expressed the hope that a review of the position concerning the ratification of this Convention, next year, would show substantial progress.

56. This year the Director-General's Report to the Conference reviewed how the Organization's programme and the means for its implementation could be adapted to the needs of a changing world. The Committee fully agreed that the machinery for supervision of the application of international labour standards must likewise satisfy these needs, and that the I.L.O. Conventions and Recommendations should remain the backbone of the Organization's activities. The concern of all was to ensure that these standards should find the widest possible response among member countries and that, by perfecting the methods for securing respect of freely accepted obligations in this field, these standards might make an effective impact on living and working conditions. One indication of the progress made during the past year was provided by the fact that in over 30 cases the Committee of Experts had this year noted that specific measures had been taken with a view to bringing national legislation and practice into conformity with the ratified Conventions; in a number of cases the Committee has been informed of similar action taken subsequently.

57. The Committee expresses its appreciation of the fact that no less than 56 governments were good enough to submit oral or written information to it, on the manifold questions coming within its purview, and thus to co-operate in working towards the objectives referred to above. The discussions which the Committee has on these cases from year to year demonstrate that the acceptance of international labour standards is no mere gesture, but involves continuing efforts to ensure their implementation in law and practice. The Committee was gratified to note the assurances given by a considerable number of Government representatives of their countries' desire to respect fully the obligations incumbent upon them under the Constitution and ratified Conventions. By continuing to give concrete expression to this desire, governments will not only advance the cause of international cooperation, but will contribute to the promotion of social justice and the reinforcement of human rights in their own countries. It is in this hope that the Committee places its report before the Conference.


(Signed) IAN LAGERGREN, Vice-Chairman and Acting Reporter.
OBSERVATIONS AND INFORMATION CONCERNING REPORTS ON RATIFIED CONVENTIONS (ARTICLE 22 OF THE CONSTITUTION)

A. General Observations and Information concerning Certain Countries

Afghanistan. The Government communicated the following information:

The draft Labour Code is still under consideration. At present the Government is not in a position to comment on its exact date of enactment. The Department of Labour has already submitted the text of the ratified Conventions to a committee assigned for the second reading of the draft Labour Code. The terms of the Conventions ratified by Afghanistan will be fully incorporated in the new Labour Code.

Argentina. A Government representative made the following statement:

In virtue of article 31 of the national Constitution ratified Conventions had the force of national law. If existing legislation was brought into line with Conventions, this was done by a Government committee set up to avoid divergencies in interpretation and uncertainties in practical application. At present Congress was not functioning. It was therefore not possible to adopt the Bills mentioned last year. Furthermore, in the light of the country's federal structure certain matters dealt with in the observations fell within the legislative competence of the provinces. Finally, the principle that legislation had certain shortcomings was met by collective agreements covering practically all the workers and having force of law. All these comments related to the observations on various Conventions.

The Committee regretted that this information did not indicate any progress as compared with last year; it hoped that the measures mentioned would be taken by next year. It drew the Government's attention particularly to the part of the Committee of Experts' general report dealing with the question of the practical application of Conventions.

Brazil. The Government communicated the following information:

1. Difficulties concerning the co-ordination of statistics needed to complete reports had once again been the cause for delay in sending these reports. However, the Brazilian Government was trying to eliminate these difficulties. As the Committee had been informed at the 46th Session, the Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, in conformity with a decision of the Permanent Committee on Social Law, appointed a commission in 1962 to consider the systematic co-ordination of statistics dealing with matters of labour and social security. This Committee met about the middle of 1962 and was still working diligently. In addition it must be pointed out that, by Decree No. 1583 of 25 June 1962, a working group had been created to study a plan for the development and bringing up to date of statistical information.

2. The requests by the Committee of Experts concerning Conventions Nos. 5, 98 and 99, while received in good time by the competent authorities, had not been despatched to the Permanent Committee on Social Law in time. It had not therefore been possible to supply the necessary reply. The Government regretted this omission which would be taken care of in future reports.

Bulgaria. A Government representative made the following statement:

The reasons for which the reports had not been sent had been explained to the Conference Committee. The Government would do everything possible to ensure that next year all reports were sent on time.

The Employers' members pointed out that it was not only a matter of submitting reports on time; the reports should also contain appropriate information on the practical application of Conventions.

In reply the Government representative stated that, in the reports that had been sent, the Government had endeavoured to provide the Experts with all necessary explanations; to that extent, it did not agree with the observation made. Nevertheless, the comments of the Committee would be transmitted to the Government, and it would do everything possible to improve the contents of its reports.

Burma. A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government greatly regretted that, because of pressure of work, it had been unable to furnish the reports due on Conventions Nos. 26, 29 and 87; these reports were now being despatched, together with a supplementary report on Convention No. 16, containing a reply to a previous request. The delay in regard to Convention No. 29 was due to the fact that the views of a number of government departments concerned had not yet all been received.

The Committee noted that the above-mentioned reports had not yet been received by the Office. It expressed the hope that the Government would not fail in future to furnish its reports in time and to reply to the observations and requests addressed to it.

Colombia. A Government representative made the following statement:

The Labour Code of 1950, amended several times, was one of the most advanced in the world. The provisions of the Conventions were incorporated in the legislation.

The Bill for the revision of the Labour Code was under active study by the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. It was expected that it would be adopted soon. The Bill submitted by the Government took the Conventions into account. However, Congress was sovereign and could modify the Bill. The Government had no power to compel Congress to speed up the adoption of the Bill.

In reply to a question by an Employers' member the Government representative indicated that it was often difficult to incorporate statistics relating to the practical application of Conventions. Practical application was ensured through the provisions of the Labour Code and through the supervision of labour inspectors. The Ministry of Labour, which came into existence 25 years ago, and the two large central trade unions ensured the practical application of Conventions.

The Committee hoped that the Bill to amend the Labour Code would be adopted in the near future and that the reports would contain information on the practical application of Conventions.

Congo (Leopoldville). The Government communicated the following information:

The Government has taken due note of the observations of the Committee of Experts and will endeavour to take them into account when preparing the next detailed reports.

Costa Rica. A Government representative made the following statement:

Costa Rica was a small country with limited financial resources and this had been an obstacle to the setting up in the public administration of an efficient service which could prepare the reports to be supplied to the I.L.O. The Legal Department of the Ministry of Labour had made some improvements this year which would permit
of wider compliance with obligations towards the I.L.O. Efforts had been made to supply the reports requested, and, although these had not been sent in time to be examined, they might by now have been received by the Office.

Cuba. A Government representative made the following statement:

Since the new revolutionary Government had been set up, there had been numerous changes in the social, economic, political and other fields. As regards plantations, for example, substantial measures had been taken for land reform which entailed major innovations in all aspects of agriculture. Similarly a new social security law had been introduced which would provide for coverage for all workers, including agricultural workers. Numerous other new texts introducing improvements in the social field were being prepared. All these measures had made it difficult to prepare a report on the Plantations Convention, and also explained why other reports had been sent late, particularly as a total of 58 reports had been due from Cuba. Steps would, however, be taken to ensure that in future the Government’s reports would be supplied to the I.L.O. within the prescribed time and that they would contain all the required information.

The Employers’ members indicated that the Committee should urge the Government to submit its reports in good time, so as to permit of their examination by the Committee of Experts and also by members of the Conference Committee.

A Workers’ member stated that the table in the report of the Committee of Experts showed that not one of the 58 reports due from Cuba had been received on time. The Government must be asked to ensure that its reports be furnished in good time, since they constituted the basis of the work of the Committee of Experts and the Conference Committee.

The Committee took note of the assurance given by the Government representative concerning the supplying in future of reports due on ratified Conventions.

Czechoslovakia. A Government representative made the following statement:

The delay in sending the report was due to the fact that the competent services had first dealt with the question of submission. In drawing up future reports careful account would be taken of the general observations of the Committee of Experts.

The Committee expressed the hope that future reports would be furnished in time and that they would contain all the information requested, particularly with regard to practical application.

Ecuador. A Government representative made the following statement:

Owing to internal constitutional difficulties, it had not been possible to send the reports. Every effort would be made for the regular supply of reports in the future.

The Committee expressed the hope that reports would be supplied.

Gabon. The Government has communicated the following information:

All measures will be taken so that the reports will in future contain full information concerning the practical application of ratified Conventions.

Guatemala. A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government, because of unforeseen circumstances, had been unable to carry out the undertakings given in previous years as regards the furnishing of reports on Conventions Nos. 97, 98 and 99. Nevertheless, the Government had every intention of honouring these assurances.

The Committee noted this assurance and expressed the hope that measures would soon be taken to ensure full compliance with the obligations undertaken.

Honduras. A Government representative made the following statement:

The necessary elements were not available at present to show whether the reports on Conventions Nos. 87, 98 and 100 contained a satisfactory reply to the observations of the Committee of Experts; an effort would be made to supply the necessary information at the next session of the Committee.

The Committee regretted that the Government representative could not reply at present on all the points raised in the observations of the Committee of Experts; it hoped that the Government would supply full information on these observations for next year.

Indonesia. A Government representative made the following statement:

Copies of reports had been communicated to the six most important workers’ organisations and to employers’ organisations. Due to a regrettable omission, the fact had not been mentioned in the Government’s reports.

Kuwait. The Government communicated the following information:

The observations of the Committee of Experts will be taken into consideration so that copies of the reports will in future be communicated to representative employers’ and workers’ organisations.

Malaysia. The Government communicated the following information:

The footnote on the cover page of the reports supplied by the Government for the period under review reads as follows: “These reports will be placed before the National Joint Labour Advisory Council, which comprises representatives of employers and workers and to promote time. The Government must be asked to ensure that its reports be furnished in good time, since they constituted the basis of the work of the Committee of Experts and the Conference Committee.

The Committee took note of the assurance given by the Government representative concerning the supplying in future of reports due on ratified Conventions.

Nicaragua. A Government representative made the following statement:

The reports had not been sent owing to internal structural changes which had taken place in the country and which also affected the Labour Department. The new Government, which had come to power on 1 May 1963, promised the Committee that, within the framework of the established programme, it would put into effect the principles stated in Conventions. In his message to the people on assuming power the President of the Republic had indicated that the new Government would take a clear stand in support of the freedom of the country and that it would abide strictly by its international treaty obligations. The Government intended to encourage the formation of trade unions of workers and peasants according to democratic principles and to promote vocational training. It would also endeavour to promote a co-operative spirit between workers and employers in the public and private sectors and would encourage all initiatives to increase productivity and to develop raw materials resources. The Government asked the Committee to postpone examination of the present case until the 43th Session of the Conference so that the Government might be able to take the necessary measures to give effect to ratified Conventions and to submit the reports due.

The Workers’ members stated that there were two serious cases of non-application of Conventions which had to be pointed out: the Night Work (Women) Convention (No. 4) and the Night Work of Young Persons (Industry) Convention (No. 6), both of which had been ratified by Nicaragua 29 years before. For years the Government had stated that Bills had been prepared, but no progress had been made in the application of these Conventions.

The Committee regretted that the Government had again omitted to comply with its obligations and expressed the hope that the Government would in future furnish all reports requested, indicating progress made concerning the application of ratified Conventions.

Panama. A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government had always faithfully fulfilled its obligations towards the I.L.O. The Government delega-
tion had asked both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Labour, Social Welfare and Public Health to supply the information requested. If it should not be received in the course of the present session, measures would be taken so that it would be sent at the earliest possible date.

The Employers' members stated that this was a serious case; no report had been sent, although various first reports had already been submitted to the I.L.O. in 1959, 1960 and 1961. As was the case last year, no progress had been made.

The Workers' member of Panama stated that Conventions ratified by Panama were not applied at all; Convention No. 87, for example, had not been applied. Trade union leaders were expelled from undertakings. Besides being contrary to Convention No. 87, this was contrary to article 67 of the national Constitution. The I.L.O. should take strong steps to ensure the application of Convention No. 87. The present Government had been in power for three years and still had not applied the Convention. It had also remained as indifferent towards the problems of the freedom of association as the preceding Government. It was indispensable that the workers' demands be satisfied if democracy were to be maintained in the country. The I.L.O. and the Workers' members of the Committee should support these aspirations.

In reply the Government representative made the following statement:

In 1960 the Government had been changed. The present Government, more conscious of its responsibilities than its predecessor, had made a possible effort to remedy the failings of its predecessor. The Workers' delegation from Panama could be assured that all workers enjoyed the protection, efficacy and the good faith of the present Government, which endeavoured to guarantee workers their constitutional rights and the strict application of the Labour Code. Freedom of association was a reality in the country, the workers' organisations had all the guarantees from the Government. Social justice, human rights and the Labour Code were strictly observed. The Government was aware that a balance should exist between capital and labour, in order to guarantee equitably the rights of both parties. During the last two years the Government had not fulfilled its obligations towards the I.L.O., but this would not recur in the future.

The Committee took note of the assurance given by the Government representative and expressed the hope that reports, including first reports on the application of ratified Conventions, would be communicated.

Rumania. A Government representative made the following statement:

In future all the Government's reports would contain complete and detailed information on each Convention. A committee of specialists had been set up to examine the problems which had already been postponed twice because of staffing difficulties.

Sierra Leone. The Government communicated the following information:

The delay in forwarding the reports was due to several changes of staff among those usually responsible for the work, and to the fact that the Deputy Commissioner of Labour was seconded as Secretary to a most important inquiry whilst the Commissioner of Labour was absent on holiday, a condition which had already been postponed twice because of staffing difficulties.

Spain. The Government communicated the following information:

The Government notes the observation by the Committee of Experts. It will take steps so that future reports will contain the appropriate information and data on the application, in the African provinces of Spain, of the Conventions ratified by this country, since, in accordance with the declaration communicated to the Director-General of the I.L.O. on 8 June 1962 concerning the metropolitan character of these provinces, the Conventions ratified by Spain have become applicable to the provinces in question.

Syrian Arab Republic. A Government representative made the following statement:

The Syrian Arab Republic would in the future present all the reports requested. The failure to send the reports was due to administrative difficulties. The Committee expressed the hope that, in future, all the reports requested would be communicated on time.

Turkey. The Government communicated the following information:

The competent authorities dealing with the preparation of reports on the application of Conventions and Recommendations give continuous attention to the need for replying as expeditiously as possible to each of the questions in the forms concerning these reports and attach very special importance to making the reports as complete as possible. Nevertheless, the competent authorities will make every effort to provide more complete information on the practical application of Conventions in the reports which will be prepared in future.

U.S.S.R. In reply to a question as to when the Labour Codes of the various Republics of the U.S.S.R. could be communicated, a Government representative stated that the preparatory work for the drafting of basic principles of labour legislation had been finished; the draft of this text had been published previously with a view to public discussion. Following the adoption of this basic law and of new Codes in the Republics they would be communicated to the I.L.O.

Uruguay. A Government representative made the following statement:

Uruguay not only made efforts to ratify a large number of Conventions but also sought to secure their strict application. The letter with which the reports had been sent indicated that a copy of these reports had been communicated to various employers' and workers' organisations, mentioned therein. As regards the drafting of these reports, the necessary measures had been taken to ensure that the group of experts at the Ministry would in future draw up all information and reports to be submitted to the I.L.O. in the form required.

The Employers' members noted that, while some progress had been made in supplying reports, it was greatly to be regretted that there had been no progress in the application of a number of Conventions, which were applied only to a limited extent.

In reply the Government representative stated that the Government had taken all possible measures. For example, a law had recently instituted sickness insurance for dockers, in conformity with the relevant Conventions. There were already similar schemes for other branches. The Committee thanked the Government for the information supplied and expressed the hope that it would in the future furnish detailed reports and full particulars for examination by the Committee of Experts.

Venezuela. A Government representative made the following statement:

Future reports would be sent, as requested in the observation made by the Committee of Experts. As regards the Conventions mentioned in the general observation, it should be noted that the Government's replies to the observations and requests were being communicated to the I.L.O.

The Committee expressed the hope that the Government would, in future, include in its reports all necessary information.

Yugoslavia. A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government regretted that reports on Conventions Nos. 100 and 102 had not been supplied. These reports would be submitted before the end of the current session.
Colombia (ratification: 1933). A Government representative made the following statement:

The figures mentioned in the observation did not correspond to actual hours of work. The statistics which had been used indicated the number of hours paid, including public holidays, while the number of hours of work were, in fact, lower. In the petroleum industry, for example, an average of 214 hours per month had actually been worked, to which had been added 55 hours paid for but not worked.

**Article 4 of the Convention.** The hours of work never exceeded an average of 56 a week. The list of the necessarily continuous processes given in the 1931 decree was still in force. If the 17 million employees of industry felt that this list warranted comments, the Government would examine them. The authorised hours of work never exceeded an average of 56 hours a week and they were normally fixed at 48 hours.

**Article 5 and Article 7, paragraph 1 (b).** The point in question did not arise; section 165 of the Labour Code provided that average hours of work could not exceed 48 per week.

**Article 6 and Article 7, paragraph 1 (c).** The application of the Labour Code took account of the Convention. Authorisations were given only temporarily and in exceptional cases.

**Article 8.** The Government had taken note of the observation and was now considering the possibility of establishing a register in conformity with this provision.

In answer to questions by Employers' members the Government representative stated that as regards Articles 6 and 7, the statistics used had presented an inaccurate picture. The statistics were not inaccurate but were compiled according to a system which did not permit comparison with the Convention.

The Workers' members noted that the information supplied was important and the Government should include it in its next report. The Committee took note of the information furnished, and requested the Government to provide full particulars in its next report. It expressed the hope that the necessary modifications would be made in the immediate future, and that the Convention, which had been adopted many years ago, would be fully applied.

**Czechoslovakia (ratification: 1921).** A Government representative stated that the Observations of the Workers' members were well-founded.

The law providing for the progressive institution of a 40-hour working week in mines and a 42-hour week in other branches had not yet been adopted. In a number of undertakings an experimental reduction of hours of work without reduction of wages had been applied. Ministerial directives requested dealt not only with overtime but also with various other economic, social and legal questions. Accordingly, it would be sufficient to furnish the next report information only on overtime. Act No. 37 of 1959 would also be communicated. The Central Committee of Trade Unions, in collaboration with economic and scientific organisations and with workers, had drawn up principles for the Labour Code which had been submitted to public discussion at the beginning of last year. Many comments had been submitted. The question of overtime had received particular attention in the draft. The period of overtime had been considerably reduced, the procedure for permits had been made stricter, and supervision tightened. The discussion itself had increased the effectiveness of the measures to reduce overtime. The results of this discussion had been examined by the Central Committee of Trade Unions in May 1963.

The Employers' members stated that the Government should be urged to communicate copies of the ministerial directives.

The Workers' members recalled that the Convention had been ratified in 1921. However, a great amount of overtime was still authorised. It was regrettable that the new Law of January 1963 had not yet come into force.

The Committee expressed the hope that the necessary measures would be taken in the near future and drew the attention of the Government to the above observations.

**Greece (ratification: 1920).** The Government communicated the following information:

The extension of the eight-hour day to railway staff will be ensured as from 1 July 1963 by virtue of Royal Decree No. 315 of 30 May 1963. In addition the Government representative made the following statement:

The Government, anxious to keep the assurance given to the Committee at the 46th Session of the Conference, had pursued its efforts to eliminate the discrepancies with regard to a certain number of railway workers. These efforts had constituted the last step towards the solution of the financial difficulties resulting, for several years, from the running of railways. After the reorganisation of the rail network, through Act 4246/1962, a committee of experts had been created in order to study the extension of an eight-hour day to categories of railway workers to which the Convention had not so far applied. It had thus been possible to extend the eight-hour day to railway workers, by the Royal Decree of 30 May 1963. The maximum hours of work at night at seven (42 per week) or the necessity of completing work begun. Section 50 had provided that overtime should not exceed 48 hours per day or be worked more than three times per week. Apart from this Bill, which would be adopted shortly, it should be emphasised that the Committee of Experts had taken positive measures to eliminate a discrepancy which had existed for many years. This information had, moreover, been confirmed by the Greek Workers' delegate at the Conference.

The Employers' members noted that the matter seemed to be on the way towards a solution.

The Committee took note with satisfaction of the progress made in regard to the application of the Convention.

**Peru (ratification: 1945).** A Government representative made the following statement:

A committee appointed by virtue of resolution No. 0.14 of January 1963 had prepared a Labour Bill which implemented the provisions of the Convention. Under section 40 of the Bill the normal daily hours of work were fixed at eight hours (48 hours weekly); section 41 fixed the maximum hours of work at night at seven (45 per week); section 46, concerning children and women, provided for an eight-hour day and a 45-hour week; section 49 laid down certain exceptions: in case of accident or danger of death, necessity of saving property from destruction due to external causes, force majeure, or the necessity of completing work begun. Section 50 provided that overtime should not exceed 48 hours per day or be worked more than three times per week. From this Bill, which would be adopted shortly, it should be emphasised that measures had been taken without previous authorisation, which was never given contrary to the provisions of the Convention.

In reply to a request from the Workers' members, the Government representative added that the above-mentioned Bill had been prepared by a committee composed of university professors and lawyers and had been communicated to employers' and workers' representative organisations and the public for submission of comments within a period of 15 days. It was ready for promulgation.

**Spain (ratification: 1929).** The Government communicated the following information:

The Government insists on the fact that by virtue of the principle of application of "the most favourable conditions" the standards and provisions in labour regulations or collective agreements—issued or concluded in accordance with the Acts of 10 October 1942 and of 24 April 1943—provide the most favourable conditions for the worker shall always be applied in the field of labour relations. These standards apply to all hours of work without distinction, including hours of work in industry, covered by the Decree of 1 July 1931, which was adopted as an Act on 9 September of the same year. Consequently the Government did not understand why the Committee of Experts still considered that the position as regards the maximum hours of work in a given branch of activity is still obscure. The amendment of the National Labour Regulations for Road Transport of 3 October 1947, to which the observations
As regards the revision of labour legislation, a draft had by a subsequent resolution. Moreover, the Night Work provision was always applied. The Conventions was ensured by the existing provisions. In fact, the application of required a systematic and coherent compilation of provisions whose revision was being considered, because it resolution of 5 July 1961 and the Labour Regulations not applicable; regulations concerning road transport was undertaken because it violated the provisions of the Convention, because the courts had always decided in favour of the working women concerned in case of a mistake resulting in the prolongation of the period of maternity leave. Moreover, the provisions applicable, for example, to public servants provided for a shorter period than that fixed in the general legislation and the Convention. As regards the second point, Act No. 11933 did not provide for any qualifying period; benefits were granted upon entry into employment. As regards the third point, Act No. 11933 required the employer to maintain women in employment during their absence due to illness arising out of pregnancy or confinement of the position. The position was therefore in conformity with the Convention with regard to these three points.

As to the two examples mentioned by the Experts with regard to lack of certainty as to whether the most favourable clause prevailed, two points should be emphasised: (a) the amendment in 1961 of the national labour regulations concerning road transport was undertaken in order to remove the doubts of the Committee and not because it violated the provisions of the Convention, since in so far as they were less favourable than the 1931 Act on maximum hours of work, these regulations were not applicable; (b) the contradiction between the provisions of 5 July 1961 and the Labour Regulations concerning bakeries of 12 July 1946 had been removed by a subsequent resolution. Moreover, the Night Work (Bakeries) Convention (No. 20) was one of the instruments whose revision was being considered, because it was no longer adapted to conditions in this industry. As regards the revision of labour legislation, a draft had already been prepared and would take the form either of a code or a general labour ordinance.

The Workers' members pointed out that this Convention had been ratified by Spain in 1929 and that its application had been the object of many observations. It seemed that the general legislation was not in conformity with the Convention and that, in addition, labour regulations contained in certain cases standards which were less than the general legislation. 'The discrepancies continued to exist in spite of the Experts' observations.

The Government representative replied that national labour laws were legal provisions and were applicable, in conformity with the 1942 Act by virtue of which they had been issued, to the various sectors of activities. Any provision more favourable than the 1931 Act contained in such regulations was always applicable. The Government was undertaking a general reorganisation of its labour legislation, not with a view to securing the application of the national labour laws but to lay down a uniform basis, which gave effect to Article 3 of the 1919 Convention for the reasons already given; this was consequently in conformity with the Convention. The Committee expressed the hope that the necessary modifications would be approved in the immediate future and that the Convention, which had been ratified many years ago, would be fully applied.

The Chamber of Deputies of Colombia was considering a Bill on contracts of employment, sections 94 and 97 of which gave effect to Article 3 (a), (b), (c) of the Convention. Under the Bill, the maternity leave would have been present eight to 12 weeks and interruptions for nursing from the previous 20 minutes to 30 minutes each. As for Article 4 of the Convention, section 241 of the Labour Code prohibited dismissal during pregnancy and was consequently in conformity with the Convention.

The Committee expressed the hope that the necessary modifications would be approved in the immediate future and that the Convention, which had been ratified many years ago, would be fully applied.

The Chamber of Deputies of Colombia was considering a Bill on contracts of employment, sections 94 and 97 of which gave effect to Article 3 (a), (b), (c) of the Convention. Under the Bill, the maternity leave would have been present eight to 12 weeks and interruptions for nursing from the previous 20 minutes to 30 minutes each. As for Article 4 of the Convention, section 241 of the Labour Code prohibited dismissal during pregnancy and was consequently in conformity with the Convention.

The Committee expressed the hope that the necessary modifications would be approved in the immediate future and that the Convention, which had been ratified many years ago, would be fully applied.

As regards the request made by the Committee of Experts, communications a copy of the directives which were given in October 1962 to the regional social security directors following a decision of the Supreme Court of Cassation. It was ruled, in this case, that in applying the Convention, daily benefits should be paid during the period between the presumed date and the actual date of confinement when these two dates did not coincide, even if the insured person had already benefited, at the time of the presumed confinement, from payments for pre-natal rest during a period of six weeks. The I.L.O. has therefore been requested to take this decision into account when examining cases submitted to them.

Convention No. 2 : Unemployment, 1919.

Argentina (ratification : 1933). A Government representative made the following statement:

The new legislation on the organisation of the employment service will permit the employment offices to register applications from all persons seeking employment, including those excluded from the scope of the ordinance of 1933, if they wish to register. Employment agencies no longer exist. There are only public free employment agencies. The appointment of the Advisory Board is still under way. The I.L.O. will be informed in due course when the Board is appointed.

Convention No. 3 : Maternity Protection, 1919.

Argentine (ratification : 1933). A Government representative made the following statement:

Colombia (ratification : 1933). A Government representative made the following statement:

Cuba (ratification : 1928). See under Convention No. 103.

France (ratification : 1950). The Government communicated the following information:

1. As regards the last clause of Article 3 (c) of the Convention (mistake of the medical adviser in estimating the date of confinement), the Government, in reply to the request made by the Committee of Experts, communicates a copy of the directives which were given in October 1962 to the regional social security directors following a decision of the Supreme Court of Caseation. It was ruled, in this case, that in applying the Convention, daily benefits should be paid during the period between the presumed date and the actual date of confinement when these two dates did not coincide, even if the insured person had already benefited, at the time of the presumed confinement, from payments for pre-natal rest during a period of six weeks. The I.L.O. has therefore been requested to take this decision into account when examining cases submitted to them.

2. In reply to questions put by certain Workers' members the Government representative added that, in cases where the labour regulations contained less favourable provisions than the general legislation, workers had the right to take the simpler applicable law, whereas the Supreme Court could oblige the Government to amend the provision in question. Although the amending legislation to which the Government referred in its report, for examination by the Committee of Experts, was consequently in conformity with the Convention and that, in addition, labour regulations contained in certain cases standards which were less than the general legislation. The position was therefore in conformity with the Convention. As regards the first point of the observation of the Committee of Experts refer, fully confirms this position as regards the system applicable in the field of maximum hours of work in all types of activities. More urgent work which it was impossible to postpone, such as the fixing of minimum wages in pursuance of Decree No. 55/53 of 17 December 1953 has delayed the completion of activities to consolidate the legislation in question, despite the Government's good will in the matter.

A Government representative supplied the following additional information:

As regards the question of hours of work in bakeries the Government insists on the fact that section 33 of the Labour Regulations was binding legal provision and were not applicable; these regulations were less favourable than the general legislation. These regulations contained in certain cases standards which did not apply; (b) the contradiction between the regulations of 5 July 1961 and the Labour Regulations concerning bakeries of 12 July 1946 had been removed by a subsequent resolution. Moreover, the Night Work (Bakeries) Convention (No. 20) was one of the instruments whose revision was being considered, because it was no longer adapted to conditions in this industry. As regards the revision of labour legislation, a draft had already been prepared and would take the form either of a code or a general labour ordinance.

The Workers' members pointed out that this Convention had been ratified by Spain in 1929 and that its application had been the object of many observations. It seemed that the general legislation was not in conformity with the Convention and that, in addition, labour regulations contained in certain cases standards which were less than the general legislation. There were, however, no legal provisions and were not applicable, in conformity with the 1942 Act by virtue of which they had been issued, to the various sectors of activities. Any provision more favourable than the 1931 Act contained in such regulations was always applicable. The Government was undertaking a general reorganisation of its labour legislation, not with a view to securing the application of the national labour laws but to lay down a uniform basis, which gave effect to Article 3 of the 1919 Convention for the reasons already given; this was consequently in conformity with the Convention. The Committee expressed the hope that the necessary modifications would be approved in the immediate future and that the Convention, which had been ratified many years ago, would be fully applied.
2. As regards Article 3 (d) (two 30-minute nursing periods), and in order to meet the Committee of Experts' observations, a circular T.M.O.-C.27 (V) was sent on 7 December 1962 to labour inspectorate officials for application, and to the prefects for information. This circular refers to the terms of Article 3 (d) of the Convention concerning the employment of women before and after confinement, which states that a woman shall in any case, if she is nursing her child, be allowed half an hour twice a day during her working hours for this purpose. The last paragraph of the circular specifies that employers who put at the disposal of their women workers a nursing room shall be reminded of these indications, and stresses that the Convention must be strictly respected in every case where a circular of this kind has been supplied. It should be recalled that no difficulty has been brought to the attention of the labour inspection authorities. The Committee noted that the Committee of Experts' comments were due to the fact that there was no formal general prohibition of work by children under 14 years of age, as the only provisions in force in this connection referred to the prohibition of contracts of apprenticeship for children under 14 years, and as the Act of 1931 to ratify the Convention had been followed by the adoption of a Labour Code which did not cover night employment of children under 14 years of age. It drew attention to the fact that the national labour legislation was based on the principle of equality and that these Conventions were not fully applied; the Government should wait until next year before deciding whether the case of Colombia should be mentioned in its report.

The Government representative stated that the Government had been asked for any necessary indications on the various legislative texts giving effect to the provisions of the Convention.

The Committee agreed that the Committee of Experts' comments were due to the fact that there was no formal general prohibition of work by children under 14 years of age, as the only provisions in force in this connection referred to the prohibition of contracts of apprenticeship for children under 14 years, and as the Act of 1931 to ratify the Convention had been followed by the adoption of a Labour Code which did not cover night employment of children under 14 years of age. It drew attention to the fact that the national labour legislation was based on the principle of equality and that these Conventions were not fully applied; the Government should wait until next year before deciding whether the case of Colombia should be mentioned in its report.

It should be recalled that no difficulty has been brought to the attention of the labour inspection authorities. The Committee noted that the Committee of Experts' comments were due to the fact that there was no formal general prohibition of work by children under 14 years of age, as the only provisions in force in this connection referred to the prohibition of contracts of apprenticeship for children under 14 years, and as the Act of 1931 to ratify the Convention had been followed by the adoption of a Labour Code which did not cover night employment of children under 14 years of age. It drew attention to the fact that the national labour legislation was based on the principle of equality and that these Conventions were not fully applied; the Government should wait until next year before deciding whether the case of Colombia should be mentioned in its report.

Convention No. 6 : Night Work of Young Persons (Industry), 1919.

HUNGARY (ratification : 1928). A Government representative made the following statement:

As stated in previous years and in the reports of the Government, the Government's policy was the gradual suppression of night work for young persons between 16 and 18 years of age as well as night work of women. Conventions Nos. 6 and 41 had been ratified by the Government of the former régime, which had not applied them. The present Government had not wanted to denounce these Conventions, because it was in agreement with the standards which they contained. For several years it had tried to create the conditions required for the prohibition of night work. The Government aimed at the establishment of a general prohibition rather than make use of the exceptions permitted by the Convention, which was not applicable to commerce and agriculture. Various measures had already been taken : section 102 of the Labour Code prohibited night work for apprentices : other provisions prescribed work prohibited for persons less than 18 years old (Order No. 4/1962 of the Minister of Labour) ; in the textile industry the duration of night work permitted was shorter for young persons ; young persons employed in night work were subject to medical examination every second month. The national labour legislation was based on the principle of equality between the different branches of activities, including agriculture, and that the general prohibition could not be introduced until conditions made this possible.

The Government considered it preferable to create these conditions gradually. Although it had not hitherto been able to establish a general prohibition, it had nevertheless succeeded in reducing the number of persons employed in night work.

The Government representative stated that the Convention had been ratified under the old régime. Nevertheless, the new régime had come into power many years ago, and still only gradual application was contemplated. It was hoped that there would be rapid progress in the application of these Conventions in the next 12 months. The Government urged the Government to supply full information on the situation in practice, as it admitted that these Conventions were not fully applied; the Committee expressed the hope that the Government's efforts would yield results in the near future.

ROMANIA (ratification : 1921). A Government representative made the following statement:

The divergence between the national legislation and the Convention, according to the Experts, was due to the fact that section 50 of the Labour Code defined night as a period of eight hours. The Committee of Experts representative claimed that the Convention was applied and was prepared to produce the necessary texts in support of his statement. This data should have been submitted with the report as, according to the Experts, the Government's reports had contained no new information on the application of the Convention. All the relevant information should be communicated to the Committee of Experts so that it might assess the situation. The Committee should wait until next year before deciding whether the case of Colombia should be mentioned in its report.

The Government representative stated that the Government had been asked for any necessary indications on the various legislative texts giving effect to the provisions of the Convention.

The Committee agreed that the Committee of Experts' comments were due to the fact that there was no formal general prohibition of work by children under 14 years of age, as the only provisions in force in this connection referred to the prohibition of contracts of apprenticeship for children under 14 years, and as the Act of 1931 to ratify the Convention had been followed by the adoption of a Labour Code which did not cover night employment of children under 14 years of age. It drew attention to the fact that the national labour legislation was based on the principle of equality and that these Conventions were not fully applied; the Government should wait until next year before deciding whether the case of Colombia should be mentioned in its report.
which prohibited night work for women and young persons, were part of a group of provisions on protection of women and young persons (Chapter XI of the Labour Code). The definitions of the various terms and concepts used in the Code appeared in Chapter XVII which did not however contain any definition of "night work". Section 50 of the Labour Code, which fixed the duration of night work at eight hours, did not purport to define the term "night" but only to require the payment of a bonus for persons who had the right to do night work. The definition in section 50 referred therefore only to these cases. If the legislator had had the intention of establishing a general definition of the term "night" he would have done it in the chapter of the Code containing definitions. Moreover, according to national law of Rumania, Conventions which had been ratified acquired the force of internal law. It followed that sections 85 and 91 of the Labour Code were supplementary to, and not in derogation of, the Conventions in question. It could not, therefore, be said that these two Conventions were not applied. Nevertheless, in order to eliminate all controversy, the Committee of Experts had decided in favour of the inclusion in the chapters on protection of women and young persons of a provision in conformity with the Conventions. A new Constitution had not been adopted, and a series of codes, including the Labour Code, was being revised. This Code would be modified to bring it into conformity with the provisions of the two Conventions. Concerning, more particularly, Conventions had suggested that the Government modify section 85 of the Labour Code so as to limit decisions which could be taken to authorise night work on certain cases. Taking into account the provisions of Article 7 of the Convention and the fact that duly ratified International Conventions were incorporated in the national legislation, ministerial decrees could be issued under section 85 of the Code subject only to the conditions laid down in Article 7 of the Convention.

The Committee took note of these statements and hoped that the Labour Code would be revised soon, so as to indicate the position clearly in a single law.

Convention No. 8 : Unemployment Indemnity (Shipwreck), 1920.

Argentina (ratification : 1933). A Government representative made the following statement:

The Bill to amend certain sections of the Commercial Code to bring them into line with maritime Conventions has not been adopted, and a series of codes, including the Labour Code, was being revised. This Code would be modified to bring it into conformity with the provisions of the two Conventions. Concerning, more particularly, Conventions had suggested that the Government modify section 85 of the Labour Code so as to limit decisions which could be taken to authorise night work on certain cases. Taking into account the provisions of Article 7 of the Convention and the fact that duly ratified International Conventions were incorporated in the national legislation, ministerial decrees could be issued under section 85 of the Code subject only to the conditions laid down in Article 7 of the Convention.

The Committee took note of these statements and hoped that the Labour Code would be revised soon, so as to indicate the position clearly in a single law.

Convention No. 9 : Placing of Seamen, 1920.

Colombia (ratification : 1933). A Government representative made the following statement:

There were no services for the placement of seamen in Colombia. The shipowners had their own office for the recruitment of seamen. The Government wished to give effect to the observations of the Experts and would urge the National Congress to enact the necessary legislation.

The Committee expressed the hope that the proposed modifications would be made in the immediate future and the Convention, ratified many years ago, would be fully applied.

Convention No. 11 : Right of Association (Agriculture), 1921.

Brazil (ratification : 1957). The Government communicated the following information:

1. The doubts raised by the Committee of Experts had been definitely eliminated by the recent promulgation of the Rural Workers Statute (Act No. 4214 of 2 March 1963) a copy of which has been communicated. Title VI of this Statute regulated ex novo all matters of trade union organisation of rural workers. While the complete implementation of the Act still depends upon the opinion of the National Congress concerning the veto by the President of the Republic of various provisions, nevertheless section 136 is fully enforced and is drafted as follows:

" Paragraph 1. The rural worker elected to an administrative or professional representation post cannot be prevented from the exercising of his functions by reason of service, nor be transferred to an area or to a post which makes it difficult or impossible for him to carry out his mandate, except for a reason recognised by the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs as justified.

" Paragraph 2. The periods during which the rural worker is absent from his work in order to accomplish the tasks referred to in this section are considered as holidays without pay.

" Paragraph 3. The employer who dismisses, suspends or demotes a rural worker, or reduces his salary, so as to prevent him from joining a trade union, organising a trade union association or exercising a right inherent in his condition as an organised worker, is liable to a fine of from 1,000 to 10,000 cruzeros. This fine will be doubled in cases of recurrence, according to the decision of the local authority of the Minister of Labour and Social Welfare without prejudicing other compensation to which the worker is entitled."

On the other hand, section 111 states as follows:

"Article 111. All provisions in the Convention related to rural work contract contrary to the collective rural work agreement or contract in force are considered null and void.

Experts and the Conference Committee had made observations on this point for a number of years.

The Committee regretted the Government's failure to bring its legislation into conformity with the Convention and expressed the hope that the necessary measures would soon be taken.

Rumania (ratification : 1930). A Government representative made the following statement:

Section 20 (c) of the Labour Code did not apply to cases falling within the Convention. This section presupposed the cessation of the activity of the "unit"; i.e. the entire enterprise in the term "unit" was defined in section 132 of the Labour Code. In Rumania ships were the property of the State and were operated directly by various enterprises, which did not own a single ship. Consequently, the shipwreck of a vessel did not involve the cessation of the activity of the undertaking. As for the situation of seamen in case of shipwreck, under the national legislation the employer was obliged to give them other employment, taking account of their qualifications. In the meantime they continued to enjoy all rights arising out of their labour contracts. However, section 20 (c) of the Labour Code, which had been adopted in 1950, had never been applied. This was the reason why the repeal of this provision was being considered, but it would also meet the Committee of Experts' observation.
"Paragraph 1. All infractions of this section will be punished by a fine of 1,000 to 20,000 cruzeiros, one-half to be paid by the employer and one-half by the worker, according to the decision of the competent authority.

Paragraph 2. If the conditions of the contract or the right of association of agricultural workers, had been undertaken. Chile was an isolated country, to which criteria similar to those of other countries could not be applied. It was the first American country to have adopted a complete law on social security (1924) covering all contingencies in case of work injuries and occupational diseases (currently under consideration by the Conference). Therefore the exclusion of agricultural workers, Chile provided maximum facilities in the fields of education, health, welfare, and sanitary assistance, etc. Agricultural workers enjoy the minimum period of 60 days, which could even go to the President of the Republic.

The Workers' members made the following statement:

The supremacy existing in Chile should be extended to the right of association of agricultural workers. Chile had ratified the Convention 38 years ago. There were four fundamental problems. First, it had been stated four years ago that a Bill for the amendment of the Labour Code had been discussed by the Senate and sent for examination to the Chamber of Deputies. This Bill maintained the conditions provided for in section 443 of the Code on the constitution of trade unions (that the founders of the union should pay a sum corresponding to at least 40 per cent. of the workers on the estate). Further a trade union could not be constituted except within the limits of the agricultural estates, and the union had to be presented during the sowing and harvesting periods, fixed by regulations and the duration of each being at least 60 days. Finally, the Government representative had already made a statement in 1962, substantially similar to the present one, referring to the same difficulties and promising practical results before the following session of the Senate. There had been no change in this respect, and it was therefore difficult to accept the explanations submitted.

The Employers' members agreed with the above views and noted that, while the information supplied by the Government representative contained a number of praiseworthy factors, no progress had been achieved in the application of the Convention.

In reply the Government representative pointed out that if a minimum period of continuous service was required for the founders of a trade union, this was due to the fact that the agricultural population was closely attached to the earth which they cultivated, and that prevention of infiltration by agitators was sought. The prohibition of the right to strike during harvest was explained by the fact that, in view of the vastness of the country, and the cost of transport, an agricultural strike at this period could lead to a very serious state of things which would be prejudicial to all workers. The northern mining zones had no agricultural production and were 1,000 kilometres from the town which took place recently made it imperative to give priority to other works such as construction, roads, railways, etc. With the I.L.O.'s assistance, a programme for the repatriation of the agricultural population in it was undertaken. A comparison between the administrative rules which regulated the organisation and recognition of trade unions in industry, and the provisions of the Ministerial Resolution No. 535-A, does not make it possible to consider the observation in question as valid.

Accurate organisation and registration of trade unions in industry, as well as the registration of other trade unions covered by the Consolidation of Labour Laws, as provided by Ministerial Resolutions Nos. 39 and 126 of 28 June 1958, which provide for the recognition of trade unions, and for the adoption of similar provisions which correspond to those which apply in industrial activities.

In this respect, it did not seem reasonable to talk of limitation of rights, unfavourable to agricultural trade unions.

Chile (ratification : 1925). A Government representative made the following statement:

This case had been discussed in 1952 and assurances had then been given that the Government had intended to apply the Convention at the earliest date. The Government representative contained a number of praiseworthy factors, no progress had been achieved in the application of the Convention.

The Convention No. 13 : White Lead (Painting), 1921. A Government representative made the following statement:

The labour regulations for agricultural workers were not identical with those existing for industrial workers. In practice these regulations had been replaced by collective agreements and by the Land Reform Act. A new Bill containing labour regulations for rural workers had been tabled by the Chamber. The next step would be approval by the Chamber, which would be based on the results of the Convention.
Convention. Section 62 of the draft Labour Code provided positive results. That the Government would regulate the use of noxious substances as white lead, etc., in conformity with the international Conventions. After the adoption of the new Code, it would be given to the provisions of the Convention under the above-mentioned section. A campaign had been launched in 1956 against the toxic effects of certain products containing white lead, which had given positive results.

The Employers' members stated that the use of white lead should not be merely regulated; it should be completely prohibited.

The Committee expressed the hope that appropriate modifications would be made in the near future and that the Convention, which had been ratified many years ago, would be fully applied.

Mexico (ratification : 1938). A Government representative made the following statement:

Under article 133 of the national Constitution, ratified Conventions had force of law. While in special cases it might be necessary to incorporate the provisions of Conventions expressly in the legislation, in the present case no provisions were necessary, as no form of white lead was used in Mexico. If white lead should be used in the future, the Government would take the necessary measures for the adoption of provisions on the matter. The pointed out that, instead of waiting for white lead to come into use before adopting the necessary provisions, it would be preferable to adopt them so as to prevent this from happening.

Convention No. 14 : Weekly Rest (Industry), 1921.

China (ratification : 1934). The Government communicated the following information:

The English version of the Chinese draft Labour Code has been sent to the I.L.O. and to other organisations for their comments; the I.L.O. expert on labour legislation has already made preliminary observations on this draft code. It is only after an official report has been submitted to the Chinese Government by the I.L.O. on an over-all review and a final revision of the draft Labour Code can be made. Provisions based on ratified Conventions will be respected. Once this is done the draft Labour Code will be submitted to the Legislative Yuan for its examination and enactment.

Greece (ratification : 1929). The Government communicated the following information:

The Government had already indicated in its report for the period 1960-62 that the weekly rest period had been extended to railway personnel by virtue of Royal Decree No. 387/1962 (Official Gazette, No. 93, 23 June 1962). The railway staff do not yet enjoy a weekly rest period, but the question of extending it to this category of personnel is being considered. The Government hopes that it will be able to announce this extension in the near future.

Turkey (ratification : 1946). The Government communicated the following information:

A Bill prepared by the Ministry of Labour and concerning the general revision of the Labour Code has just been forwarded to the President of the Council of Ministers, for submission to the Grand National Assembly. This Bill provides, inter alia, for the amendment of sections 182, 183 and 190 of the Labour Code, which, when adopted, will permit the application of the provisions of the Convention to all categories of undertakings men­tioned in Article 1 of the Convention, regardless of the number of workers employed or the importance of the region in which they are situated.

Viet-Nam (ratification : 1955). The Government communicated the following information:

The Government providing for periods of rest in compensation for the exceptions authorised by sections 182, 183 and 190 of the Labour Code was promulgated on 22 March 1963. Copies of this Legislative Decree have been supplied.

In addition a Government representative made the following statement:

The Government took note of the observation concerning inland navigation. Regulations concerning con­ditions of work in inland navigation, which provided for weekly rest for the workers in question, were under study by the Ministries of Public Works and Labour and the trade unions concerned. It was hoped to adopt a general law for this branch. As a result of the war, inland navigation was obstructed. As regards the weekly and, in practice, workers had more than one day's weekly rest. Tramways had been replaced by buses. The public bus corporation in the capital would apply the labour standards of the former company. Weekly rest had been long observed. The bus workers' union was one of the strongest; it negotiated with the public corporation on unsettled matters. As regards the railways, the situation was no longer governed by the order of 1937, but by agreements concluded between the administration of the Federal Railways and the National Assistance Board which employed many railway workers. A new campaign under the above-mentioned section. A campaign had been launched in 1956 against the toxic effects of white lead was used in Mexico. If white lead should be used in the future, the Government would take the necessary measures for the adoption of provisions on the matter. The pointed out that, instead of waiting for white lead to come into use before adopting the necessary provisions, it would be preferable to adopt them so as to prevent this from happening.

Convention No. 15 : Minimum Age (Trimmers and Stokers), 1921.

Turkey (ratification : 1958). The Government communicated the following information:

The Ministry of Labour has again reminded the Ministry of Commerce and the employers of the child workers in the list of the crew (model No. 2) a new column indicating the age, or date of birth, of any member of the crew under 18 years old, when the Convention was sent to the I.L.O. and to other organisations for its examination and enactment on 27 April 1954 on the qualifications and number of seamen are amended.

A Government representative added that provision had now been made for the list of the crew to contain a column indicating the age, or date of birth, of crew members under 18 years of age.

Convention No. 17 : Workmen's Compensation (Accidents), 1925.

Chile (ratification : 1931). A Government representative made the following statement:

Article 5 of the Convention authorised the payment of a lump sum whenever there were guarantees that it would be utilised properly. It was therefore unreasonable to require periodic payments in all cases, even when incapacity was only partial, instead of the payment of a lump-sum indemnity. Moreover, Act No. 10383 (sections 33, 34, 35 and 36) on social security, covering almost all industrial and commercial workers, and all agricultural workers, in addition to the lump-sum indemnity paid by the employer, a part of the employee's contribution towards the cost of medical care system, such as that of the United Kingdom. The Government accepts the validity of the Committee of Experts' observations. Articles 9 and 10 of the Convention provided that workmen injured in an industrial accident should be entitled to medical aid, pharmaceutical aid and appliances, etc., without cost. In the United Kingdom, under the National Health Service, which covered all residents in the country, the victims of an accident were treated in exactly the same way as anyone else in need of treatment; medical care was entirely free, but patients had to make a small contribution towards the cost of medicines, drugs and appliances. If the payment was likely to be heavy, the National Assistance Board would reimburse the cost. The subject of benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases was being discussed at the Conference this year, together with the revision of Convention No. 17. The Committee of Social Security Experts had recommended its revision and indicated that any new instrument should recognize that medical care might be furnished to the victims of employment injuries, either directly by an employment injury compensation scheme, as envisaged by Convention No. 17, or through a general medical care system, such as that of the United Kingdom.
One could not foresee what sort of instrument would be adopted. The Government felt that the appropriate course would be to examine its position when the new instrument was adopted. It was extremely difficult to make a distinction between persons entitled to the National Health Service, according to whether they were or were not victims of industrial accidents. The Government hoped that it would be able to ratify the revised Convention. Otherwise, it would have to consider the denunciation of Convention No. 17.

The Workers' members pointed out that, as long as a Convention had not been revised, it should be applied as it stood. It was emphasising that the Government, while recognising the validity of the observations, did not intend to change its legislation. It was inadmissible that a part of the cost of medical treatment should be defrayed by the victims of accident. The Convention should not be revised in this way.

The Employers' members stated that a Convention which had been ratified must be fully applied. The Convention was obviously not observed as regards persons injured in industrial accidents. The Government should consider its denunciation, if the revised instrument did not prove satisfactory.

The United Kingdom Workers' member stated that, in his country, health service charges were a minor matter. However, the position of the victims of industrial accidents was less favourable under the National Health Service than under the old Workmen's Compensation Act, which provided for full reimbursement of medical expenses. It would be easy to adopt legislative provisions to remove the charges payable in this case.

The Committee expressed the hope that the Government would re-examine its position and that a solution would be found by next year.

Convention No. 19: Equality of Treatment (Accident Compensation), 1925.

Sudan (ratification: 1957). The Government communicated the following information:

The legislative provisions for the payment of compensation for industrial accidents in the Sudan are included in the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance, 1949. The provisions of this ordinance cover all workmen, as provided by the ordinance, in the Sudan; and there is no discrimination as to Sudanese or non-Sudanese.

Within the scope of the ordinance, the victim or his dependants are entitled to due compensation; and this is provided by section 12 (1) of the ordinance which reads as follows: "The compensation shall be payable to or for the benefit of the workman, or where death results from the injury, to or for the benefit of his dependants as provided by this ordinance."

As for remittances of amounts due to the victim or his dependants, the matter lies outside the scope of labour legislation. Yet it may be of interest to state that remittances made by other countries are allowed when there is a case of payment of compensation for industrial accidents happening in the Sudan.

Convention No. 20: Night Work (Bakeries), 1925.

Argentina (ratification: 1955). A Government representative made the following statement:

The first question concerned permissible exemptions which were in certain provinces. The Convention was fully applied, and this question related to exceptions of minor importance. As regards the second point, the Government supplied the text of collective agreement No. 50 of August 1944; it had been revised by more recent texts.

The Committee took note of the information and decided to transmit it to the Committee of Experts for consideration.

Colombia (ratification: 1933). A Government representative made the following statement:

The general regulations on night work constituted the only legislative provisions relating to the questions covered by the Convention. Under this legislation night work was authorised only in special cases, and when a special rate was paid for overtime. The Government would urge the National Congress to give effect to this Convention when it adopted the Labour Code. That was a formal undertaking, given on the strength of over 20 years' personal interest in the work of the I.L.O. and in the Conventions and Recommendations as a means of improving conditions of work in the various countries. Colombia having ratified the Convention in 1910, under the Colombian Constitution, the National Congress was the ratifying authority for Conventions. The Government submitted to it texts, together with proposals for ratification. Conventions Nos. 29, 30, 81, 102, 106 and 116 had been submitted for the approval of Congress in this way. Conventions 87 and 98 would be ratified likewise.

The Workers' members pointed out that if the National Congress ratified Conventions, it could not refuse to adjust the national legislation to the Conventions that it had ratified. It should be possible for the Government to introduce legislation by amending the existing national legislation which provided for full reimbursement of medical expenses. It would be easy to adopt legislative provisions to remove the charges payable in this case. The revised Convention. Otherwise, it would have to consider the denunciation of the Convention in question.

In reply the Government representative stated that the procedure consisted of two phases which could not be considered simultaneously under the national Constitution. The ratification of international treaties was a matter for a special congressional commission. The legislation would be modified only after ratification. National legislation should be brought into line with the provisions of the Convention. The Labour Code was in process of revision and every effort would be made to have the Code adopted in the near future.

The Committee took note of the statements of the Governments and their representatives.


Convention No. 22: Seamen's Articles of Agreement, 1926.

Argentina (ratification: 1960). A Government representative made the following statement:

The matter was governed by the Commercial Code. It was an old Code which had been superseded on numerous points by regulations and collective agreements. A Committee had been set up to adapt the Code; this showed the Government's desire to follow up the Experts' observations. The Convention was, however, applied in practice.

See also under Convention No. 8.

Mexico (ratification: 1934). A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government considered that the Convention was applied. The Ministry of Shipping had been approached with a view to taking appropriate measures, and the Government maintained its view that section 146 of the Federal Labour Act, which prohibited generally the cancellation of contracts of employment, was more favourable to the worker than Article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which permitted employers to cancel a contract (a power they did not have under the Mexican Act). Such dismissal by an employer in a foreign port would create a difficult situation for the seaman.

The Workers' members noted that the provisions of the Convention were clearly not applied. One could not regard the national provision as being more favourable than the Convention, since it prevented seamen from putting an end to their contracts freely, thus restricting their liberty. If by next year the situation was the same, the Committee might consider its denunciation, if the revised Convention did not prove satisfactory.

The Committee took note of the statements of the Governments and their representatives.

Venezuela (ratification: 1944). A Government representative made the following statement:

The Committee of Experts had asked whether any minimum wages were now in existence. All collective agreements contained schedules of wages, which constituted minimum wages. If no agreement was reached between the parties, the State intervened and the question was settled by means of an award.
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Convention No. 27 : Marking of Weight (Packages Trans­ported by Vessels), 1929.

Argentina (ratification : 1950). See under Conventions Nos. 8 and 22.

India (ratification : 1931). The Government communi­cated the following information :

The observations of the Committee of Experts have been communicated to the authorities concerned, for the action necessary. Information regarding the action taken will be supplied in the report for 1961-63.

Convention No. 29 : Forced Labour, 1930.

Bulgaria (ratification : 1932). A Government represent­ative made the following statement :

All explanations concerning the observations had been given the year before. However, it should be added that the Special Labour Services had been created in order to respect the constitutional provisions, which provided that the special forces should be retained before the law. Some young people could not be drafted into the armed forces while others were exempted from this obligation. The conscripts recruited for the Special Labour Services had the feeling of doing a patriotic duty. The special con­ditions of every country must be taken into account in any assessment of the situation in this respect, as the Director-General suggested in his Report, on the very subject of forced labour (page 27). In a socialist country all work was carried out freely for the well-being of all, in a spirit of comradeship. Concerning self-taxation of the population, the Experts' Committee appeared not to have understood the meaning of section 8 of the Act of 6 February 1958. This section should be interpreted within the scope of article 2 of the Act, notably sections 1 to 5, which established the voluntary nature of this work. The fact of specifying the age of persons called upon to provide their services did not prove that it was a case of forced labour. The Government believed that the national legislation was not contrary to the Convention.

The Workers' members noted that the points made last year by the Workers' members concerning the matter remained valid. If the Bulgarian Government member's arguments were accepted, it would follow that it would suffice to be a socialist country for forced labour to be permitted. The matter must be judged objectively : the Convention was not applied in Bulgaria. It was also to be regretted that the Government of Bulgaria had not sent a report on the Convention. Finally, the degree to which the Convention was applied could not be judged according to the ideology of each country, but on the basis of a comparison of its legislation with the pro­visions of the Convention.

The Employers' members noted that the Bulgarian Government representative had said that everyone, irrespective of age and beliefs, was to participate in self-taxation schemes. Thus, at least, there was no dis­crimination concerning the matter. But it was still forced labour which must be judged according to the same criterion. The Employers' members had been opposed to the inclusion, in any rules for the Committee of Experts, of a criterion referring to the economic and social conditions of different countries, precisely in order to prevent Conventions from being interpreted in a differ­ent way for each member State.

A Government representative pointed out that there was a certain contradiction in the statements of the Bulgarian Government representative. On the one hand, work was said to be voluntary, and on the other, it was said that certain persons had to be obliged to carry out special services to maintain equality before the law. It was surprising that a country like Bulgaria should have to resort to such methods in order to ensure its economic development. It was a serious breach of a fundamental human right.

The Bulgarian Government representative noted that the statements regarding the situation in Bulgaria seemed to have been misunderstood. The self-taxation schemes were voluntary. Citizens offered themselves voluntarily because they knew that their work had as its object the improvement of conditions in their locality. The Special Labour Services had been created by a progressive Government, and in 1948, this system was still being accepted by the present Government, which had improved the conditions of work. Until 1961 no observa­tions had been made on this subject. The Government had to devote all its efforts to developing the economy of the country and, in order to do so, it needed the support of the population. These efforts had given positive results which would not have been obtained if there had been forced labour.

In reply to an Employers' member the Government representative added that no sanction was imposed on citizens who refused to provide the services required by the Act on self-taxation. The situation was different as regards the Special Labour Services, which were composed of conscripts not enlisted in the army. In this case, the conscripts were subject to certain penalties, so that these wo services made necessary in order to take account of constitutional provisions.

The Committee took note of these statements and requested the Government to re-examine the situation. In so far as there were no penalties, it should be easy to amend the national legislation to bring it into conformity with the Convention, in order to make clear that the work was voluntary.

Sudan (ratification : 1957). The Government communi­cated the following information :

Article 2, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention. The work exacted by virtue of Military Service Laws has a purely military character.

Article 2, paragraph 2 (c). Work which is exacted from persons after conviction in a court of law is carried out under the supervision of and controlled by public authorities; and it cannot be fixed or placed at the disposal of private persons, companies or associations.

Article 2, paragraph 2 (e). No minor communal ser­vices have been exacted, although a special service can be exacted as a part of the normal civic obligations of the citizens of a fully self-governing country.

Article 7. No forced labour can be exacted in favour of chiefs or "sheiks".

Convention No. 30 : Hours of Work (Commerce and Offices), 1929.

Austria (ratification : 1932). The Government com­municated the following information :

A. Article 4 of the Convention. The regulation in section 23 (1), second paragraph, of the current Workers' Protection Act—which was included in the Act when the maximum general work-week was reduced from 48 to 45 hours by the Act of 25 November 1958—aims at estab­lishing that working hours shall normally be distributed over six weekdays. In other words, distribution of work time over five days is not considered as normal. The regulation does not permit agreements to increase the normal work day beyond nine hours (as stated in section 23 (1), first sentence). All the main organisations of employers and workers agree on this interpretation of the regulation.

B. Article 6. The same department in the Ministry of Local Government and Labour, maintains that the comments of the Experts' Committee, as handles applications for dispensation from the Workers' Protection Act. It has therefore been considered unnecessary to issue formal instructions to the effect that the comments made in the report of the Norwegian Government for the period 1958-60. However, such formal instructions will be issued for commercial and office undertakings which are covered by the Convention, since the Experts' Committee finds this more satisfactory.

C. The observation by the Committee of Experts will be communicated to the transport services concerned, with the request that it be taken into consideration during revision of the current special regulations for these ser­vices.

D. Article 7. The Committee of Experts "feels that the practice in Norway as described is in conformity with the Convention", but it proposes that steps be taken to bring Norwegian law into formal conformity with the Convention, for example by stipulating a maximum of two or three hours' overtime, usual working time per day. The statement by the Committee has been discussed with the leading organisations of employers and workers. The Norwegian Employers' Association has affirmed that overtime is used very little in commercial and office activities, but whon on occasion it does occur, it usually is necessary to get the extra work done with the least possible delay. The Committee is of the opinion that a general limitation of overtime to two or three hours a day is against the interests of both employees and the undertakings, and therefore opposes stipulation of a directive or norm for such limitation.
The Norwegian Trade Union Federation has confirmed that overtime is used only occasionally in these undertakings, and points out that the employees often wish to do their overtime all at once, or in as few days as possible, rather than spread it out over a longer time. The Trade Union Federation is therefore also of the opinion that formal regulation of daily overtime permitted, beyond the regulation already practised, is not necessary. The formal regulation of daily overtime permitted, beyond the regulation already practised, is not necessary. The Government has also noted that under these conditions the Committee of Experts will accept current practice as satisfactory. Since Norwegian law leaves it up to the parties to distribute over the days of the week the overtime up to ten hours a week which can be worked without dispensation, no binding order to limit overtime per day can be issued without a change in the Workers' Protection Act made by Parliament on a proposal by the Government. It would be rather unfortunate if the Government, as a result of ratification, should have to consider proposing a change in the law which in Norway is considered unnecessary. As an alternative, the question of revoking ratification of the Convention would arise.

E. The Norwegian Government is aware that the description of the cases in which according to the Workers' Protection Act, section 25 (1), (b), (c), (d) and (e), overtime may be worked, does not coincide exactly with the wording of Article 7 (2) (a), (b), (c) and (d) of the Convention. Thus, it may be seen that any significant difference would arise in practice, especially as regards Article 7 (2) (d), under which overtime can be worked in "cases of abnormal pressure of work due to special circumstances". The Government therefore hopes that the Committee of Experts will withdraw its observation on this point.

F. Formal instructions will be issued as proposed by the Committee of Experts, stating that authorisations are to be granted under section 24 (b) of the Act only if the maximum number of additional hours permitted in the day is specified in each case.

G. Investigation will be made of the necessity of maintaining special regulations for state-owned transport undertakings in the Workers' Protection Act, section 25 (1) (e).

With regard to application of the Workers' Protection Act, section 26 (3), the Directorate of Labour Inspection has been given authority to allow overtime up to 20 hours a week and 40 hours in four consecutive weeks, but not for longer than three months. Applications for the working of overtime beyond these limitations are decided by the Ministry. The Directorate of Labour Inspection has reported that very few exceptions under section 26 (3) have been authorised to undertakings in trade and office activity. The Ministry has given some comparatively broad dispensations to cover shorter periods of abnormally pressing work. The most important of these are dispensations to banks carrying out their annual balancing of accounts, to the postal service during the Christmas mail rush, and to the Telecommunication Service to handle periods of exceptionally heavy traffic. A complete list will be made, if necessary, of all dispensations given within a definite period of time to undertakings covered by the dispensation under section 26 (3) can be put into effect until after the employees, through their representatives, have had the opportunity to express their opinions (section 26 (4)). The usual practice in such dispensations has been to leave up to the parties concerned to apportion the overtime allowed per week over the separate weekdays. (See D above, and the report for 1958-60.
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Convention No. 32: Protection against Accidents (Dockers) (Revised), 1932.

Argentina (ratification: 1950). A Government representative made the following statement:

A committee composed of government representatives and of representatives of employers and workers engaged in ports had drawn up port labour regulations, which would take into account the provisions of the Convention.

Belgium (ratification: 1952). A Government representative made the following statement:

Following the Experts' observations, the Government was prepared to re-examine its interpretation, and hoped to find a solution which would satisfy the Committee of Experts.

China (ratification: 1936). The Government communicated the following information:

The Committee of Experts has pointed out that the Chinese national regulations concerning the safety and protection of dockworkers do not comply with the terms of the Convention. The question is now being examined by the various competent authorities concerned.

Section 2 of the above regulations provides that priority should be given to the ratification of this Convention and, when necessary, the said regulations may be amended in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, or the Convention itself may be given force of law.

France (ratification: 1955). A Government representative made the following statement:

The various problems which had arisen as regards the application of the Convention to inland navigation (Article 1 of the Convention) were receiving careful consideration by the competent services. As soon as this study had been completed, the results thereof would be communicated to the I.L.O.

The Committee took note of the statement and expressed the hope that a satisfactory solution would be found before the next session.

Italy (ratification: 1933). The Government communicated the following information:

The work of the committee charged with drawing up special rules for the security of port workers, to assure, inter alia, harmonisation, full compliance with the Convention, continues. However, the desired results have not yet been obtained because of unforeseen difficulties which have appeared in regard to the co-ordination of the various bodies dealing with port work.

As stated in previous reports, the Government fully recognises the need to adopt model security regulations and, while hoping that the matter can be resolved in a more uniform manner by the adoption of new general regulations on the security of port workers, the Maritime Minister intervened with the competent port authority to assure that security regulations, as far as possible, would be made uniform and brought into conformity with the provisions of the Convention, while taking local conditions into account. The Government wishes to comply with the observations of the Committee of Experts and will endeavour to resolve the question by means of the special committee mentioned above, and it can now be affirmed that the difficulties encountered will be solved as soon as possible.

A Government representative made the following additional statement:

The situation was as follows: certain local security regulations had been modified and brought into conformity with the Convention; a list of these regulations had been brought to the attention of the Committee of Experts. Other regulations were being prepared. The work of the special committee had met with certain difficulties as regards the co-ordination of the various authorities concerned in work in ports. The Government agreed once again on the advisability of preparing a model security regulation and it would make every effort to solve the difficulties and to adopt this regulation.

Mozambique (ratification: 1934). A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government would do everything possible to adopt the provisions necessary to give full effect to Articles 4, 8, 11 and 13 of the Convention. It was hoped that by next year the matter would be settled.

Convention No. 41: Night Work (Women) (Revised), 1934.

Hungary (ratification: 1936). See under Convention No. 6 (in so far as it is relevant to Convention No. 41).

Convention No. 43: Sheet-Glass Works, 1934.

Czechoslovakia (ratification: 1938). A Government representative made the following statement:
For the reasons indicated with regard to Convention No. 1, the Government's report was incomplete. The information requested by the Committee of Experts required careful preparation and would be furnished in the next report.

Convention No. 45: Underground Work (Women), 1935.

China (ratification: 1936). The Government communicated the following information:

Regulation 187 (2) of the Taiwan Regulations for the Security of Mines, which was contrary to Article 5, is considered as null and void. At present the Ministry of Economic Affairs and the Taiwan provincial government are undertaking jointly to make the necessary amendments with a view to bringing these Regulations into conformity with the Mines Act and with the Convention.

Furthermore, the Ministry of the Interior issued an order in October 1958 requiring all the undertakings to employ women in underground work to transfer them to surface work. The Mines Inspection Commission of Taiwan Province has been working under strict orders. Since March 1958 all the vacancies left by women workers in underground work in mines have been filled by male workers so that the practice of employing women underground may be gradually abolished. See under Convention No. 43.

Convention No. 49: Reduction of Hours of Work (Glass-Bottle Works), 1935.

Czechoslovakia (ratification: 1938). See under Convention No. 43.

Convention No. 50: Recruiting of Indigenous Workers, 1936.

Argentina (ratification: 1950). A Government representative made the following statement:

Recruiting of indigenous workers was a question which fell within the competence of the provinces, since it was related to the inspection and the supervision of the labour system. There was a national administration for indigenous affairs in charge of co-ordinating all activities in this field; a number of local agreements had determined in detail the conditions of recruitment. The texts of some of these agreements were submitted to the Committee.

The Committee thanked the Government for this information and the texts supplied, which would be transmitted to the Experts for examination.

Convention No. 52: Holidays with Pay, 1936.

Cuba (ratification: 1953). The Government communicated the following information:

The provision by virtue of which "interruptions of work due to sickness are absolutely separate from the right to holidays and are not counted in the annual paid holidays" is in section V of Act No. 40 of 1936, which provides as follows: "Absence from work due to sickness, accident, stoppage of work in the commercial or industrial undertaking because of force majeure, lockout or lawful strike shall not be considered as interruptions in the year's service."

Moreover, sick leave enjoys an independent legal status in virtue of Resolution No. 5798/62 which provides as follows, in section 2 (c): "The following shall not be considered as interruptions when calculating the period in respect of which holidays with pay are due: (1) sickness, industrial accidents, force majeure, etc., duly proved to the undertaking and the trade union branch; (2) maternity leave; (3) decease of the father, mother, wife, child, brother or sister; (4) absence authorised by the administration as a reward or for another reason; (5) absence due to the mobilisation of the worker in the revolutionary militia of the Revolutionary Armed Force."

Convention No. 59: Minimum Age (Industry) (Revised), 1937.


France (ratification: 1950). The Government communicated the following information:

The subcommittee of the Occupational Safety Committee entrusted with the revision of the Decree of 9 August 1937 will complete its work by the end of 1958. A decree, which has been the subject of long technical studies, will probably be presented to the Occupational Safety Committee in the early months of 1954. The Government hopes to be able to issue this decree before the next session of the Conference.

Mexico (ratification: 1941). A Government representative made the following statement:

With reference to the Regulations on Building and Public Services in the Federal District, it should be noted that section 42 (a) already covered all kinds of hoisting machines and similar appliances, without distinction between permanent and temporary machines. The Workers' members noted that the main problem as regards this Convention was that of geographical scope, as the regulations in question applied only in the Federal District, with the result that only 65,000 building workers were covered, whereas 182,000 building workers in other states remained excluded from the application of the Convention.

In reply the Government representative admitted that the regulations applied only in the Federal District, although their extension to the other federal states had been recommended. The procedure for this extension had fallen within the competence of the federal units, but the Government had requested them to adopt the necessary measures.

The Committee took note of these statements.


Cuba (ratification: 1954). The Government communicated the following information:

The failure to publish the data and statistics required by the Convention, in the manner prescribed therein, is not due to the fact that there was no organisation but to the fact that there were no statistical services when the present Government took over. Nevertheless, the Government is now making every effort to establish a solid and efficient statistical basis, this being indispensable. Not only the provisions of a ratified Convention, but also the requirements of economic planning which has been undertaken, made necessary the measures which have been taken to hasten the proper functioning of the services created for statistical work. The national directorate of the Central Planning Board (JUCEPLAN) and the responsible department in the Ministry of Labour, have taken measures with a view to obtaining and compiling the data and statistics required under the Convention, with a view, inter alia, to guiding their directing bodies. The Government hopes that once these tasks have been completed, it will be possible to supply the information referred to under Article 1 (c) of the Convention.

Convention No. 67: Hours of Work and Rest Periods (Road Transport), 1939.

Cuba (ratification: 1953). The Government communicated the following information:

The constitutional practice itself, as well as the modifications introduced in legislation, were brought to the attention of the public by all existing means of diffusion, whether official or not. In the case of modifications affecting road transport, diffusion was also ensured by means of the posting of notices in depots and stations. As regards collective agreements, Chapter 1, section 31 et seq., of Act No. 1025/62 lays down the procedure to be followed in respect of the conclusion, termination and annulment of collective agreements. In virtue of these measures collective agreements may now be concluded in full freedom without any restriction other than those established by law, morality and public order. Consequently, collective agreements respecting hours of work and rest, and may not contain provisions which are less favourable than those prescribed in the relevant legislative provisions. No exception is made in this respect in the sector of road transport.
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Resolution No. 3186 of 9 January 1956 of the Minister of Transport was repealed by resolution No. 10 of 20 January 1956, issued by the National Transport Corporation, a copy of which has been supplied.

The manner in which registers or documents are to be kept by employers are made available to the inspection services is prescribed in detail in section XV of the Regulations issued under the Eight-Hour Act. Failure by an employer to submit to the authorities the registers which he is required to keep in virtue of the regulations, in regard to hours of work and of rest, would render him liable to the penalties prescribed in section 575 (9) of the Code of Social Defence.

No measures have been adopted, or are being considered, permitting drivers to accumulate working hours up to 192 hours in order that they may rest for the remainder of the month. Such measures would clearly be harmful to the health of transport workers, and the protection of the health of these and of all other workers in Cuba is one of the main preoccupations of the Government.

Convention No. 68 : Food and Catering (Ships' Crews), 1946.

Argentina (ratification : 1956). A Government representative made the following statement : There were collective agreements which took account of the provisions of Conventions Nos. 68 and 73. A copy of the State Merchant Navy Service Regulations, which gave effect to the Conventions, was being transmitted to the Committee. See also under Convention No. 8.

The fact that the information and documents furnished would be transmitted to the Committee of Experts for examination. The Committee hoped that in all cases the Government would supply detailed information in its next reports.

Convention No. 73 : Medical Examination (Seafarers), 1946.


Greece (ratification : 1955). The Government communicated the following information :

Article 12, paragraph 1 (c), of the Convention. (1) (Clause (c) (i)). Greek legislation does not contain any formal regulations on this subject, but it follows from the provisions of Legislative Decree No. 2954/1954 (sections 8 (2) and 10 (2) that the inspectors are granted the powers in question; the application of this provision of the Convention in practice.

(2) (Clause (c) (ii)). Greek legislation does not contain any special provision on this subject, but in cases where it prescribes the keeping of books, the legislation also provides that these should be placed at the disposal of the labour inspectors (section 4 of Law No. 530/1945 on annual holidays with pay and section 153 of the Presidential Decree of 14/22 March 1954 on hygiene and safety for workers and employees in industrial undertakings and for craftsmen of all sorts, workshops, etc.).

(3) (Clause (c) (iii)). Section 150 of the above-mentioned Presidential Decree contains a provision similar to that of Article 12, paragraph 2.

(4) (Clause (c) (iv)). No formal provision exists on this subject, but this follows from the provisions of section 7 (3) and (4) of Legislative Decree No. 2954/1954 ; the application of the Convention on this point is thus ensured in practice.

Article 12, paragraph 2. This provision is applied in practice, except in cases where the inspector considers that notification of his visit to the employer may impair the effectiveness of inspection.

Article 13. The powers described in this provision of the Convention are granted by (a) section 161 of the Decree of 14/22 March 1954 on hygiene and safety of workers and employees, and (b) section 39 of the Royal Decree of 17 February 1956 on safety of workers and technicians in the building industry (Official Gazette, No. 106, Part A, 19 April 1956).

Article 14. (1) Section 2 (2) of Royal Decree No. 473/61 on contributions for occupational accidents (Official Gazette, No. 119, Part A, 26 July 1961) provides that employers are obliged to notify to the competent labour inspectorate any accident that may occur to a worker covered by the Institute of Social Insurance. Section 2 (2) of the above-mentioned decree contains the same obligations as regards occupational diseases.

(2) However, in order to bring the provisions of national law into complete harmony with the Convention, particularly as regards occupational diseases, a special provision on this subject has been incorporated in the draft law which is under discussion in Parliament, and which aims at modifying and completing the provision.

It reads as follows : " Section 40. After paragraph (c) of section 10 of Royal Decree No. 2954/1954 on the organisation of the services of the Ministry of Labour, the competent Labour Inspectorate in the Ministry of Labour and other provisions, a new provision is added, reading as follows : ‘ During the first month of each year the principal insurance institutions shall notify to the local labour inspectorates only the cases of occupational diseases which have occurred as regards insured persons of this region during the past year.‘ "

The Government considers that this new provision, together with section 23 of the Insurance Regulations of the Institute of Social Insurance (Decision No. 57440/13.1.1958 on Royal Decree, Official Gazette No. 33, 1958, Part B) regulates this question.

Articles 20 and 21. By virtue of section 7 (2) (c) of Legislative Decree No. 2954/1954 on the organisation of the labour inspectorate, labour inspectors have for many years past been entitled monthly to reports dealing with the number of inspections and controls, cases brought before the courts, approval of lists indicating hours of work, overtime, etc. These reports are compiled by the Inspector-General. The Government hopes that it will soon be able to publish the annual report on labour inspection and to communicate a copy, in accordance with Article 6 of the Convention.

In addition a Government representative made the following statement : The Government considered that the national legislation gave effect to Articles 12, paragraph 1 (c), and 13 of the Convention. In any case, in the course of the powers exercised by the labour inspectors had not so far met with any difficulty in practice. Nevertheless, the matter of bringing the legislation into formal compliance with the Convention was being studied. As for Article 14 of the Convention, it would be brought into conformity with the legislation by the insertion of a new provision in the above-mentioned Bill. For the application of Articles 20 and 21, the necessary instructions had already been given to the services concerned.

The Committee took note of this information with interest.

Pakistan (ratification : 1953). A Government representative made the following statement : The Committee of Experts' report had been received late. Extracts from this report had been communicated to the services concerned for the collection of information on the points which had been raised. Information in respect of the Committee's observations would be furnished as soon as possible.

A Bill concerning the Factories Act was ready but as, under the new Constitution, the labour matters were the responsibility of the provincial governments, the Factories Act could not be enacted during the last session of the National Assembly. The revision of the Mines Act and the promulgation of the new Factories Act were expected very soon.


Albania (ratification : 1957). A Government representative made the following statement : The Government of Albania had sent its reports regularly and had given the explanations requested in the observations made by the Committee. As regards point 1, no legal provision limited the right of foreigners to become members of trade unions. No infringements of that right had been reported in the interval. As regards point 2, section 20 of the national Constitution guaranteed all citizens without distinction freedom of speech and of the press, the right to organise, and the right of public demonstration and meeting. Section 21.
guaranteed the right of association. No legal provisions deprived the workers of the right to exercise their constitutional rights, or were contrary to the provisions of the Labour Code. The trade union movement in Albania was formed on the basis of freedom and democracy. The Albanian Congress of Trade Unions was elected by secret ballot and its decisions expressed the will of all members. The trade union organisations, which reflected the fundamental principles of freedom of association.

Every occupational organisation established its own programme and rules. So far there had been no case of any trade union having its activities obstructed or prohibited. No section of the Labour Code permitted the authorities to intervene with a view to limiting freedom of association. The trade unions of Albania were formed associations freely and had approved their rules. The trade unions “shall have belonged to the occupation for at least five years”, but “in favour of workers, regardless of their social and economic conditions.”

The Albanian Labour Code did not depart from the provisions of the Convention. As regards point 5, Act No. 2362 provided for the creation of social, sports, cultural, technical, scientific organisations, etc., which were not public authorities and functioned in conformity with those organisations’ rules: that was the meaning of sections 229 and 229 of the Labour Code. Concerning point 4, the members of production co-operatives also had constitutional freedom of association. Those organisations were not covered by Act No. 2362. The members of these organisations had formed associations freely and had approved their rules. Agricultural and craft co-operatives which defended the interests of their members. The Government could not intervene or obligate the workers to participate in any co-operatives or to create organisations other than those which they had decided to set up. As regards point 3, directors of undertakings and employers could join trade unions. The creation of unions of employers was limited neither by the Labour Code nor by Law No. 2905. The creation of an employers’ organisation did not require prior authorisation of the Congress of Trade Unions. Concerning point 2, the trade unions “shall have belonged to the occupation for at least five years”, but “in favour of workers, regardless of their social and economic conditions.”

The provisions of the Labour Code were not voted by the National Assembly “against the leaders of trade unions” but “in favour of workers, regardless of their social and economic conditions.” Nevertheless, the Government deems it necessary to stress that the revision of certain sections of the Labour Code is now envisaged with a view to respecting the provisions of the Convention.

2. As mentioned above, the Government felt that it was necessary to require, for some time, certain guarantees from trade union leaders. A Bill to amend Act No. 61/221 of 2 June 1961 will be presented soon to the National Assembly. It will be for the Assembly to decide the amendment of section 10 of the Labour Code, which stipulates that the officers of trade unions “shall have belonged to the occupation for five years.”

The Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare is in favour of the rectification requested by the International Labour Office.

3. Under section 6 of the Labour Code “persons practising the same profession, similar trades or related professions participating in the manufacture of certain products, or carrying on the same kind of liberal profession, can freely establish a trade union “. 

4. As mentioned under 1 above, the National Assembly had found it inadmissible that (to mention only one example) former cooks and voluntarily unemployed workers should have the right to discuss, during collective
negotiations, problems relating to road transport. Accordingly, the legislation provided, as regards section 6 of the Labour Code, that collective agreements should be discarded in the event of the occurrence of disagreement, while stating specifically that delegats may be assisted by the administrative secretary of their trade union.

It is correct that the Government had not paid sufficient attention to the wording of the last phrase of section 22.

It should be stressed once more that the concern of the Government is not so much to defend trade union leaders but to defend the interests of the working masses.

5. The Government will, in the near future, submit a report on the amendments to the law on association submitted to the National Assembly. As yet, as the provisions of Act No. 60-170 of 12 December 1960 and Decree No. 60-011 of 10 January 1961, the Government notes with pleasure that the competent Committee has emphasized that under Article 8 of the Convention "workers and employers and their respective organisations, like other persons or organised collectivities, shall respect the law of the land".

The law expressly provides that only "persons practising the same occupation, similar trades or related professions participating in the manufacture of certain products, or practising the same liberal profession, can ever tolerate the existence of a trade union, composed of few workers and people not covered by the Public Service Regulations, or the workers of the sugar cane estates of the Republic."

The Government hopes that the competent Committee will appreciate that there has been no violation of freedom of association but that the Government has on the contrary sought to remind workers and employers that the development by the said organisations of the activities in conformity with the existing legal provisions; this right did not imply previous authorisation, which would be incompatible with Articles 2 and 7 of the Convention.

6. The statements made by the Government representative before the Committee gave a clear and accurate interpretation of section 11 of Act No. 962 of 1961 and of section 26 of the Act.

The recognition of special rights, particularly as regards collective bargaining, as suggested by the Committee of Experts, is acceptable to Cuban workers, even if as it would signify an inadmissible case of discrimination.

5. Under section 40 (e) of the Act, trade union leaders must belong to the trade union organisation corresponds. This is so by virtue of the right enjoyed by workers to decide which type of organisation best serves their interests, that is, in this case, a national trade union organisation.

6. The Committee of Experts indicates that there is incompatibility between section 26 of Act No. 962 of 1961 and Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention. It would seem that the Committee of Experts has considered the form but not the substance of the legislative provision in question.

The competent Committee's observations had been repealed or whether the Royal Decree of 1888 respecting associations referred to in the Committee of Experts' interpretation is incompatible with Article 6 of the Convention shows that the Committee of Experts' interpretation is based on an erroneous criterion.

The Cuban workers have not considered it appropriate to establish organisations other than those referred to in section 11 of the Act in question is incompatible with Article 6 of the Convention shows that the Committee of Experts' interpretation is based on an erroneous criterion.

The Royal Decree of 1888 (Associations Act) merely regulates the relationship between associations and the State; it does not regulate their internal activities, as stated by the Committee of Experts, and all the authorities have been consulted on the subject of the Royal Decree of 1888, which provides as follows: "The inhabitants of the Republic shall enjoy the right to assemble, peacefully and without arms, to hold processions and to form associations in lawful pursuin to the public interest with the relevant legal provisions and without any restrictions other than those which are indispensable to the public order."

The Royal Decree of 1888 (Associations Act) merely regulates the relationship between associations and the State; it does not regulate their internal activities, as stated by the Committee of Experts, and all the authorities have been consulted on the subject of the Royal Decree of 1888, which provides as follows: "The inhabitants of the Republic shall enjoy the right to assemble, peacefully and without arms, to hold processions and to form associations in lawful pursuin to the public interest with the relevant legal provisions and without any restrictions other than those which are indispensable to the public order."

Moreover, since the setting up of the Revolutionary Government, the authorities have not therefore been deprived of the right to prevent such a violation, thus safeguarding the efficiency and validity of the Fundamental Act of the Republic, by preventing the occurrence of the event concerned, while stating specifically that delegats may be assisted by the administrative secretary of their trade union.

The Royal Decree of 1888 aims solely at preventing crimes; as the authorities cannot declare themselves incompetent to deal with such cases, they must intervene ex officio, this being a question of public order.

Nevertheless, there is undeniable a possibility, although remote, that such a violation could occur and the State
its full application and in this connection to modify its legislative texts. See also General Report, paragraph 26.

Honduras (ratification : 1956). A Government representative made the following statement:

The legal situation was rather difficult in the country and it was difficult to bring the national legislation into harmony with the Convention, even more so since the Constitution had already adopted a Labour Code which also governed trade unions. However, efforts would be made to introduce the necessary modifications in the national legislation, after consultation with trade unions.

A Workers' member pointed out that it was not enough to consult trade unions on the changes to be made in the national legislation, that the Convention must also be consulted. In certain countries the trade unions which claimed to be the most representative were agreed with the Government in condemning plurality of trade unions, an attitude which was contrary to the provisions of the Convention.

In reply to a question put by an Employers' observer, the Government representative pointed out that the modifications would be incorporated in an Act amending the Labour Code, as regards trade unions; this would not constitute a new Labour Code. The rights of the parties were to be safeguarded. The Experts had stated in paragraph 1 of its observation that, although authorised to do so, under the terms of the Labour Code, at least 90 per cent of the workers in the service of the union from affiliating to the trade union, which was still pursuing its activities. The Government representative pointed out that the Government's next report would contain information concerning the result of the transmission of the observations of the Committee of Experts and that the national legislation was not consistent with the Convention.

A Workers' member stated that information should be supplied as to whether the modified legislative texts would contain provisions guaranteeing freedom of association and the autonomy of the trade union movement; whether the unions would be set up in the fullest freedom and would have the right to determine their own working; whether they would enjoy the right to strike and whether they would be open to all workers without discrimination between national workers and foreign workers.

The Government representative replied that the Committee of Experts had observed in 1961 that the national legislation did not respect freedom of association and that it could be used by the Government to harm trade union rights. However, this was not the case as regards the provisions of section 53 of the Statute, which permitted such a measure. The Committee of Experts had also mentioned that the national legislation was not compatible with the provisions of the Convention as far back as 1959. The Government representative pointed out that the Government intended to draw up a text compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

The Workers' members stated that the case of Honduras was a classic one. The Committee of Experts had pointed out the divergencies between the national legislation and the Convention as far back as 1959. The Government should respond to the question put by the Government's representative.

In reply to a question put by an Employers' observer, the Government representative stated that the Government representative would supply this information.


Mexico (ratification : 1950). A Government representative made the following statement:

Sections 46, 49, 50 and 51 of the Statute for Workers in the Service of the Union did not impose any kind of previous authorisation for the establishment of trade unions by these workers. Both article 123 (XVI) of the Constitution and the Federal Labour Act laid down the rights of association and combination to the fullest extent. As regards section 53 of the Statute, which prohibited the re-election of leaders, the aim was to prevent the permanent holding of office to the detriment of the workers' interests. However, elections of trade union leaders were held in full freedom and without government interference. The prohibition for trade unions of workers in the service of the union from affiliating to central industrial organisations was due to the traditional distinction in Mexico between three classes of workers: industrial workers, agricultural workers and other workers (called "popular" category). Workers in state service were subject to no restrictions as regards affiliation to confederations of "popular" organisations. Finally, the registration requirement laid down in the Statute was not related to acquisition of legal personality, but to its recognition. It was obvious that, for organisations to be able to operate, certain requirements had to be laid down for them to prove their existence and their representative character. The problem of bringing trade union legislation in certain federal units into conformity with the Convention was in the hands of the legislatures of the various states at different periods, but it was hoped that by the next session of the Conference a satisfactory solution would have been reached.

The Workers' members considered that a trade union which was not recognised, even if it existed, had no means of action, and the situation was thus not in conformity with the Convention. They believed it was urgent that the Government should supply this information.

In reply the Government representative stated that the Government's next report would contain information on the matter.

Netherlands (ratification : 1950). The Government communicated the following information.
The Bill to which the Committee of Experts refers in its observations was submitted to the Parliament on 13 March 1963. However, as general elections were held on 15 May last, Parliament has not yet dealt with the Bill in question.

Pakistan (ratification: 1951). A Government representative made the following statement:

The question of the application of the Convention was still under consideration by the Government, but a decision on this matter was expected shortly. The Employers' members recalled that the Committee of Experts had asked the Government to supply full particulars to the Conference on the application of this Convention. The Government's short statement could not be accepted. Following the Committee's observations of last year, the Government had made no effort to bring the legislation into conformity with this Convention. The Government's short statement could not be accepted. Following the Committee's observations had not been met.

The Employers' members regretted that the Committee's observations had not been met. The Employers' members recalled that these Bills had been mentioned by the Government for many years without any results. The Committee expressed the hope that the proposed legislation would be adopted shortly.


Cuba (ratification: 1962). The Government communicated the following information:

On the repeal of Act No. 907 of 31 December 1960 the provisions of section 21 were reproduced in section 15 of Act No. 1021 of 1962, under which the national authority responsible for all questions of employment and unemployment remains the same. These services are provided by the Labour Departments within the Committees for Co-ordination, Implementation and Inspection, which are administrative bodies of local government. There are at present 122 such Departments, normally one for each Committee for Co-ordination, Implementation and Inspection in the national territory, with the exception of Havana, where services are provided by the Manpower Directorate of the Ministry of Labour.

Convention No. 89: Night Work (Women) (Revised), 1948.

Austria (ratification: 1950). The Government communicated the following information:

There were considerable divergences of view between the workers and the employers as regards the Bill concerning night work of women, drawn up by the Federal Ministry of Social Affairs. As a result of the national elections of 1962 and the lengthy period required for the setting up of the Government, it had not yet been possible to procure the agreement of the two parties. Nevertheless, efforts were still being made with a view to introducing new regulations on this matter.

As already indicated on several occasions, the terms of the Convention had been incorporated in the internal law, in accordance with the Austrian constitutional law; consequently, all the authorities were compelled to apply its provisions. Since the ratification of this instrument, the labour inspection services granted permits for the night work of women only in the cases provided for in the Convention. The labour inspection services also consulted the employers' and workers' organisations before granting such permits, in conformity with the terms of the Convention.

Czechoslovakia (ratification: 1950). A Government representative made the following statement:

Practice was in full conformity with the Convention. The draft containing the principles of the Labour Code would remove the existing legislative discrepancy. In reply to a question the representative added that the draft Labour Code would be submitted to the Government and then to the National Assembly.

Pakistan (ratification: 1951). A Government representative made the following statement:

The Mines Bill had not been presented because of the new Constitution (see Government's statement under Convention No. 81), but it was hoped it would soon be enacted.

The Employers' members regretted that the Committee's observations had not been met. The Workers' members noted that there were serious discrepancies between the national legislation, which gave the central Government a general power to grant exemptions from the provisions of the relevant Act, and the Convention, which permitted exceptions for night work for women only in cases of serious emergency.


Czechoslovakia (ratification: 1950). See under Convention No. 89.

Pakistan (ratification: 1951). A Government representative made the following statement:

A Bill amending the Factories Act had recently been drawn up but had not yet been enacted (see Government's statement under Convention No. 81). It was hoped that the new Factories Act would be promulgated shortly.

Convention No. 92: Accommodation of Crews (Revised), 1949.

Cuba (ratification: 1952). The Government communicated the following information:

As stated by a Government representative before the Conference Committee in 1962, the Directorate for Labour Protection reviews working conditions not only in the maritime sector but in all sectors of labour and suggests appropriate legislative and administrative measures, and the Labour Inspectorate is responsible for enforcement. Thus, new regulations for the safety of labour are being prepared with the co-operation of the central workers' organisation and the managements of undertakings. In these regulations account will be taken of the safety provisions provided for by the Convention.

Convention No. 94: Labour Clauses (Public Contracts), 1949.

Austria (ratification: 1951). A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government representative had stated in 1962 that, through the efforts of the Ministry of Social administration and the Ministry of Commerce and Reconstruction, it had been possible to eliminate the differences of opinion between the two ministries regarding the interpretation of the Convention, except on three points: the right to withhold payments, subcontractors, and penalties. Discussions had been resumed in March, this year, with the co-operation of representatives of workers' and employers' organisations. Agreement had been reached on all the outstanding points and a draft containing new provisions on labour clauses had been submitted to the Council of Ministers and had just been approved. This text was in conformity with the Convention.
The Workers’ members congratulated the Government on these measures, which put a term to a problem which had been of serious concern to the Committee for many years. They would, however, consult the Austrian workers’ delegation.

The Committee noted the statement of the Government representative with satisfaction.

Bulgaria (ratification : 1955). A Government representative made the following statement:

In Bulgaria the right to work was guaranteed to all citizens, irrespective of nationality, religion, race, sex, etc., by sections 71, 72, 73 and 74 of the Constitution. State undertakings and other public institutions operated on the basis of democratic centralism with the assistance of workers and officials. Under section 1 of the Act on State undertakings and other public institutions, all the conventions were regulated by Part II of the Labour Code which contained provisions on all matters covered by the Convention. An analysis of the provisions of the Labour Code would show that they met the requirements of the Convention. Moreover, the Order of the Council of Ministers No. 282 of 12 December 1957 on collective labour contracts and the Order of the Council of Ministers No. 55 of 29 March 1958, gave full effect to the provisions of the Convention. The contents of labour contracts were not defined in any general expression, but referred to clearly defined legal categories. The Bulgarian Government was of the opinion that no divergence existed between the national legislation and the Convention. The Workers’ members pointed out that the Committee of Experts had been unanimous in its observations on this point.

The Employers’ members stated that the Convention was of a specific technical nature and concerned one particular aspect of labour law. The Government should give special attention to the matter, and should in its next report supply information, point by point, on the different Articles of the Convention.

In reply the Government representative stated that in Bulgaria the labour relations were under the State, co-operatives, or other institutions of a public character. There were very few private employers. Section 175 of the Labour Code regulated labour relations for workers employed by private employers. These workers were treated in the same manner as other workers. It was not correct to say that this Convention had a technical character. The Bulgarian Government nevertheless take into consideration the points made in the discussion and try, in its next report, to supply information which would satisfy the Committee of Experts.

The Committee took note of these statements.

Philippines (ratification : 1953). A Government representative made the following statement:

Following consultations between the chairmen of the labour committees of both Houses of Congress and the Ministries concerned, it was agreed that all that was needed was to revise the standard public works contract in order to include the clauses provided for in the Convention. The drafting of these clauses was entrusted to a special committee whose work had been completed. It was hoped that the Committee of Experts could be informed of the results achieved at its next meeting.

Convention No. 96 : Fee-Charging Employment Agencies (Revised), 1949.

Federal Republic of Germany (ratification : 1954). The Workers’ member of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the German Confederation of Trade Unions had on several occasions drawn the attention of the Government to Article 96 of the application of Convention No. 96, particularly in a letter of 9 October 1961. The Government had included the workers’ observations in its reports to the I.L.O., but no attention had been given to the point. The purpose of the Convention was the complete abolition of fee-charging employment agencies conducted with a view to profit. The Unemployment Insurance and Placement Act did not contain provisions corresponding to those of Article 5, paragraph 2 (b), of the Convention. The Committee of Experts should examine the Act, section 54 in particular. The Committee took notice of the above points and noted that the Federal Republic of Germany would be called upon to supply a report on this Convention for the current period.

Pakistan (ratification : 1952). A Government representative made the following statement:

A Bill concerning the abolition of fee-charging agencies had recently been drawn up. (See Government’s statement under Convention No. 81.) The promulgation of the above-named Bill was not yet finished. The Workers’ members stated that this was a serious case and a matter of concern to the Workers’ group. Although this Convention had been ratified more than ten years ago it had not been implemented at all. Furthermore, although the Government had stated before the Conference Committee in 1962 that legislation had been presented to Parliament at its June 1962 Session, its report for 1961-62 stated that the proposed legislation had not been enacted.

The Committee regretted that no measures had yet been taken to implement the Convention and expressed the hope that they would be taken without further delay.

Convention No. 97 : Migration for Employment (Revised), 1949.

France (ratification : 1954). The Government communicated the following information:

The Government has noted the Committee of Experts’ observations that according to the statistics, family allowances must be considered family benefits within the meaning of Article 6 of the Convention, and must accordingly be granted to immigrants on the same terms as to French nationals.

After further examination of the problem, the Government must, for the time being, maintain its earlier position, basing itself on the following considerations:

Article 6, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention, refers to “social security (that is to say, legal provision in respect of employment injuries, maternity, sickness, invalidity, old age, death, unemployment and family responsibilities, and any other contingency which, according to national laws or regulations, is covered by a social security scheme).” Maternity allowance cannot be covered by the enumeration in this paragraph; this allowance is not aimed at compensating family responsibilities since, as the Government’s earlier replies had emphasised, it is a benefit of an essentially demographic nature. In these circumstances the Government considers that it has not contravened Article 6 of the Convention by maintaining in its legislation a provision reserving entitlement to maternity allowance to the birth of children of French nationality.

The Committee of Experts relies in particular on the consideration that maternity allowances, like all other benefits of this nature, are financed by means of contributions to family allowances. Even allowing for the fact that this statement is only partially correct (since under a number of special schemes the State makes a considerable financial contribution: mines, merchant navy, agriculture), the Government points out that no provision of Article 6 refers to the means of financing the benefits to which it refers; the Government considers that, in these circumstances, it is not possible to infer from the manner of financing the nature of the benefits that they are governed by the provisions of this Article. Finally, the fact that maternity allowances are generally paid by the bodies responsible for the payment of family allowances has no bearing on the nature of these allowances.

In any event, the studies to which the Government referred to in 1962 have had to be resumed in the light of the Convention on equality of treatment adopted by the I.L.O., and the position of maternity allowances in relation to this Convention can be determined only subsequently.

In addition, a Government representative made the following statement:

The French legislation on family allowances dealt with foreign workers residing in France with their families in the same way as with French workers. He supplied further information on the conditions under which maternity allowances were granted and added that in the various bilateral and multilateral agreements.
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concluded by France as regards social security, it had always been provided—and no objection had been raised—that the principle of equality of treatment could not override the French nationality clause laid down in section 5 of the Act of 22 August 1946, as amended. In reply to a question put by the Workers’ members, the Government representative added that the State contributed very generously to certain schemes and it was impossible to say whether any of those allowances was paid by the State and what part by the social security scheme. The Workers’ members pointed out that, as the maternity allowances were paid out of social security funds, to which all workers contributed, they should be granted without discrimination to French and foreign workers alike, even if there was a contribution by the State to certain funds. The Government representative indicated that the importance of the question was fully appreciated and the matter was being considered. It was hoped that a solution would be reached by next year. The Committee took note of the statements communicated and expressed the hope that the full application of the Convention would be ensured by next year.


Japan (ratification : 1953). A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government maintained its views, which were indicated in the Committee of Experts’ report. However, progress had been made. The Government had submitted to the Diet a Bill for the ratification of Convention No. 87. Once this Bill was adopted, the observations made by the Committee of Experts would be met. The Committee took note of this statement.

Rumania (ratification : 1958). A Government representative made the following statement:

The organisation and functioning of trade unions were regulated by Act No. 52 of 1945, to which section 96 of the Labour Code referred. This Act had been modified by Act No. 316 of 1 September 1947, as well as by Decree No. 263 of 1957. All these texts had been published in the Official Bulletin. The decree of 1957 had repealed the provision which required previous authorisation by a state body before the granting of legal personality to trade unions. Section 2 of this Act accorded to all persons who worked in the same occupation or in similar or connected occupations the right to create trade unions without previous authorisation from the authorities. No one could be forced to join or not to join a trade union or to cease being a member of a trade union. The representation by the union constituted what was necessary for the organisation of trade unions and the functioning of a trade union were determined by the free will of the members, and through their statutes. Under Act, the trade unions having legal personality had, inter alia, the right to conclude collective agreements with individual employers as well as with organisations of employers. According to section 38, the dissolution of a trade union could be decided by a two-thirds vote of the general assembly of its members. The right to conclude collective agreements was also regulated by Chapter II of the Labour Code. Section 11 of this Code empowered trade unions who were parties to collective agreements to supervise the manner in which the undertakings fulfilled the obligations under these agreements. The above-mentioned texts were available to the Committee.

The Employers’ members stated that it was difficult to assess the application of a Convention on the basis of an oral statement. It was hoped that the Government would submit a complete report for next year. A Workers’ member stated that the Government should communicate the texts to which the Government represented referred, (a) so that the experts would be able to make observations on those which were not in conformity with the Convention. In reply to the Government representative stated that the experts had already considered certain legislative texts, including the Labour Code. The Government would communicate the entire text of the Act of 1945, and of other Acts, as soon as possible so that the Committee could get a complete idea of the Rumanian legislation.


Belgium (ratification : 1959). The Government communicated the following information:

The Government is not convinced that the Convention necessitates the modification of the legislation requested by the Committee of Experts.

In conformity with Article 31, Belgium guarantees employment injury compensation to the persons protected. This guarantee is the result of the legal obligation, confirmed by an Act of 12 August 1949, as regards the collective compensation for the consequences of employment injuries. The observance of this obligation is ensured either by a general insurance scheme controlled by the State or by secondary insurance which is also controlled, or, finally, by the state-controlled solvability of employers who have been exempted from contributions as an exceptional measure. The pensions service is also state-controlled.

In conformity with Article 6, the legislation does not have recourse in regard to employment injury compensation to "voluntary insurance for protected persons". Such persons must be and are insured legally, judicially and in fact, as regards the prescribed compensation. Consequently this compensation is not left to the free choice of the protected persons.

The legislation also ensures the application of Article 71, the object of which is to spread the costs by ensuring that persons with limited means shall not be overburdened. The legislation provides that protected persons shall be exempted from any participation in the financing of the scheme and also provides that those persons who must contribute may choose the system which is most advantageous, without thereby affecting the security enjoyed by protected persons.

The financing of benefits and administrative costs is ensured by a fund to which of contributions is made: (a) of special contributions to be paid to a guaranteed fund for heads of undertakings, which is also state-controlled. In 1960 the special contributions have nearly been trebled in order to encourage employers to have recourse to insurance.

All workers are protected by law. Those whose employers have recourse to the insurance system must contribute 998 per thousand persons protected. There is a
guarantee that the remaining two per thousand, in regard to which it was thought inexpedient to contribute to the fund, receive the legal compensation.

**Federal Republic of Germany (ratification: 1958).** The Workers' member of the Federal Republic of Germany made the following statement:

Section 84 (3) of the Unemployment Insurance and Pension Insurance Act provided that if unemployment benefits might be suspended even when the persons concerned had not taken a direct part in a strike, but were merely indirectly affected. Under that section of the Act it was therefore possible for benefit to be suspended when the stoppage of work in any undertaking was the indirect consequence of a strike in another industry on which it was dependent. The decision of the Employment Court that the benefit might be suspended only when the insured persons had lost their employment as a direct result of a work stoppage. For that reason, the legislation was not in conformity with the Convention. The Government should be called upon to amend its legislation.

In reply the Government representative indicated that note would be taken of the statement of the German Workers' representative. However, the Experts had not made observations on the point, but had merely made a request for supplementary information.

The Workers' members suggested that the Government be asked to supply a report on the Convention covering the current period, for examination in 1964. The Government representative opposed this suggestion.

**Greece (ratification: 1955).** The Government had communicated the following information:

As regards the observation made by the Committee of Experts according to which section 29 (7) (c) of Law No. 115/1953 and provisions of the Code of Labour Insurance with Part IX of the Convention, it should be noted that in accordance with Article 58 of the Convention, the benefits provided for in Articles 54 and 55 of the Code would be granted throughout the contingency or until their replacement by an old-age benefit. This provision specifies clearly the period for which the said benefits shall be granted and particularly the duration of the contingency. The meaning of the term "throughout the contingency" is sufficiently explained by Article 54 of the Convention which states that the term "contingency covered" as inability to engage in any gainful activity, to a prescribed extent. Consequently, as soon as the inability to engage in a gainful activity no longer exists the "contingency covered" according to the above-mentioned provisions also ceases to exist, and consequently the obligation to grant the benefits.

The Government considers that the above-mentioned provisions of legislation are not incompatible with those of the Convention, but are, on the contrary, more favourable for the insured persons. It does not seem to be contrary, in the Government's opinion, to the provisions of Part IX of the Convention; the application of the provisions of the national law is, in fact, tantamount upon engagement in a gainful activity which eliminates the contingency covered, and consequently the obligation to grant the relevant benefits.

The Government considers that the above-mentioned provisions of legislation are not incompatible with those of the Convention, but are, on the contrary, more favourable for the insured persons. It does not seem to be contrary, in the Government's opinion, to the provisions of Part IX of the Convention; the application of the provisions of the national law is, in fact, tantamount upon engagement in a gainful activity which eliminates the contingency covered, and consequently the obligation to grant the relevant benefits.

**Convention No. 103: Maternity Protection (Revised), 1952.**

**Cuba (ratification: 1954).** The Government communicated the following information:

The legislation which gave rise to the Committee of Experts' observa­tions in paragraph 11 of its report in regard to the recruiting of labour by the administrative authorities. The Committee would welcome information on this point.

**Portugal (ratification: 1959).** A Government representative made the following statement:

The observations of the Committee of Experts were mainly directed to obtaining statistics and certain texts. A reply to these points would be given in the Govern-

**Convention No. 110: Abolition of Forced Labour, 1957.**

**Federal Republic of Germany (ratification: 1958).** The Government representative made the following statement:

The Government representative stated that, as regards paragraph 738 of the Commission's report, the rural Labour Code for the Portuguese Overseas Provinces had been adopted, and a Committee had been set up, in conformity with the Convention, to find that the allegations concerning the non-application of the Convention were not justified. It had also been alleged that workers recruited in Angola and Mozambique were submitted to inhuman treatment and even to South Africa. The evidence and other information collected by the Commission proved the inexactitude of these observations contained in paragraph 738 of the Commission's report. In conclusion the Commission stated, in paragraph 718 of its report, that it had been favourably impressed by the degree of freedom exercised by a very large majority of those with whom it had come into contact. In paragraph 725 (4) the Commission stated that it was fully satisfied of the bona fides of changes of policy, legislation and practice. In paragraph 743 it stated that it had found no evidence of the employment of forced labour in light industry or commerce in either Angola or Mozambique.

The Workers' Vice-Chairman pointed out that the Committee of Experts had listed 11 questions on which the Government was requested to reply, but that the Government had replied orally only. The Commission set up under article 26 of the Constitution specifically requested, in paragraph 738 of its report, that the Government should examine the position in regard to the recruiting of labour by the Diamond Company of Angola, 12 months after a decision of 28 October 1961 directing the company to establish its recruiting centre in return for recruiting labour without recourse to the administrative authorities. The Committee would welcome information on this point.

The Portuguese Workers' member assured the Committee that there was no forced labour whatever in Mozambique.

The Government representative stated that, as regards paragraph 738 of the Commission's report, the Rural Labour Code which came into force in October 1962 contained provisions which would prevent the Diamond Company of Angola from recruiting without the knowledge of the administrative officials and indigenous chiefs. The Company had now established its own system of recruiting. The Committee considered that the application of this Convention will particularly interest the Commission, and called upon the Government to include in its next report full information on all the points raised by the Committee of Experts.
The Committee of Experts had made only a request for supplementary information. The Federal Government would supply information when it had received that request, according to the usual procedure. 

China, from the Federal Republic of Germany made the following statement:

The Government’s report on this Convention indicated that the legislation was in conformity with this instrument and that no discrimination existed in this field. In the Federal Republic there existed discrimination on grounds of sex as regards remuneration and vocational training. For example, in collective agreements no formal distinction was made between men and women; women workers, but lower rates of remuneration were fixed for certain jobs which were almost exclusively reserved for women for years. These differences were placing women’s demands on the subject before employers in the course of the negotiations. Article 3 (a) of the Convention provided that the Government had to co-operate the acquisition of employers’ and workers’ organizations in applying a policy of non-discrimination. What had the Government done to give effect to that Article? The Committee of Experts should ensure that not only the legislation, but also practice was in conformity with the Convention.

The Workers’ Vice-Chairman stated that it was not only a question of equal remuneration; women had to be given an opportunity for vocational training, offering them the same employment opportunities as men.

The Portuguese Government representative stated that, in the Federal Republic of Germany, employment opportunities were the same for young men and women.

A representative from the Federal Republic of Germany made the following statement:

It had been stated that there was equality of employment opportunities for men and women workers in the various countries. Yet, in the Committee there had been reference to the need for measures to encourage women to fight against retrograde traditions. There should exist vocational training programmes giving women access to occupations not open to the former.
The Committee decided that the Committee of Experts would be informed of the discussions that had taken place on the subject.

Liberia (ratification: 1959). A Government representative made the following statement:

There was no doubt that the Experts’ report was independent and objective; they should be thanked. Liberia’s report on Convention No. 111, which it had ratified, unfortunately arrived too late. The Government pointed out that the unemployment rate in the large towns was reaching alarming levels, in the country, particularly through its educational and economic programmes. It was resolved to prevent any discrimination in the interpretation of the Convention. Liberia did not subscribe to, promote or engage in any form of discrimination as regards employment and occupation. This was confirmed by article 1 of the Constitution of Liberia. The Labour Code and the Penal Code contained the provisions in these texts constituted the basis for the Government’s social policy and the Government was doing its utmost to obtain their implementation and to ensure the full application of the Convention.

Portugal (ratification: 1959). The U.S.S.R. Government representative made the following statement:

The work of the Experts had unduly stressed positive experience with regard to discrimination. The Experts quoted, for example, as a positive measure the 1962 Rural Labour Code of the Portuguese colonies. In fact, cruel discrimination prevailed in these colonies and had been condemned by the Ministers of Labour of Tanganyika and Algeria at the Conference.

A Portuguese Workers’ member stated that there were no Portuguese colonies, only overseas provinces. In his capacity as a trade union official from Mozambique, he could confirm that no racial discrimination existed in these territories.

A Portuguese Employers’ member indicated, as a native of São Tomé, that he had never, in schools or elsewhere, come across any discrimination. No discrimination existed in Portugal.

A Government member from the Central African Republic stated that as regards Angola, there was no economic or financial separation between native and non-native workers as appeared from a printed report which the Angolan Workers’ Union had distributed to delegates of the Conference. Actually, indigenous workers were only employed in agriculture.

A Workers’ member from Congo (Brazzaville) indicated that there was flagrant discrimination in employment in Angola. He had had occasion to discuss this subject with indigenous workers at the first I.L.O. Advisory Committee meeting which was held at Luanda and in which he had participated. Most urban jobs were reserved for Angolans and Africans were obliged to do agricultural work under very unsatisfactory conditions. Article 35 of the Constitution should be revised in the light of developments, so that discrimination and lack of equality as regards remuneration might be found in all countries. It would therefore be surprising if there was no discrimination in the Portuguese territories. It was not for the Committee to discuss the Portuguese Constitution; however, in so far as this Constitution resulted in subjection and exploitation, it should be considered by the Committee. The facts to which the document of the Angolan Workers’ Union referred were correct. Discrimination existed and the members of the Committee should ascertain whether they could deal with this problem and work together with a view to solving it.

The Employers’ Vice-Chairman stated that specific cases could not be discussed unless the necessary documentation was available. The report of the Committee of Experts did not deal with the conditions of the Mozambique population. This report referred, inter alia, to the lack of hospitals and the very low level of medical care which made it necessary for indigenous people to cross the frontier to Tanganyika to obtain treatment. It indicated that Africans had been killed because of membership in an association of Mozambique workers having social objectives, stressed the severity of the conditions of living, etc. A similar situation is described in the statement of the Angolan Workers’ Union.

The Portuguese Government recalled that certain conclusions advanced in the report of the Commission had been adopted. In paragraph 725 of the report of the Commission set up under article 26 of the Convention to examine the application by Portugal of Convention No. 111 dealing specifically with any particular country. On the other hand, it indicated that requests had been addressed directly to certain States, not competent to discuss the constitutional provisions of the various states.

The Workers’ member from Congo (Brazzaville) stated that the Portuguese Constitution had been drawn up in Portugal without consultation of the Angolan people. The Malian Government member made the following statement:

The statements made by the Portuguese representatives were surprising. It was difficult to understand how certain countries, which considered themselves to be more advanced, could declare other countries to be colonies. Angola was not a Portuguese province. The report of the Commission appointed under article 26 of the I.L.O. Constitution to examine the complaint filed by the Government of Ghana against Portugal as regards the observation of the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, indicated that forced labour existed in certain sectors, such as plantations and ports. The position was the same as regards discrimination. Portugal should be cited as one of the countries practising a policy of discrimination, as in the case of the Republic of South Africa.

The Government member from the Central African Republic recalled that various members had pointed out that discrimination and lack of equality as regards employment in Portugal could not be found in Angola. It would therefore be surprising if there was no discrimination in the Portuguese territories. It was not for the Committee to discuss the Portuguese Constitution; however, in so far as this Constitution resulted in subjection and exploitation, it should be considered by the Committee. The facts to which the document of the Angolan Workers’ Union referred were correct. Discrimination existed and the members of the Committee should ascertain whether they could deal with this problem and work together with a view to solving it.

The Committee of Experts would examine the replies of these countries and report on the matter to the Conference Committee in 1964.

The Bulgarian Government member stated that in this connection reference might be made to a United Nations Report (Ref. A/5253) of 8 October 1962 which described, on page 404, severe living and working conditions of the Mozambique population. This report referred, inter alia, to the lack of hospitals and the very low level of medical care which made it necessary for indigenous people to cross the frontier to Tanganyika to obtain treatment. It indicated that Africans had been killed because of membership in an association of Mozambique workers having social objectives, stressed the severity of the conditions of living, etc. A similar situation is described in the statement of the Angolan Workers’ Union.

The Portuguese Government member recalled certain conclusions advanced in the report of the Commission and article 26 of the Convention to examine the application by Portugal of Convention No. 105. In paragraph 718 of its report the Commission stated that it had been strongly impressed by the degree of freedom exercised by the very large majority of those with whom it had come into contact in Angola and Mozambique. In paragraph 725 (4) the Commission explicitly stated that no discrimination had occurred in Portuguese legislation and practice in connection with the ratification of Conventions Nos. 29
and 165, and that it was fully satisfied of the bona fide of these changes. Finally, in paragraph 748 of its report the Commission had stated that it had had no evidence that the labour employed on plantations was recruited by methods contrary to the provisions of the Convention, and that the plantations visited were chosen by the Committee itself. The questions which had been raised by the Bulgarian Government member were outside the terms of reference of the Committee, which should not occupy itself with political questions, but only with the manner in which the various Conventions were applied. It had raised them.

The Labour Employment Commissioner had stated that it had had no evidence that these changes. Finally, in paragraph 748 of its report the Commission had stated that it had had no evidence that the labour employed on plantations was recruited by methods contrary to the provisions of the Convention, and that it was fully satisfied of the bona fide of these changes. Finally, in paragraph 748 of its report the Commission had stated that it had had no evidence that the labour employed on plantations was recruited by methods contrary to the provisions of the Convention, and that the plantations visited were chosen by the Committee itself. The questions which had been raised by the Bulgarian Government member were outside the terms of reference of the Committee, which should not occupy itself with political questions, but only with the manner in which the various Conventions were applied. It had raised them.

The Algerian Workers' member stated that he fully agreed with the remarks of the representatives of Mali and the Central African Republic concerning the living and working conditions of the coloured Afrikaner and Mozambican. The situation was worse than slavery.

The Portuguese Workers' member stated that, last year, the Workers' representative from Portugal was a coloured Angolan. Many indigenous persons occupied high positions in the Government and were ministers, provincial secretaries, members of parliament, etc. As regards the application of the Convention on coloured bases in the African territories, many people, even in Europe, liked to go abroad for treatment and this did not constitute evidence of discrimination. Further, medical and educational facilities in these provinces were being improved.

The Portuguese Employers' member stated that creidence should be given to the conclusions of the I.L.O. Commission of Inquiry, which was composed of independent and impartial persons, rather than to speculations and pamphlets. The report of this Commission indicates, in paragraph 777, that Portugal was one of the first countries to ratify the discrimination Convention; it was rightly proud of the absence of racial discrimination in her territories.

The U.S.S.R. Government member noted that the present debate was on the application of the Convention in Portuguese colonies. The evidence given by representatives of the Convention from African countries was authentic and should be taken into account, since the representatives of the Committee concerned could not come to Cape. It was surprising to hear native workers liked to emigrate, and that this did not prove that discrimination existed. However, their salaries were low, their conditions of work bad; the documents of the United Nations did not fail to mention the existence of discrimination in Portugal. The report must mention this and insist that it be ended.

The Workers' member from Congo (Brazzaville) stated that a number of Africans held political posts. The number of persons of African ethnic origin in the Congo was significant compared with the total indigenous population. The world at the time was shaken by the need for liberation and respect for human beings. In the United States the Government was testing the limits of discrimination and was actively working to eliminate it; on the other hand, it was very serious that Portugal refused to admit the facts.

The Government member from the Central African Republic noted that the Committee of Experts had done its utmost to produce a satisfactory report but it had based itself solely on legislative and similar texts and was insufficient, particularly in regard to matters such as discrimination. Efforts were being concentrated at another conference, on improving the working of the Organisation and the same attitude should be adopted in the present Committee; this meant that members should be free to modify the traditional procedure, if necessary, and to discuss important matters in detail. Examination of the factual situation in the Portuguese African provinces showed that the African workers' positions were better than in the other Portuguese colonies, in spite of the number of United Nations documents and also by the personal experience of certain members of the Committee.

The Algerian Workers' member stated that the documents on discrimination published in Angola included a book recently published by the editor of the New Left Review. Moreover, if the Committee so desired, it would be possible to summon an Angolan African worker to be able to give a very detailed information on discrimination in his country.

The Committee decided to ask the Government of Portugal to supply information on the application of Convention No. 111, ratified by this country.

Subsequently, a Government representative made the following statement:

Portugal's policy of non-discrimination, which went back over 45 years, was based on the Portuguese Constitution of 1933, which provided for full equality of all citizens, in articles 5, 8 and 134. Section 69 of the new Overseas Labour Rural Code, to which the Committee of Experts referred, established the principle of equal pay for equal work, thus confirming the principle of non-discrimination and ensuring the application of Convention No. 111.

As regards Article 2 of the Convention, a Bill relating to contracts of employment had been submitted to the National Assembly; this text, which contained prohibitions and penalties, was fully in compliance with the principle of Convention No. 111.

As regards Article 3 of the Convention, the above-mentioned Bill would certainly establish standards in harmony with Article 3; it was now exceptional for different wages to be paid to men and women workers for the same work and all recent collective agreements laid down the principle of equal pay for equal work.

As regards paragraphs (a) and (b) of Article 3, there existed no rules applying discrimination in law or in practice. Everyone knew of the existence of bad practices where African workers were not in the same conditions as indigenous workers, and the Portuguese workers were exploited; this was confirmed by a number of existing publications, statements, etc., showing that no discrimination was practised in the African provinces. An American writer had emphasised that distinctions there were not based on race, but were due to social and economic position and degree of civilization. Texts on the subject could be distributed to the members of the Committee.

The Portuguese Workers' member made the following statement:

A new law had been adopted a year ago in Mozambique laying down extremely harsh penalties for those failing to comply with legislative provisions prescribing non-discrimination; the penalties went as far as to provide for the closing down of restaurants and shops, etc., which failed to comply with the law. Important examples could be quoted of Negroes holding high posts in public employment or to the private sector which made any distinction based on sex or ethnic origin. Existing statistics made no distinction according to the colour of employed persons, but a new classification was adopted, so that the necessary information, in respect of public employment, would be included in the Government's next report.

In Angola 45 per cent of persons of African ethnic origin were of African ethnic origin and many of these held high-ranking posts; the information relating to Mozambique was not so detailed but certainly a comparable percentage of persons of African ethnic origin were in public employment. The texts quoted by the Experts, excluding women from certain posts in public employment, related to the diplomatic service (Decree No. 29970), to certain judicial posts (Legislative Decree No. 44278), and to higher municipal functions (Administrative Code). Women were traditionally excluded from the matter and should be reconsidered in future and full information on this question would be included in the Government's next report.

Legislative Decree No. 25317, to which the Experts referred, provided that, on appointment, public officials must make a formal declaration that they would respect the Political Constitution of the country; Legislative Decree No. 27003 laid down penalties, such as dismissal, in the case of officials who failed to respect their declarations. These two Legislative Decrees were in full conformity with Articles 3 and 4 of the Convention.

As regards paragraph (e) of Article 3, the placement services did not practise any form of discrimination; further information on this point would be submitted in the Government's next report. As requested by the Workers' members, the Government was prepared to submit a detailed report on this Convention this year.

The Employers' member from Portugal made the following statement:

There was ample evidence in the press and in numerous publications, statements, etc., showing that no discrimination was practised in the African provinces. An American writer had emphasised that distinctions there were not based on race, but were due to social and economic position and degree of civilization. Texts on the subject could be distributed to the members of the Committee.

The Portuguese Workers' member made the following statement:

A new law had been adopted a year ago in Mozambique laying down extremely harsh penalties for those failing to comply with legislative provisions prescribing non-discrimination; the penalties went as far as to provide for the closing down of restaurants and shops, etc., which failed to comply with the law. Important examples could be quoted of Negroes holding high posts in public employment or the army. No discrimination whatever based on race was practised in the areas of housing, education or health facilities, and these services were all improving.

The Workers' Vice-Chairman made the following statement:

The Government representative had indicated that 45 per cent of the persons in public employment in Angola were of African ethnic origin; this figure in itself
had little meaning, as it would include all subordinate positions in the army and police, doorkeepers, etc., and there was no indication whether these persons had access to higher posts. In the former Belgian Congo, for example, of which he had personal experience, the percentage of Africans in the public service had been higher than 45 per cent, but all the senior posts had been held by Belgians. The Workers' members would be glad to know whether there was any possibility for the people of Angola to decide for themselves on their future. Information should also be supplied showing whether the indigenous people of Angola and Mozambique enjoyed the same opportunities as Europeans in regard to education and vocational training, as this was essential if they were to enjoy equal opportunities in regard to higher posts and employment. Ninety-nine per cent of the population of Mozambique and Angola were illiterate, and were thus deprived of any opportunity of access to skilled and higher jobs.

In reply the Portuguese Government representative stated that the question under discussion was not vocational training, but discrimination. Education and training facilities were open to all groups of the population. The above-mentioned figures of illiteracy must be out of date.

The Committee noted that the Government had agreed to supply a detailed report for examination by the Committee of Experts at its next session. The question of the application of the Convention by Portugal would be re-examined next year in the light of this report and of any comments made by the Committee of Experts.

C. Detailed Reports on Ratified Conventions

Reports Received and Reports Not Received by 21 June 1963

Reports due: 1,309. Reports received: 1,121. Reports not received: 188.

The table published in the Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, page 122, should be brought up to date as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Reports received</th>
<th>Reports not received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number received</td>
<td>Conventions Nos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba *</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 42, 45, 52, 58, 59, 60, 63, 67, 77, 78, 79, 81, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12, 104, 105, 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87, 98, 99.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1, 11, 17, 18, 19, 26, 29, 30, 45, 52, 81, 87, 88, 95, 96, 98, 100, 101, 105, 106, 107, 111.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reports received too late to be summarised in Report III (Part I).
### D. Statistical Table of Reports on Ratified Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reports requested</th>
<th>Reports received at the date requested</th>
<th>Reports received in time for the session of the Committee</th>
<th>Reports received in time for the session of the Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-32</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-33</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-34</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-35</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-37</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-38</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-39</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-45</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-49</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>134 ²</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>283 ³</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>1,362 ²</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>1,309 ²</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The opening date of the session of the Committee of Experts has, in general, been the end of March or the beginning of April. In a number of cases, however, the session has opened on other dates, varying between 29 February, in 1932, and 30 July, in 1945; the date limit for the receipt of reports has accordingly varied. ² The Conference did not meet in 1940. ³ First year for which this figure is available. ⁴ As a result of a decision by the Governing Body detailed reports were requested on only certain ratified Conventions.
APPENDIX II

OBSERVATIONS AND INFORMATION CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF CONVENTIONS
IN NON-METROPOLITAN TERRITORIES
(ARTICLES 22 AND 35 OF THE CONSTITUTION)

A. General Observations

Netherlands

The Government communicated the following information:

The Government of the Netherlands had transmitted in good time the observations of the Committee of Experts to the governments of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam (Conventions Nos. 19, 42, 58, 62, 81 and 94). The Netherlands Government had not so far received a reply from the Surinam government. The Netherlands Antilles government had stated that, wherever possible, information on the practical application of the Convention would be supplied. As already indicated on previous occasions, the governments of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles had sole responsibility as regards their internal affairs, to the exclusion of the Netherlands Government. The said Government was not therefore in a position to reply to the observations made by the Committee of Experts.

The Committee took note of this information.

United Kingdom

Nyasaland. A Government representative stated that the reports had not been sent owing to a misunderstanding as regards the constitutional position.

B. Observations and Supplementary Information on the Application of Conventions

CONVENTION NO. 50: RECRUITING OF INDIGENOUS WORKERS, 1936

United Kingdom

British Guiana. A Government representative made the following statement:

The observations of the Committee of Experts on Conventions Nos. 50, 64 and 86 had been transmitted to the government of this territory which was entirely responsible for questions on labour legislation. Unfortunately, as the result of a general strike which was at present taking place in this territory, no information had been received on these observations. The United Kingdom Government would submit the necessary information in a detailed report for the period 1962-63.

In reply to questions put by several members of the Committee, the Government representative stated that this strike had been called two months ago by the Trade Union Congress in protest against the introduction of new labour legislation. The fact that civil servants were also on strike had prevented the sending of information.

A Government member stated that this strike could not constitute a valid reason for not sending replies to observations of the Committee of Experts.

An Employers' member pointed out that the entire history of the strike was tied to the introduction of a new labour law which the trade union movement opposed. Thus, reports could not be furnished as long as this conflict, of which the strike was only the last step, continued. The government of the territory should be informed that the employers, as well as the workers, desired to be consulted before the introduction of all labour legislation.

The Committee took note of these statements and urged the Government to give information in its next reports on the measures taken to apply these three Conventions.

Hong Kong. A Government representative made the following statement:

The government of Hong Kong had originally intended to adopt a comprehensive Employment Bill covering also the subject-matter of the Convention. Because of drafting difficulties concerning other parts of this Bill, the government had decided to enact special legislation to apply the Convention. Bills had been drawn up and had been submitted for examination to the tripartite advisory committee. It was hoped that the matter would be settled within three months. Meanwhile the application of the Convention was assured by administrative means.

CONVENTION NO. 58: MINIMUM AGE (SEA) (REVISED), 1936

Netherlands

Netherlands Antilles. The Government communicated the following information:

Regulations concerning the minimum age for the employment of adolescents on board ship are being prepared.

CONVENTION NO. 64: CONTRACTS OF EMPLOYMENT (INDIGENOUS WORKERS), 1939

United Kingdom

Bechuanaland. A Government representative made the following statement:

Legislation ensuring the full application of the Convention had been adopted in May 1963 and would enter into force on 1 January 1964.

The Committee took note with satisfaction of the adoption of this legislation.

British Guiana. See under Convention No. 50.

Northern Rhodesia. A Government representative made the following statement:

The observations of the Committee of Experts had been transmitted to the government of the territory, which was fully self-governing in matters of labour legislation. No reply to these observations had been received from the government in question.

The Workers' members pointed out that the Government of the United Kingdom was responsible for the international relations of this country, and should explain why the legislation did not provide for the application of Article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention. It was regrettable that one could not directly consult representatives of the territories involved.

A Government member recalled that article 35 in its present form required the British Government to furnish the information requested by the Committee of Experts. The reply of the United Kingdom Government representative showed once again that article 35 of the Convention conflicted with the aims of the Organisation.

In reply the Government representative made the following statement:

The United Kingdom Government could not intervene in the internal affairs of Northern Rhodesia. With
reference to the delay in the adoption of the new legisla­
tion, it should be recalled that a new government had
just taken office in this territory and that the Committee
had, in the past, recognised that new governments coming
into power encountered various difficulties. Article 36
only required his Government to consult with the govern­
ment of the territory concerned, and no measures could
be taken on the matter without the agreement of the
government of Northern Rhodesia. This country had had
the opportunity of sending an observer, but had not
wished to avail itself of this opportunity.

The Committee took note of these statements.

**Convention No. 84 : Right of Association**
**(Non-Metropolitan Territories), 1947**

**United Kingdom**

Fiji. A Government representative made the follow­
ing statement:

A trade union Bill had been submitted for examination
to the tripartite advisory committee. This Bill, when
adopted, would meet the Experts’ observations.

Southern Rhodesia. The Government communicated
the following information:

There was a general election in December 1962. A
new government was elected and is considering the
matter.

Singapore. A Government representative made the
following statement:

The government of Singapore sought to encourage the
creation of a democratic and independent trade union
movement. It intended to adopt legislation which would
ensure the application of Article 2 of the Convention, by
providing appeals against the refusal or the cancellation
of the registration of a trade union to the High Court and
not to the Minister. Nevertheless, the chief concern of
any government must be the preservation of the security
of the State against foreign-inspired subversive elements.
Unfortunately, a minority group of trade union leaders
had become tools in the hands of these elements. This
movement had asked the government to give it the
assurance that it would modify the legislation as this might encourage subversive
elements. The independent and democratic trade union
movement had asked the government to give it the
assurance that it would apply to the democratic and
patriotic trade unions (which at present enjoyed the con­
fidence of the great majority of workers) the provisions of
the Convention and that it would take measures to modify
the national legislation so as to give effect to Article 2 of
the Convention as soon as the menace of subversion had
disappeared. These assurances had been given to the
trade union movement in question, as its representative,
who was present, could confirm. The government of
Singapore gave the same assurances to the Committee.

The Workers’ observer from Singapore stated that the
Trades Union Congress had asked the government for
assurances because it feared that the latter might enact
trade union regulations during a period of crisis. These
assurances had been given and it was hoped that the
government of Singapore would amend the trade union
legislation when security had been re-established in the
country and that it would then again consult the Trades
Union Congress on this matter.

The Workers’ members recalled that Article 2 of the
Convention provided that the right of employers and
workers to associate for all lawful purposes should be
guaranteed by appropriate measures. On which law did
the government base itself when it prevented the creation
of a trade union?

In reply the Government representative stated that the
only discrepancy between the legislation and the Con­
vention lay in the provision establishing that appeals
against refusal or cancellation of registration of a trade
union came before the Minister and not before the High
Court.

The Employers’ members regretted the fact that the
refusal or acceptance of a trade union depended upon a
ministerial decision; however, it appeared, from the
statement of the Government and Workers’ representa­
tives of Singapore, that a solution was being sought. The
government should regulate questions relating to sub­
version by special legislation and not by violating the
Convention.

The Committee urged the government to re-examine
the question without undue delay.

**Convention No. 85 : Labour Inspectorates**
**(Non-Metropolitan Territories), 1947**

**Nyasaland.** A Government representative made the
following statement:

The government of Nyasaland had prepared a Bill in
conformity with the provisions of the Convention. It
was hoped that this Bill would be submitted to the
legislative authorities.

**Convention No. 86 : Contracts of Employment**
**(Indigenous Workers), 1947**

**United Kingdom**

British Guiana. See under Convention No. 50.

Southern Rhodesia. The Government communicated
the following information:

The introduction of a General Employment Bill is in
abeyance, but a Bill dealing with the maximum length of
written contracts to implement the provisions of the
Convention is being introduced.

A Government representative added that the text of
this Bill had been communicated to the I.L.O. to ascer­
ttain that it covered the provisions of the Convention.
Appendix V: Application of Conventions and Recommendations

C. Reports Received and Reports Not Received by 21 June 1963

Reports expected: 1,405. Reports received: 1,348. Reports not received: 57.

The table published in the Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, page 143, should be brought up to date as follows:

(The numbers of Conventions in respect of which declarations of application without modification or declarations of application with modifications had been registered by 30 June 1962 are printed in italics.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries and territories</th>
<th>Reports received</th>
<th>Reports not received</th>
<th>Population (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number received</td>
<td>Conventions Nos.</td>
<td>Number not received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Départements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Territories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 26, 27, 32, 33*, 35, 36, 37, 38, 43, 49, 58, 62, 68, 84, 87, 97, 98, 99, 100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>5*, 7, 8*, 11, 15, 16, 26, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 50*, 59, 64, 68, 84*, 86, 87, 97, 98, 99, 102</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5*, 7, 8*, 11, 15, 16, 26, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 50*, 64, 68, 84, 86, 87, 97, 98, 99, 102</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Christopher-Nevis-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5, 7, 8*, 11, 15, 16, 26, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 50, 64, 68, 84*, 86, 87, 97, 98, 99, 102</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5, 7, 8*, 11, 15, 16, 26, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 50, 64, 68, 84*, 86, 87, 97, 98, 99, 102</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reports received too late to be summarised in Report III (Part 1).
APPENDIX III

SUBMISSION TO THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES OF THE CONVENTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE (ARTICLE 19 OF THE CONSTITUTION)

Observations and Information

Afghanistan

The Government communicated the following information:

The submission of Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities involves many stages which often take longer than the prescribed time limits laid down in the Constitution. To date the submission of the Conventions and Recommendations has not been completed.

In addition, a Government representative made the following statement:

"The instruments adopted by the 41st to 45th Sessions of the Conference were being examined by the Council of Ministers which was to present them to the National Assembly. In the meantime a new Government had come into power and the instruments had had to go before the Council of Ministers once again. The Government assured the Committee that the instruments in question would be submitted to the National Assembly in the very near future and that all information on this matter would be provided.

The Committee expressed the hope that the instruments would be submitted to the National Assembly before long.

Albania

A Government representative made the following statement:

In accordance with article 59 of the Albanian Constitution the competent authority in regard to the submission of Conventions and Recommendations was the Præsidium of the People's Assembly. Consequently instruments adopted by the Conference were submitted to this body, and this practice was not contrary to article 19 of the Constitution of the I.L.O.

The Employers pointed out that instruments should be submitted to the most representative legislative body, which in Albania, from statements previously made on the Government's behalf, appeared to be the People's Assembly. Conventions and Recommendations should accordingly be submitted to the People's Assembly.

In reply, the Government representative stated that article 19 of the Constitution of the I.L.O. did not specify that instruments should be submitted to the most representative legislative body. The Government was acting in accordance with the constitutional provisions of the I.L.O. in its procedure of submission.

The Committee recalled that it had, for many years, stressed that one of the objects of submission was to give wide publicity to I.L.O. instruments; it had therefore asked governments to submit these instruments to the most representative legislative body in order to ensure such publicity. The Committee expressed the hope that the Government would consider the possibility of following this procedure.

Austria

The Government communicated the following information:

The Council of Ministers has decided to submit the report of the Federal Minister of Social Administration on Convention No. 116 and Recommendation No. 115 to the National Council. The Government's proposals and the report of the Committee of Social Administration will be communicated as soon as the parliamentary procedure is completed.

Belgium

The Government communicated the following information:

The instruments adopted at the 45th Session of the Conference had been submitted to Parliament on 5 April 1963 with a governmental statement. In this statement the Government indicated its intention to propose the ratification of Convention No. 116. As regards Recommendation No. 115, the Government declared that there appears to be no difficulty for the acceptance of this instrument since most of its provisions are already in force.

Brazil

A Government representative made the following statement:

Conventions Nos. 115 and 116 had been submitted to Parliament on 26 November 1962 (Official Gazette, 27 November 1962).

Bulgaria

A Government representative made the following statement:

The competent authority to which international instruments were submitted for ratification was the Præsidium of the National Assembly or the National Assembly itself. The Præsidium was a body of the National Assembly and its enactments had the same authority as those of the National Assembly; it was thus the competent authority according to article 19 of the I.L.O. Constitution. As the National Assembly met only once or twice a year, it was the Præsidium which, between sessions, promulgated the necessary legislative texts and subsequently reported its decisions to the National Assembly. No enactment could be approved without the matter being reported to the National Assembly, and in this sense all acts of the Præsidium were submitted to the National Assembly. The fact that the Præsidium had ratified so large a number of Conventions proved the effectiveness of this procedure. If the National Assembly did not approve of a decision by the Præsidium, it had the power to alter it. The texts communicated to the I.L.O. were those that had received the approval of the National Assembly.

The Committee noted that the Præsidium of the National Assembly reported to the National Assembly all decisions to ratify Conventions. However, the Præsidium should also report on any decision not to accept a particular instrument.

Byelorussia

A Government representative made the following statement:

"Article 19 of the Constitution left it to each country to determine what was the competent authority for the purposes of this article, and to decide on the procedure to be followed in regard to submission. The competent authority in Byelorussia was the Præsidium of the Supreme Soviet and it was to this body that all Con-"
ventions and Recommendations were submitted. They were circulated to trade unions, directors of undertakings and to all organisations and bodies interested in the matter. Thus the public was kept fully informed of the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the Conference.

Central African Republic

The Government communicated the following information:

The Government has decided to adopt the Workers’ Housing Recommendation, 1961 (No. 115).

Chile

The Government communicated the following information:

Convention No. 116 was submitted to the National Congress in October 1962. Recommendation No. 116 was brought at the same date to the knowledge of the Chamber of Deputies.

China

The Government communicated the following supplementary information:

1. All the Recommendations adopted at the various sessions of the International Labour Conference have been submitted to the Legislative Yuan.

2. The situation of the Conventions listed in the report of the Committee of Experts as not having been dealt with by the various competent authorities is as follows:

(i) Convention No. 85 (Protection of Wages) and Convention No. 98 (Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining) have already been ratified; the instruments of ratification of these two Conventions were registered by the I.L.O. on 16 November 1962 and 11 October 1962, respectively.

(ii) The examination of Conventions Nos. 87, 90, 91, 92, 94, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109 and 110 has already been completed by the various competent authorities concerned; the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have already submitted these Conventions to the Executive Yuan for transmission to the Legislative Yuan for consideration.

(iii) Convention No. 93 which has been revised by Convention No. 109 has not been dealt with.

(iv) The examination of Convention No. 89 has been done by the various competent authorities concerned. The Conference will soon be submitted by the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Executive Yuan for transmission to the Legislative Yuan for consideration.

(v) A date has already been fixed for the examination of Conventions Nos. 88, 96 and 97.

3. The examination of Conventions Nos. 53, 58, 73 and 117 has now been completed by the various competent authorities concerned; the ratification of these Conventions is recommended. These Conventions will soon be submitted by the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Executive Yuan for examination and transmission to the Legislative Yuan for consideration. Besides, a date has already been set for a joint examination by the various competent authorities concerned of Conventions Nos. 9 and 118.

Costa Rica

A Government representative made the following statement:

Costa Rica had for many years promoted social legislation which was in harmony with the instruments adopted at the International Labour Conference and which met the special conditions in the country. Many of the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the Conference were already implemented in Costa Rica through existing legislation. This did not mean that the Government was not aware of the obligation to submit these instruments to the legislative body, in accordance with article 19 of the Constitution of the I.L.O. Recent administrative improvements should facilitate the preparation of the studies required prior to the submission of Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities, but it had been impossible to submit, at one and the same time, all the Conventions to the Legislative Assembly. Preference had been given, in regard to submission, to those Conventions whose ratification was likely because this would not necessitate modifications in the legislation and because these modifications would not prove considerable. Out of the 19 Conventions submitted for ratification, 18 had been ratified and the remaining Convention would soon be ratified also. The Government was aware of the possibility of ratification was not a condition to submission, but the procedure indicated above had been followed since it was impossible to submit at one and the same time all the instruments adopted. Convention No. 111 was submitted to the Legislative Assembly in September 1962. The Committee expressed the hope that the Government would soon submit all the instruments to the Legislative Assembly.

Cuba

A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government had submitted all the Conventions and Recommendations to the Council of Ministers, which was the competent authority for the purpose of article 19 of the Constitution. Decision on these texts would be taken in due course. The ratification of Convention No. 111 was being considered but certain formalities still had to be completed.

The Employers’ members asked what measures were taken by the Government to inform the population of Cuba, or its parliament, about instruments adopted by the Conference in cases where ratification was not being proposed by the Government.

In reply the Government representative stated detailed information on the instruments adopted by the Conference was provided to the population through various organisations, including trade unions.

Czechoslovakia

The Government communicated the following information:

The Government has of late devoted special study to the questions of the standard-setting activities of the International Labour Organisation and, in connection with this, to the implementation of the obligations arising for Czechoslovakia from article 19 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation.

On this occasion careful consideration was also given to the question of the procedure followed in submitting the Conventions and Recommendations adopted at the International Labour Conference to the competent Czechoslovak authorities, as required under paragraphs 5 and 6 of article 19 of the Constitution and the I.L.O. Memorandum concerning the obligation for Members to submit Conventions and Recommendations to their competent authorities.

In complete accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation and with the Czechoslovak constitutional and other legal texts, the following procedure is observed in submitting the Conventions and Recommendations adopted at the Conference:

1. In accordance with article 19 of the I.L.O. Constitution, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs submits to the Government Conventions and Recommendations adopted at the Conference for approval and consideration with a view to passing necessary legislation or adopting other appropriate measures. At the same time, the Minister recommends endorsement of those Conventions which are in accordance with existing national laws and the enforcement of which therefore requires no special legislation. Such Conventions are then ratified directly by the Government. In the case of Recommendations, where no special legislation is necessary, the Government delegates their execution to the competent authorities.

2. Conventions and Recommendations the execution of which requires, under the provisions of article 42 of the national Constitution, the passing of special legislation, are submitted by the Government to the National Assembly for consideration and approval as well as for the adoption of the required legislation. These Conventions are then recommended for ratification by the President.
3. Conventions which have been approved by the Government, and which have been neither approved nor submitted to the National Assembly for approval, are submitted by the Government to the National Assembly together with the Government’s comments and statement of position. The same applies to all Recommendations.

4. The Minister of Foreign Affairs informs the Director-General of the International Labour Office of the results of the action taken by the national competent authorities with regard to the Conventions and Recommendations. He also transmits to him the Deeds of Adhesion to Conventions ratified directly by the Government, as well as Instruments of Ratification in the case of Conventions endorsed by the National Assembly. In the case of Conventions which have not been approved by the competent authorities, the Minister of Foreign Affairs submits to the Director-General of the I.L.O. on request from the Governing Body, a report on the legislation and practice, covering the period under review, having a bearing on the questions covered by the Convention. Similar procedure is followed in the case of all Recommendations.

A similar procedure to that described under 1 to 4 above will be adopted in the case of previously negotiated Conventions and Recommendations which, according to the 1962 report of the Committee of Experts, have not yet been submitted to the Czechoslovak competent organs.

In addition a Government representative made the following statement:

The new procedure was in full conformity with the I.L.O.’s Constitution and the national Constitution and laws. All the instruments in question were adopted at the 32nd to 45th Sessions which had not yet been submitted. The Committee took note with interest of this information.

Ecuador

A Government representative made the following statement:

There had been internal procedural difficulties. There had been a number of changes in government. The situation had now been normalised. All the Conventions were being considered by the competent authorities with a view to their submission to the next Congress, this year. The Government would endeavour to obtain the largest possible number of ratifications, wherever the legislation was already in conformity with the Conventions. In the other cases the Government would examine the legislative amendments which would have to be made.

The Committee of Experts had decided that Conventions and Recommendations should be submitted in all cases to the competent authorities regardless of the question of ratification.

Ethiopia

A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government had taken note of the observations of the Committee of Experts regarding submission. The delay in complying with the obligation laid down in article 19 of the Constitution was due to the fact that the Ministry of Labour had only been set up last year. Considerable staffing and technical difficulties had had to be met, particularly because of the need to translate all the instruments. Nevertheless, a special section of the Ministry of Labour and Police had been set up to deal with international organisations, including in particular the I.L.O. Accordingly, the Government would now be in a position to meet its obligations. No assurance could be given, however, that all the instruments would be submitted to the competent authorities at an early date, but the instruments adopted at the 46th Session of the Conference had not yet been submitted to the competent authorities.

The Employers’ members stated that this information should be noted with satisfaction. Ethiopia had long been on the Special List. It was to be hoped that the Government would make the best possible use of the central trade union organisation and the embryonic employers’ organisation which had now been established, through joint consultation, particularly with regard to the ratification and application of Conventions.

The Committee took note with satisfaction of the information supplied and hoped that the Government would take account of the comments which had been made.

Finland

The Government communicated the following information:


France

A Government representative made the following statement:

The Committee of Experts had made no observation during the past three years on the manner in which France complied with its obligations to submit Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities. Reference was made in the table included in the Committee’s report to the fact that the instruments adopted at the 45th Session of the Conference had not yet been submitted to the competent authorities. However, since the Committee met, the instruments in question, together with those adopted at the 44th Session of the Conference, had been communicated to the Committee on Cultural, Family and Social Affairs of the National Assembly. As regards the constitutional position of France, it should be noted that under Articles 34 and 37 of the national Constitution of 1958, the procedure of ratification was within the competence of the legislative power where a Convention related to the fundamental principles of labour legislation, trade union law or social security, or involved financial matters, and within the competence of the Executive in all other cases. Moreover, since the I.L.O. was particularly concerned with the publicity given to instruments adopted by the Conference, it should be noted that all instruments without exception were communicated to the Members of Parliament, who were then free to follow them up as they might think appropriate. Moreover, all instruments were communicated to the competent ministerial departments with a view to deciding how far effect was given to them under national law and practice and to decide what measures might be taken in this connection. Finally, in order to ensure maximum publicity for the work of the I.L.O., the Conventions and Recommendations were published in the “ Ministry of Labour Review ”.

The Employers’ members stated that the question of the submission of Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities in France had been raised at their request and that they were fully satisfied with the reply.

Greece

A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government was not yet in a position to furnish a final reply to the question since the examination of the procedure to be followed had not yet been completed. The Government hoped soon to be able to announce a satisfactory solution. In the meantime, the ratification of Conventions Nos. 58, 69 and 108 had been decided upon and the draft laws relating to this had already been adopted by the Parliament.

Guatemala

A Government representative made the following statement:

Because of unforeseen circumstances, the Government had been unable to comply with its obligations under article 19 of the Constitution. It was, however, fully resolved to fulfil the international obligations which it had undertaken. In a statement of 22 April 1963, the Head of the Government indicated that the Government recognised that it continued to be bound by the bilateral and multilateral treaties, Conventions and agreements undertaken by the various governments of the Republic. The Government representative would make every effort to avoid the need for further observations by the Committee of Experts.
The Committee expressed the hope that measures would be taken to ensure full compliance with the Government's obligations under the Constitution of the I.L.O. 

**Hungary**

A Government representative made the following statement:

All instruments adopted by the Conference at its 45th and 46th Sessions had been submitted to the Presidential Council. By resolution No. 126/1963, the Presidential Council had taken note of Conventions Nos. 116, 117 and 118 and of Recommendations Nos. 115, 116 and 117.

**Indonesia**

A Government representative made the following statement:

The necessary measures had been taken to allow the Government to fulfil its constitutional obligations in this matter.

**Iran**

The Government communicated the following information:

The instruments adopted by the Conference at its 41st and 46th Sessions were communicated to the Council of Ministers so as to take the necessary measures for their submission to the competent legislative authorities. The necessary preparations will be carried out rapidly and the obligation existing in this sphere in pursuance of article 19 of the Constitution will be fulfilled in the near future.

In addition, a Government representative made the following statement:

Following a general preliminary examination of these instruments, including in particular the Conventions whose ratification was to be proposed, these instruments had been communicated to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, which was required to give its opinion on the matters within its competence. The delay in submitting these instruments was mainly due to the fact that, under the national legislation, the Government could bring before the legislative powers only Bills which proposed the approval of the ratification of the Conventions. The Committee of Experts was aware of these difficulties to which attention was drawn in paragraph 91 of its general report. Exchanges of views had taken place between the competent branches of the two Chambers in order to eliminate these difficulties and an agreement had been reached on this matter. It was to be hoped that measures would be taken as soon as possible so that Iran could fully meet its constitutional obligations in this respect in the near future.

The Committee noted that the Government was fully aware of the importance of the instruments, had expressed its intention of ratifying them as soon as possible, and expressed the hope that it would be able to overcome the difficulties in the near future.

**Iraq**

The Government communicated the following information:

The Government has taken due note of the observations of the Committee of Experts. Considerable progress has been achieved by the Government in recent years towards meeting the obligations under article 19 of the Constitution. Thirteen Conventions and three Recommendations were ratified during the years 1960-62. A number of the instruments listed in the last column of Appendix I to the report; Convention No. 87 was submitted some years ago to the competent authority which decided to postpone ratification; the instrument is being reconsidered by the competent authority with a view to its ratification.

The Conventions listed in the last column of Appendix I to the report: Convention Nos. 89 and 90 have already been submitted to the competent authority but no decision has so far been taken. The aims laid down in Convention No. 105 and Recommendation No. 104 are one of the supreme objectives of the revolutionary Government; these two instruments are being studied by the departments concerned with a view to their possible ratification. As regards Convention No. 110 and Recommendation No. 116, it should be noted that although such agricultural undertakings exist at present in Iraq, a Bill is being prepared for agricultural workers; the principles contained in these two instruments will be taken into consideration with the view to their possible ratification when the Bill is enacted.

Recommendations Nos. 83 and 103 have been submitted for ratification but no decision has so far been taken. Recommendation No. 111 was ratified by notification of 3 February 1963, issued by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, and the Director-General of the I.L.O. has been notified of this ratification and provided with a copy of the notification. Recommendation No. 112 is to be submitted to the competent authority within the next few days.

In addition, a Government representative made the following statement:

The Government regretted that the Experts had to repeat their observations. The competent bodies had examined and continued to examine a large number of instruments, which had been communicated to employers' and workers' organisations and other bodies. The labour legislation was constantly being amended. However, the Government recognised its obligation to submit all the instruments to the competent authorities. It hoped that the observations would not need to be repeated next year. Certain instruments had been submitted, but not all, much to the Government's regret.

**Israel**

The Government communicated the following information:

The instruments adopted by the Conference at its 45th Session have been submitted to the Parliament with a memorandum. The ratification of Convention No. 116 has been approved. Recommendation No. 115 has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Housing and workers' and employers' organisations.

**Italy**

The Government communicated the following information:

The instruments adopted at the 45th Session of the Conference were submitted to the Chamber and the Senate in July 1962. On this occasion the Government made proposals with regard to each of these instruments. It was decided to ratify Convention No. 116. The legislation in force is already sufficiently adequate for securing the full application of Recommendation No. 116. A favourable opinion had been expressed as to the appropriateness of the application of the provisions of this instrument.

**Jordan**

The Government communicated the following information:

The Committee of Experts' observations do not reflect the true position, as the Government has ratified, inter alia, Convention No. 116. The Government is in the process of preparing Convention No. 111, and the I.L.O. will be informed of the official ratification in due time. Conventions (for the purpose of ratification) are submitted to the Council of Ministers for its decision. If the Council's decision is affirmative, the Convention is signed by the King and published in the official gazette.

In addition a Government representative made the following statement:

The Conventions and Recommendations adopted at the 46th Session of the Conference had been submitted to the competent authorities. The Conventions adopted at that session had been duly ratified. The fact that the reports had been received with administrative procedure and translation. Six Conventions (Nos. 81, 111, 116, 117, 118 and 98) had been approved last year. The Government would be able to ratify a certain number of other Conventions.

The Employers' members noted that the Government now appeared to have understood that the instruments must be submitted to the competent authorities in all cases, and not only where it proposed to ratify a Convention.

The Committee pointed out that all instruments must be submitted to the competent authorities.
Lebanon

A Government representative made the following statement:
The Government had not interpreted quite correctly the obligations of article 19 of the Constitution. The misunderstanding was removed last year following the Experts' observation, and the Government now understood the position of Conventions and Recommendations should be submitted in all cases to the competent authorities. Within some months, the Government would indicate the measures taken in order to submit all the instruments to the competent authorities and would moreover indicate whether the ratification of certain Conventions and the acceptance of certain Recommendations had been proposed.
The Committee took note with interest of the Government's statement and hoped that the information on the submission of instruments would be communicated before next year.

Liberia

The Government has communicated the following information:
All the Conventions and Recommendations adopted at the 31st to 46th Sessions of the Conference have been published in accordance with article 19 of the Constitution of the I.L.O., to the competent authority with request for its recommendation. The Conventions and Recommendations which the Government has not yet ratified or adopted are still under consideration and a detailed report on this matter will be communicated before the 41st Session of the Conference.
The Committee expressed the hope that the necessary information on the action taken would soon be communicated.

Malaya

The Government communicated the following information:
The next session of Parliament was expected to sit in May or June this year and action is in hand to table the texts of all the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the I.L.O. since Malaya became a Member, together with a government statement as to what action it proposes to take in regard to those instruments that have been fully examined. The new procedure will be correctly applied so as to comply fully with the Constitution of the I.L.O.

Federal action is considered as appropriate with regard to all the Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the Conference at its 41st to 46th Sessions. These instruments were submitted to Parliament in May 1963. A government statement was made on this occasion in respect of Conventions Nos. 110, 111, 112, 113, 114 and 115 and Recommendations Nos. 110, 111, 112 and 114. Similar statements will be made on the remaining instruments once they have been examined.

Nigeria

The Government communicated the following information:
Recommendation No. 115 was communicated in May 1962 to the competent authority of each of the governments in the Federation for consideration. Because of the widespread application of this instrument, Nigeria is not in a position to accept it.

Panama

The Employers' members made the following statement:
The Government had stated in 1962 its intention to fulfi its obligations in regard to the ratification of instruments. Nevertheless, no instrument had been submitted since Convention No. 100. In reply the Government representative stated that the present Government would not spare any effort to fulfil its obligations.
The Committee pointed out that all Conventions and Recommendations should be submitted to the competent authorities regardless of the Government's intentions in regard to ratification or to the adoption of other measures.

Poland

A Government representative made the following statement:
The information supplied by the Government on the submission of certain instruments was set out in Report III, Part III. The number of these instruments amounted to six. This question had therefore been settled in a satisfactory manner.

Romania

A Government representative made the following statement:
According to section 23 of the Constitution, the State Council was vested with the power to enact decrees and was authorised to ratify and denounce international treaties (section 37, paragraph 16, of the Constitution). The decision of the State Council had force of law and were published in the Official Bulletin. The observation by the Committee of Experts indicating that the instruments adopted by the Conference should be submitted to a body other than that specified in the Constitution, 
could not be accepted and was contrary to the concept of national sovereignty. Moreover, article 19 of the Constitution of I.L.O. sought to protect only the sovereignty of member States of the I.L.O. The Memorandum of the Governing Body did not contain any clause authorising the Committee of Experts to make observations on the constitution of a member State. Finally, it should be remembered that the Government had submitted to the competent bodies all international instruments adopted up to the 45th Session of the Conference, as was evident from the table in the report of the Committee of Experts.
The Employers' members pointed out that Conventions and Recommendations should be notified to the public in each country. This was one of the objects of submission, and this matter had nothing to do with the sovereignty of a State. What happened to instruments which the Council of State had refused to ratify?

In reply, the Government representative stated that article 19 required that Conventions and Recommendations be submitted to the competent authority designated by the national Constitution. The distribution of the competence of the different bodies of the State was an internal matter. As for the manner in which these instruments were brought to the knowledge of the public this matter had nothing to do with submission. In Romania the activities of the I.L.O. received much publicity through the press as well as through the sessions of the Council of State in which representatives of different bodies of the State and trade unions participated.

El Salvador

A Government representative made the following statement:
The situation in which the country had found itself, during which there had only been a de facto Government and no Legislative Assembly, prevented the regular submission of Conventions and Recommendations. The situation had become normal in 1962; a National Assembly had been elected; it had to deal first with questions of utmost urgency. It was hoped that at its next session the Assembly would find it possible to examine the Conventions and Recommendations. The Government subscribed to the I.L.O.'s objectives and concerns; this was reflected in the fact that the first legislative text adopted by the present Government had been the Labour Code of 23 January 1963. The I.L.O. Conventions and Recommendations had been incorporated in this Code and this was as useful a measure as ratification. The Government intended to examine a number of Conventions with a view to their ratification.
The Employers' members stated that the question was not only that of the ratification of Conventions and the adoption of laws. It was necessary to submit both Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities in all cases and not only when their ratification or the taking of other measures was envisaged. It was hoped that the Government would fully understand the scope of its obligation with regard to submission.
The Committee expressed the hope that the Government would not spare any effort to fulfil its obligations with regard to the Constitution with regard to submission before next year.
Republic of South Africa
The Government communicated the following information:

The Government is considering means of giving effect to the requirements of the Committee of Experts with regard to submission of Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities, including the possibility of submitting to Parliament a White Paper setting out the terms of the relevant instruments and the action contemplated in relation thereto.

Thailand
A Government representative made the following statement:

A special committee had been appointed. It was proposed to ratify Conventions Nos. 108 and 115 and to accept Recommendations Nos. 105, 107, 108 and 114. Convention No. 109 and Recommendations Nos. 101, 106, 107, 108 and 109 had been discussed in previous years. There were many reference books dealing with all the instruments which the Government intended to adopt, but also all other Conventions and Recommendations, must be submitted to the competent authorities.

The Government representative stated in reply that the Conventions and Recommendations adopted at the 37th to 44th Sessions were being submitted to the competent authorities. Furthermore, the departments concerned were examining the possibility of adopting certain Conventions and applying certain Recommendations.

The Committee noted with interest that all instruments were to be submitted to the competent authorities, and that the ratification of certain Conventions was under review.

Ukraine
A Government representative stated that he agreed with the views expressed by the U.S.S.R. Government member regarding the interpretation of article 19 of the Constitution. He added that in Ukraine all Conventions and Recommendations were submitted to the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet and this ensured full compliance with the obligations under article 19. Extensive publicity was given to I.L.O. Conventions, particularly in recent years. There were many reference books dealing with all the Conventions ratified by Ukraine. University students were frequently questioned on the international Conventions ratified by Ukraine, etc.

The Employers' member referred to the comments they had made in respect of other countries.

U.S.S.R.
A Government representative made the following statement:

Discussion of this question, which had already been discussed in previous years, should cease. The question of defining the nature of the competent authority was an internal matter within the sovereign rights of each State. The instruments adopted at the Conference were brought to the knowledge of a great number of persons. The Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet, this body was composed of a large number of personalities, among them the Presidents of the Supreme Soviet of the different republics and representatives from the party, trade unions and other Soviet organisations. In this way the instruments adopted by the Conference were brought to the knowledge of a great number of persons. The Praesidium met between the sessions of the Supreme Soviet. The sessions of the latter body were open to a number of invited persons, such as representatives of the diplomatic corps and various organisations. The Praesidium reported to the Supreme Soviet all texts adopted by it. For example, decrees adopted by the Praesidium were approved by the Supreme Soviet as laws. The decisions taken by the Praesidium and by the Supreme Soviet were published in the press and in a special collected edition. The ratification of a Convention was indicated in the "Building of the Supreme Soviet", which could be found in all libraries.

The Employers' members asked whether, when the Praesidium decided not to ratify a Convention, was this decision communicated to the Supreme Soviet?

In reply the Government representative stated that the Praesidium took note of documents which were submitted to it, and decided what action should be taken thereon. The Praesidium had never adopted a decision concerning the non-ratification of a Convention.

Uruguay
A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government had recently submitted to Parliament the instruments adopted at the 38th to 46th Sessions. It was hoped that a large number of instruments would be approved.

Viet-Nam
A Government representative made the following statement:

As a result of the war the National Assembly had had to deal with urgent questions, and it had not been possible to submit to it the instruments adopted at the last few sessions. The Government intended to submit these instruments to the next legislature at the end of the year. It hoped to obtain approval for Conventions Nos. 81, 107 and 111.

Yugoslavia
A Government representative made the following statement:

In practice Parliament was the body which in all cases examined and analysed newly adopted instruments. This system functioned in the following manner: (a) through ratification by Parliament of all Conventions and Recommendations whose application required the adoption of new laws or the amendment of existing legislative provisions; (b) through confirmation of the measures taken by the Executive Council or the Government, in cases where the latter was competent to ratify; (c) through submission of reports to the competent committees of Parliament on questions relating to the ratification or the non-ratification of the application of Conventions.

Therefore, Parliament, as the supreme legislative body, took the final decisions in this respect. The question of competence and the procedure of ratification of international Conventions was to be examined again in connection with the new Constitution. This Constitution, provided, inter alia, that ratified Conventions had the force of law in internal legislation. Measures were now being taken for the adaptation of the new Constitution. The I.L.O. would be informed in due course of the decision taken in this respect.

To meet the Committee of Experts' observations with regard to the communication of extracts from reports submitted to the National Assembly at the time of the submission of Conventions and Recommendations, the Government would take measures to furnish such documents.

The Committee took note of the statement made by the Government representative.
REPORTS ON AN UNRATIFIED CONVENTION AND ON A RECOMMENDATION

Discrimination (Employment and Occupation)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION AND COMMENTS CONCERNING CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Belgium

A Government representative made the following statement:

Attention has been drawn to the Belgian Government's failure to send a report on Convention No. 111, under article 19. The Government was fully aware of the importance of this instrument and had carried out a careful study of the relevant legislation and practice, requiring the assistance of various bodies and services. Information on technical education, due from one of these bodies, had not been received and this had prevented the supply of the report.

Ceylon

A Workers' member made the following statement:

The Workers' members had a report on the position of workers in Ceylon. It pointed out that discriminatory measures in employment contravening Convention No. 111 were widespread in this country. This discrimination was based on language, race and religion. It was true that Ceylon had not ratified this Convention; nevertheless, the Government should take the necessary measures in order to conform with the spirit of the Convention, and thus put an end to this discriminatory policy.

A Government member from Ceylon stated that although Ceylon had not yet ratified Convention No. 111, there was no discrimination of any sort in the country. There was obviously a misunderstanding resulting from the introduction of a new law establishing an official language which made it obligatory for all civil servants to know this language or to learn it within a certain period. National legislation on employment in the private sector was more favourable to immigrant workers than to national workers; this was the case, for example, of plantation workers.

The Workers' member stated that if no discrimination existed in Ceylon, that country should ratify Convention No. 111. However, the statement by the Government member was inconsistent with the facts. About one million Tamils could work only on plantations and were denied vocational training. The Committee should take account of all these facts and submit them to the Governing Body for appropriate action. Documents, including government circulars containing these facts, were available to the Committee.

France

The Government supplied the following information:

France reaffirmed its attachment to the principle of non-discrimination, in its broadest sense, in the Preamble to the Constitution of 1946, confirmed by the 1958 Constitution.

Articles 1 of the Convention. The Constitution of 1946 proclaimed the inalienability of the rights of the human being without distinction as to race, religion or cred, and stated that no one might suffer prejudice in his work or employment on account of his opinions or beliefs. It further provided that each citizen "has the right and the duty to have an employment". Any discrimination in employment based on the race, colour, religion or political opinion of workers would consequently be contrary to the Preamble of the Constitution whose provisions have binding force before the administrative tribunals.

The Preamble of the Constitution guarantees to women, in all fields, rights equal to those of men. In addition to equal opportunity of access to various levels of training, on which equality of opportunity in respect of employment depends, women have the same possibility of access to work as men. No discrimination based on sex exists in the recruitment of employees for the public service (section 7 of the General Public Service Regulations).

Equal access to the means of training, free education and, from 1900, the extension of compulsory school attendance to the age of 16 years, are among the factors which contribute to eliminate in practice any possibility of discrimination on the basis of social origin. Furthermore, the system of recruitment by competitive examination for public bodies eliminates all influence of factors related to social origin.

As regards distinctions founded not on nationality but on national extraction, the Nationality Code grants aliens who acquire French nationality equal rights with other citizens. Section 23 of the General Public Service Regulations provides that candidates for public employment must have had French nationality for at least five years before entering the public service. France, a country of immigration which has followed a liberal policy of naturalisation, has sought to associate persons having recently acquired its citizenship progressively in the running of public affairs. The rule for this five-year transitional period replaced provisions which had fixed it at ten years. Simular provisions apply to the practice of certain professions, with their own professional codes, and which are related to activities of public interest (e.g., the courts as regards notaries, solicitors or barristers, or public health as regards doctors and dentists). In general, this five-year waiting period imposed in respect of admission to public services and certain related professions is justified by the fact that the activities involved call for special regard for the public interest and an effective integration in the national community. The five-year period is not required where certain services have been rendered to the country.

Articles 2 and 3. The principles of a non-discrimination policy laid down in the Preambles to the Constitutions of 1946 and 1958 express clearly the desire of the public
A Government representative made the following statement:

Turkey

Turkey had been mentioned in paragraph 11 of the Experts' report as a country which contemplated the ratification of the Convention. This had not yet been done because, following the revolution of 1960, a general revision of many legislative texts, including social legislation, had been undertaken. Many Bills, including an Industrial Labour Code, a Maritime Labour Code, etc., were pending. Articles 11, 14, 46 of the Constitution, however, prohibited any discrimination on the grounds of race, sex, national extraction, etc.

United Kingdom

A Government representative made the following statement:

Although the United Kingdom had not ratified Convention No. 111, its general position on the subject was clear. The Government, when submitting the Convention to Parliament, had indicated that it fully accepted the principle of non-discrimination in regard to employment and occupation and this appeared to be inconsistent with the United Kingdom system of collective negotiation. The Government had therefore been extremely interested in the views expressed on this point by the Experts in paragraphs 60 and 74 of its survey; it was not yet satisfied, however, that the technical difficulties had been removed. Nevertheless, it should be understood that in the United Kingdom the principle of non-discrimination in regard to employment and occupation was applied in law and practice over most of the areas covered by the Convention.

The experts had indicated that national extraction was not to be confused with nationality—a point confirmed by the preparatory work—this explanation should be set out in the Committee's General Report so that it would be accepted by the Conference, with a view to removing any doubt. It was pointed out that the Convention, by referring to national extraction, did not refer to distinctions between nationals and foreigners.

Spain

A Government representative made the following statement:

The experts had mentioned in paragraph 11 of the Experts' report that Spain which contemplated the ratification of the Convention. This had not yet been done because, following the revolution of 1960, a general revision of many legislative texts, including social legislation, had been undertaken. Many Bills, including an Industrial Labour Code, a Maritime Labour Code, etc., were pending. Articles 11, 14, 46 of the Constitution, however, prohibited any discrimination on the grounds of race, sex, national extraction, etc.

A Government representative made the following statement:

The Government regretted its delay in communicating the reports required under article 19; the delay was due to the fact that the Government had hoped to be able to ratify Convention No. 111 before the session of the Conference. France had always been attached to the principle of non-discrimination in its broadest sense. The experts had noted that France had now described the position in France with regard to the 1958 instruments and referred in particular to the reasons which had so far prevented ratification. These lay in the provisions of the legal instruments for public employees and in the fact that other occupations must have had French nationality for at least 5 years before entering such employment. The experts had noted that the national policy of non-discrimination followed in France and by the fact that the activities involved called for special regard for the public interest and for effective integration in the national community. The Government appreciated the liberal and flexible views expressed on this subject by the Experts in paragraph 92 of their survey. It did not wish however to ignore the gap which might result from the application of the Convention and would welcome any further explanations on the question of national extrac-
Appendix V: Application of Conventions and Recommendations

United States

A Government representative made the following statement:

The Committee of Experts was to be commended on its impressive report. The provisions of the Convention concerning discrimination in employment defined discrimination as "any distinction, exclusion or preference made on the basis of race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equally opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation". Each of these words had considerable meaning. The Convention called upon the Governments to perform their task of studying this complex subject in some 138 countries. Although the report was preliminary in nature it furnished the basic guidelines for future programmes designed for the elimination of discrimination and pointed out obstacles to be overcome.

One of the conclusions to be drawn from the report was that discrimination in one form or another existed in every country, no matter how high its ideals nor how perfect its constitutional and legislative protections. It was, however, hopeful for the future that the I.L.O. was approaching the complicated problems of discrimination in a thorough-going manner. A distinction should be made between the types of discrimination revealed by the report. One type was state-sponsored or state-recognized; it existed in a number of States and its elimination obviously rested with the governments concerned. The second type of discrimination was more difficult to demonstrate. It was found in places where it was not accounted for by virtue of habit, custom and ignorance; this was the kind of discrimination which the report described as resulting generally from factual situations and from the practical relationships of people. In these situations the I.L.O. could perform valuable services through its research, education and promotional programmes. The Governing Body Committee on Discrimination also contributed much towards securing co-ordinated approach to the problem. The Experts rightly indicated that the essential purpose of international standards was to promote opportunity and treatment in respect of employment and occupation not only before the law, but particularly in day-to-day social relationships. The Experts were variously defined for discrimination within the scope of the Convention. They examined spheres of its application, analysed situations which nullified or impaired equally opportunity or treatment, distinguished between measures which were not deemed to be discrimination, and explored in detail all aspects of national policy designed to eliminate discrimination.

The views of the Experts were not subject to question and the United States Government therefore appreciated the fact that the Committee of Experts had ranked the United States high. The Government had shared the objectives of the I.L.O. Committee on Discrimination. Discrimination and its consequences were regarded as the most important social problems of national policy. The federal Government was to use all available legal and moral pressure to combat and eliminate discrimination from all walks of life. This policy had the support of the overwhelming majority of the people. Much had happened since the preparation of the Government's report on the discrimination Convention and Recommendation. Activities in the areas mentioned in this report had steadily increased. Stronger measures and techniques were being developed in the war against discrimination. Over the years the federal courts had steadily expanded the rights of American negroes and confirmed the measures taken to enforce these rights. In the past month alone the Supreme Court had handed down decisions in six separate cases striking down segregation in several southern states. The President had, by executive order, outlawed discrimination in public housing and was at present drawing up new legislation to be presented to Congress this week aimed at removing discrimination in other areas. The present administration was committed to doing away with all forms of discrimination. Since the President entered office he had increased the active number of negroes in federal service. They represented over 20 per cent. of all federal employees and over 500 were in the police force in New York. The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity had stipulated that government contracts would not be awarded to firms discriminating in their employment practices. The report of the President's Committee on a draft agreement on non-discrimination in conjunction with the above-mentioned Committee this week the President, speaking to 650 mayors of the major cities, suggested a 5-point programme aimed at the elimination of discrimination. More and more cities and states were enacting legislation designed to eliminate discrimination.

American society was not perfect but it had the means and the determination to bring about improvement. Problems were not hidden, and the whole world could observe and evaluate the efforts being made to solve them. The country was passing through a period in which the fight for the full rights of the negro was being intensified; it would inevitably end with the achievement of this goal. The struggle in such southern states as Alabama and Mississippi demonstrated with pitiless clarity the proposition that all men were created equal.

The whole effort at Oxford, Mississippi, saw the mass and might of the Government of the United States to put one man in the state universe where he had a right to a better life. The significance of this lay in the fact that the United States Government moved swiftly to ensure that the law of the land would be implemented for all citizens, regardless of their colour. Freedom was indivisible and as long as one man was denied his basic rights, the rights of all were in jeopardy.

Great pride was taken in the United States Constitution and one was anxious to realise the full promise of the United States Constitution for all citizens and in the struggle of each generation to preserve and secure liberty and justice. The American negro had the dream of ultimate dignity as a citizen of the American people and from this struggle would emerge a stronger and better America.

The Government representative from the United States made the following statement:

Part 3 of the Experts' report had serious defects. Its authors had not called things by their name, and instead of condemning known facts, they had referred to hypothetical cases of discrimination. Significant failures were noted in the treatment of positive aspects in the United States, which they presented as a pioneer country in this field. It was difficult to explain why the country, in whose report the situation of millions of coloured workers in the United States, while they put emphasis on the few positive aspects, there were a great number of footnotes in the report in which the United States was criticism of the report did not refer to the adopted positive measures for the elimination of discrimination. Well-informed people knew that this was not justified. Most of the 50 states of the Union, only 21 states had legislation on equality of treatment in respect of employment; not one was from the South. This legislation did not cover certain sectors, such as agriculture, domestic service, or industry, and was in the United States, while they put emphasis on the few positive aspects, there were a great number of footnotes in the report in which the United States was criticism of the report did not refer to the adopted positive measures for the elimination of discrimination. Well-informed people knew that this was not justified. Most of the 50 states of the Union, only 21 states had legislation on equality of treatment in respect of employment; not one was from the South. This legislation did not cover certain sectors, such as agriculture, domestic service, or industry, and was in 1957.
The Commission had, for example, pointed out that as a result of past and present discrimination, negro workers occupied few skilled jobs and that they were particularly affected by unemployment. Professor Sovern of Columbia University had stated that, as a consequence of discrimination, unemployment was high and wages lower among negro workers. Mr. Kenneth Clark had written that discrimination in respect of employment was a characteristic of the American economy. Mr. Roy Wilkins, of the N.A.A.C.P., had written that considering the present rate of evolution, 138 years were necessary to give negroes an equal place. The efforts made in the United States were clearly insufficient. The proposal to address an appeal for ratification should be supported without reservation; an appeal had been previously made by the Governing Body. Attention should also be drawn to the fact that the Convention could be ratified even by federal States. On submitting the Convention to Congress, the United States Government had declared that it did not propose its ratification. This was in contradiction with the fact that the United States should be quoted so often as an example. The work of the Committee should result in moral pressure for the ratification of the Convention and the complete liquidation of discrimination wherever it might still exist.

In reply the Government representative of the United States stated that he was pleased that the U.S.S.R. Government member should know the situation in the United States through the press and radio. It was hoped that the same thing could be done as regards his country, and that the U.S.S.R. Government member would use this Committee to explain the conditions prevailing in his country.

LIST OF REPORTS UNDER ARTICLE 19 OF THE CONSTITUTION RECEIVED SINCE THE CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS' MEETING

France

Convention No. 111; Recommendation No. 111.
# APPENDIX V

## TABLES ORIGINALLY PRESENTED BY SIR JOHN FORBES WATSON SHOWING THE POSITION OF RATIFICATIONS AND VOTES CAST BY GOVERNMENT DElegates
(as brought up to date by the International Labour Office)

## TABLE A

Conventions 1919-62—Total Adopted : 116

### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Latest available estimate (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>13.8 t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina *</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia *</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria *</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil *</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>8.3 t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada *</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>697.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Leopoldville)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>21.6 t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>46.7 t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaben</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany * (Fed. Rep.)</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conventions ratified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Conventions ratified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina *</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia *</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria *</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil *</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada *</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Leopoldville)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaben</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany *</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conventions not ratified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Number of these Conventions which were adopted by the Conference at sessions outside period of participation in the Organisation of the country concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina *</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia *</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria *</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil *</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada *</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Leopoldville)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaben</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany *</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Membership of I.L.O.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Membership of I.L.O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Since 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Since 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Since 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina *</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia *</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria *</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil *</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Since 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Since 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>Since 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Since 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada *</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Since 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Since 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Leopoldville)</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>From 1920 to 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Since 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Since 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Since 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Since 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Since 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Since 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaben</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany *</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>(Germany) and since 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Since 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For footnotes, see p. 561.
### TABLE A (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States *</th>
<th>Conventions ratified *</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number of these Conventions which were adopted by the Conference at sessions outside period of participation in the Organisation of the country concerned</th>
<th>Membership of I.L.O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Hungary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Since 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 Iceland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Since 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441.6 India *</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>Since 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.7 Indonesia</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Since 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2 Iran</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>Since 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Iraq</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Since 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Ireland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Since 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Israel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Since 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.8 Italy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1939 and since 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Ivory Coast</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Since 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Jamaica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Since 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.9 Japan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1940 and since 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Jordan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Since 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 † Kuwait</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Since 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Lebanon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Since 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 † Liberia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Libya *</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Since 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 Luxembourg</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Since 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Malagasy Republic Federation of Malaya *</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Since 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Mali</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6 Mauritania</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Since 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.2 Mexico *</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Since 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9 Morocco</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Since 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8 Netherlands</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 New Zealand</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Nicaragua</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1938 and since 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Niger</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Since 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.5 † Nigeria *</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Norway</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.6 Pakistan *</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Since 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Panama</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Paraguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1937 and since 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4 Peru</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.7 Philippines</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Since 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.3 Poland</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9 Portugal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Rwanda</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1942 and since 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6 Rumania</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1939 and since 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 El Salvador</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Senegal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Since 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Sierra Leone</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Somalia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 † former Trust Territory of Somaliland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7 † former British Somaliland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.8 Spain</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1941 and since 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5 Sudan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Since 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Sweden</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Switzerland *</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>From 1947 to 1958 (Syria) and since 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6 Tanganyika</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Since 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.0 Thailand</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Togo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Since 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9 Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Since 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Tunisia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Since 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.4 Turkey</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Since 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8 Uganda</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Since 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.4 † Ukraine</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Since 1934 to 1940 and since 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221.5 U.S.S.R. *</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>From 1934 to 1940 and since 1954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For footnotes see following page.
## Appendix Y: Application of Conventions and Recommendations

### TABLE A (concl.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population: latest available estimate * (millions)</th>
<th>States *</th>
<th>Conventions ratified</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number of these Conventions which were adopted by the Conference at sessions outside period of participation in the Organisation of the country concerned</th>
<th>Membership of I.L.O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>From 1935 to 1958 (Egypt) and since 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.6</td>
<td>United States *</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Since 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Since 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Since 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>From 1919 to 1957 and since 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>Viet-Nam</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Since 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>Yugoslavia *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,954</td>
<td>From 1910 to 1949 and since 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ...</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,698</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,852</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,954</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Final Articles Revision Conventions, 1946 (No. 80) and 1961 (No. 116), are procedural Conventions and as such are not included in the table; Convention No. 80 has received 50 ratifications, Convention No. 116, 23 ratifications.

2 With the exception of those marked by the sign (*), the figures given are taken from the Monthly Bulletin of Statistics of the United Nations (Apr. 1963).

* The States marked by the sign (*) are federal States.

* Including Conventions which States have undertaken to implement in virtue either of a previous ratification by a State of which they formed a part, or of a declaration by a State which was responsible for their international relations.
TABLE B
Conventions, 1919-62—Total Adopted: 116

(Position of Conventions Voted for by Governments but Not Ratified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population: latest available estimate (millions)</th>
<th>States *</th>
<th>Conventions voted for but not ratified</th>
<th>Conventions ratified *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Conventions of general application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>13.8 t</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina *</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia *</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria *</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil *</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorusia</td>
<td>8.3 t</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cameroon</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cameroon</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada *</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>697.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Leopoldville)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>21.6 t</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (Fed. Rep. *)</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India *</td>
<td>441.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>0.3 t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1.3 t</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya *</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy Republic *</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Malaya *</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico *</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For footnotes, see following page.
### Table B (concl.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population: latest available estimate</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Conventions voted for but not ratified</th>
<th>Conventions ratified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Conventions of general application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>Nigeria *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>Pakistan *</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Ruanda</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 †</td>
<td>former Trust Territory of Somalia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7 †</td>
<td>former British Somali-land</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Switzerland *</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Tanganyika</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.4 †</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>U.S.S.R. *</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>United States *</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>Viet-Nam</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Yugoslavia *</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*The Final Articles Revision Conventions, 1946 (No. 80) and 1961 (No. 116), are procedural Conventions and as such are not included in the table; Convention No. 80 has received 56 ratifications, Convention No. 116, 23 ratifications.

*With the exception of those marked by the sign (†) the figures given are taken from the Monthly Bulletin of Statistics of the United Nations (Apr. 1963).

*The States marked by the sign (*) are federal States.

*This column includes 29 maritime Conventions (Nos. 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 23, 27, 28, 32, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 91, 92, 93, 108 and 109), three Conventions concerning fishermen (Nos. 112, 113 and 114), five non-metropolitan territories Conventions (Nos. 62, 63, 84, 85 and 86), four indigenous workers Conventions (Nos. 50, 64, 85 and 104), one Convention concerning indigenous and tribal populations (No. 107), and one Convention concerning plantations (No. 110), i.e. a total of 43 Conventions.

*Including Conventions which States have undertaken to implement in virtue of a previous ratification by a State of which they formed a part, or of a declaration by a State which was responsible for their international relations.
## INDEX BY COUNTRIES TO OBSERVATIONS AND INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Observations and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Appendix IA; Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Appendix I A; and B, Nos. 3, 8, 20, 22, 27, 32, 50, 69, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Appendix I B, Nos. 89, 94, 100. Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Appendix I B, Nos. 32, 102. Appendices III, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>General Report, paragraphs 16, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Appendix I A; and B, No. 11. Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Appendix I A; and B, Nos. 29, 94. Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Appendix I A; and B, No. 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>Appendix I B, No. 87. Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Appendix IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Appendix I B, Nos. 14, 32, 46, 59. Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Appendix I A; and B, Nos. 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 13, 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Leopoldville)</td>
<td>Appendix I A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>General Report, paragraph 16. Appendix I A. Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>General Report, paragraph 16. Appendix I A; and B, Nos. 3, 62, 63, 67, 87, 88, 92, 103. Appendices III, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Appendix IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Appendix I A; and B, Nos. 1, 43, 49, 89, 90. Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>General Report, paragraphs 16, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>General Report, paragraph 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>General Report, paragraph 16. Appendix I A; and B, No. 100. Appendix III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Appendix I B, Nos. 3, 32, 62, 97. Appendices III, IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Appendix I A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany</td>
<td>Appendix I B, Nos. 96, 102, 111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Appendix I B, Nos. 1, 14, 81, 102. Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Appendix I A. Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>General Report, paragraph 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Appendix I A; and B, No. 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Appendix I B, Nos. 6, 41, 87. Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>General Report, paragraphs 16, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Appendix I B, No. 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Appendix I A. Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Appendix I B, Nos. 3, 32. Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Appendix I B, No. 98.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>General Report, paragraph 16. Appendix III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Appendix I A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V : Application of Conventions and Recommendations

Lebanon :
Appendix III.

Liberia :
Appendix I B, No. 111.
Appendix III.

Libya :
General Report, paragraph 18.

Malaya :
Appendix I A.
Appendix III.

Mexico :
General Report, paragraph 16.
Appendix I B, Nos. 8, 15, 22, 32, 62, 87.

Netherlands :
Appendix I B, No. 87.
Appendix II A.

Nicaragua :
General Report, paragraph 16.
Appendix I A.

Niger :
General Report, paragraph 18.

Nigeria :
Appendices III, IV.

Norway :
Appendix I B, No. 30.

Pakistan :
General Report, paragraph 16.
Appendix I B, Nos. 81, 87, 89, 90, 96.

Panama :
General Report, paragraph 16.
Appendix I A ; and B, No. 87.
Appendix III.

Paraguay :
General Report, paragraphs 16, 18

Peru :
Appendix I B, No. 1.

Philippines :
Appendix I B, Nos. 87, 94.

Poland :
Appendix I B, No. 87.
Appendix III.

Portugal :
Appendix I B, Nos. 105, 111.

Romania :
Appendix I A ; and B, Nos. 6, 8, 80, 98.
Appendix III.

El Salvador :
Appendix III.

Sierra Leone :
Appendix I A.

Somalia :
General Report, paragraphs 16, 18.

Republic of South Africa :
Appendix III.

Spain :
Appendix I A ; and B, Nos. 1, 20, 30.
Appendix IV.

Sudan :
General Report, paragraph 16.
Appendix I B, Nos. 2, 19, 29.

Syrian Arab Republic :
Appendix I A.

Thailand :
Appendix III.

Turkey :
Appendix I A ; and B, Nos. 14, 15.
Appendix IV.

Ukraine :
Appendix I B, No. 87.
Appendix III.

U.S.S.R. :
Appendix I A ; and B, No. 87.
Appendix III.

United Arab Republic :
General Report, paragraphs 16, 18.

United Kingdom :
Appendix I, B, No. 17.
Appendix II A ; and B, Nos. 50, 64, 84, 85, 86.
Appendix IV.

United States :
Appendix IV.

Uruguay :
Appendix I A.
Appendix III.

Venezuela :
Appendix I A ; and B, Nos. 11, 26.

Viet-Nam :
Appendix I B, No. 14.
Appendix III.

Yugoslavia :
Appendix I A.
Appendix III.
Fourth Item on the Agenda: Prohibition of the Sale, Hire and Use of Inadequately Guarded Machinery

(1) Text of the Proposed Convention concerning the Guarding of Machinery, Prepared by the International Labour Office.

(2) Text of the Proposed Recommendation concerning the Guarding of Machinery, Prepared by the International Labour Office. (These texts are given in Report IV (2) prepared by the International Labour Office for the 47th Session of the Conference.)

(3) Report of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery.¹

1. The Committee on Guarding of Machinery, set up by the Conference at its third sitting, consisted of 70 members (40 Government members, 15 Employers' members and 15 Workers' members). To achieve equality of voting strength each Government member had three votes, each Employers' member eight votes and each Workers' member eight votes. At the opening of the fourth sitting of the Committee two new Employers' voting members were added to the Committee in accordance with the decision of the Appeals Board², thus raising the membership of the Committee to 72. As a result of the addition of these two voting members, 51 votes were given to each Government member, 120 votes to each Employers' member and 136 votes to each Workers' member. The modification of the composition led to a statement by a spokesman of the Employers' group to the effect that any subsequent statement made to the Committee on behalf of that group would be in the name of those Employers' members only who had been listed as voting members prior to the decision of the Appeals Board. The two new Employers' members, in reply, said that they were full members of the Committee with full rights.

2. The Committee elected the following officers:
   
   Chairman: Mr. Drachmann, Government member, Denmark.

   Vice-Chairmen: Mr. Miller, Employers' member, United Kingdom, and Mr. O'Hagan, Workers' member, United Kingdom.

   Reporter: Mr. Azimi, Government member, Iran.

3. The Committee appointed a Working Party composed of the Chairman of the Committee and the following members: Mr. El-

¹ See Second Part, p. 304.
² See Appendix XI, p. 634.
machines they made and that the instruments sought particularly to remedy this state of affairs.

9. The Government member of Uganda pointed out that some developing countries would find it difficult to ratify a Convention with such a wide scope of application, in view particularly of their limited resources as regards inspection services. The Government member of the U.S.S.R. suggested the inclusion in the Convention of a provision requiring governments to ensure adequate inspection services for the application of the provisions of the Convention.

10. The Government members of Iran and Kuwait considered it necessary to include also in the instrument the prohibition of the export of machinery without appropriate guards. In their opinion, developing countries would greatly benefit from a requirement of this kind.

Discussion of the Proposed Convention

PART I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1

Paragraph 1.

11. The Committee considered an amendment submitted by the Workers’ members which proposed the application of the Convention to machinery driven by manual power in so far as it presented a risk of injury to the worker. This class of machinery was implied in the Office text, although only in so far as the competent authority would so determine. The authors of the amendment considered that, for many countries which did not yet have sufficiently developed competent services, the proposal made by the Office would remain a dead letter. A subamendment reintroducing the Office proposal was, nevertheless, adopted by the Committee by 159 votes to 141, with 27 ab- stentions. The amendment as modified was adopted by 306 votes to 0, with 21 abstentions (Article 1, paragraph 1, of the proposed Convention). 2 It was understood that the word “power-driven” in the English text applied also to machinery driven by animals.

12. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Nigeria proposed the deletion of the qualifying words “new or second-hand” with a view to precluding possible omissions as to the nature of the machinery dealt with and, as a result, a wrong interpretation of the Convention. The opponents of the amendment considered that the words referred to covered all possible cases. This amendment was rejected by 126 votes to 174, with 21 abstentions.

Paragraph 2.

13. An amendment submitted by the Workers’ members proposed that, as far as concerned the application of the Convention to machinery driven by manual power, consultation by the competent authority with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned could also take place at the initiative of these organisations. The Committee adopted this amendment by 306 votes to 0, with 21 abstentions (Article 1, paragraph 2, of the proposed Convention).

Paragraph 3.

14. The Government member of the United Kingdom submitted an amendment proposing that the Convention should not apply to road and rail vehicles during locomotion in respect of persons other than the operator or operators of the vehicles. The Committee, having considered that it was not practicable to protect in particular the wheels of these vehicles as far as persons other than those being carried were concerned, adopted this amendment unanimously (Article 1, paragraph 3, of the proposed Convention).

PART II. SALE, HIRE AND EXHIBITION

Article 2

Paragraph 1.

15. The Committee had before it four amendments intended to include in Part II of the Convention the question of “transfer in any other manner”. They had been submitted by the Government members of Nigeria and the Netherlands respectively and by the Employers’ members of Rumania and Yugoslavia. A rather long discussion took place on this question. The members in favour of the amendments held that the transfer such as by gift, or other manners of transfer free of charge, could be extensive and this should therefore be taken into account in the Convention. Those opposing these amendments considered that this notion was too vague and that these types of transfer would be difficult to control. The Committee finally adopted, by 3,162 votes to 1,800, with 486 abstentions, a text providing that the transfer of machines in any other manner should be included to such extent as the competent authority may determine.

16. The Committee also discussed the question as to whether the exhibition of inadequately guarded machines should be prohibited to such extent as the competent authority may determine. By 2,838 votes to 2,448, with 273 abstentions, the Committee adopted this concept as submitted in a subamendment by the Government member of Cyprus, it being understood that the prohibition would not be limited to the exhibition only with a view to sale or hire.

17. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Austria proposed that the exhibition of machinery should be permitted in cases where the guards had been provisionally removed for purposes of demonstration. Although this possibility was implied in the text of paragraph 1 of Article 2, the Committee nevertheless adopted the amendment by 4,113 votes to 51, with 1,224 abstentions.

1 The numbers of the Articles and paragraphs refer to the Articles and paragraphs of the proposed text which appear in Report IV (2). (Note appended to the report of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery.)

2 The numbers of the Articles and paragraphs in parentheses refer to the Articles and paragraphs of the proposed Convention and Recommendation adopted by the Committee. (Note appended to the report of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery.)
18. An amendment submitted by the Government members of Norway and Sweden proposed to specify that the prohibition of sale or hire should apply to machinery sold or hired for use. Its purpose was to make the object of the transfer clear right away and so avoid recourse to exemptions for the scrapping or for the reconditioning of machinery, or other exemption that might prove necessary. Opponents thought it would impose on the labour inspection services the burden of proving that the machinery was sold for purposes other than use. The Committee rejected the amendment by 2,208 votes to 3,045, with 294 abstentions.

Paragraph 2.

19. The Committee considered an amendment submitted by the Government member of Nigeria, which aimed at defining more clearly that such parts as specified in paragraph 2 were included only when they were likely to cause danger. The amendment was further modified, providing for the intervention of the competent authority for prescribing other parts, and adopted by 5,100 votes to 51, with 255 abstentions. Another amendment submitted by the Government member of Austria proposed to include cases where projecting parts could be made safe by the way in which they were arranged. The Working Party recognised that these parts could, in fact, be so designed that they would be more dangerous than placed, as to render them safe. The Committee accepted this view (Article 2, paragraph 2, of the proposed Convention).

Paragraph 3.

20. The Government member of Japan submitted an amendment which proposed the deletion, amongst the parts specified, of shafting (including journal ends), cams and slide blocks on the grounds that these parts were not necessarily dangerous in all cases. The amendment was rejected by 510 votes to 2,738, with 1,473 abstentions.

21. The Committee considered an amendment submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom with the aim of excluding from the scope of paragraph 3 "control gear", which in his opinion was not a clear notion. Members opposed to the amendment thought that, as control gears would, in the light of the proposed text, have in any case to be specified by the competent authority, a precise definition of this expression was not essential. The Committee rejected this amendment by 2,310 votes to 2,637, with 510 abstentions. The Working Party proposed, subsequently however, the deletion of the words "control gear", while adding a statement that controls should be so designed or protected as to prevent danger. The Committee unanimously adopted this proposal, it being understood that the added statement was meant to ensure that machinery would be provided with such controls as would prevent them being put in motion accidentally.

22. Two amendments were submitted to the Working Party. The first, which was submitted by the Government member of Austria, envisaged that the fact of placing the parts in question in an appropriate manner could also constitute a means of protection. The Working Party considered that an appropriate shape of the parts specified in the paragraph could constitute a method of rendering them harmless. The second amendment, submitted by the Government member of Austria, was intended to define more clearly that the parts specified would be involved only when they were likely to present a risk. The Working Party drafted a text mainly on the basis of the two amendments with the addition, in accordance with the decision taken in respect of paragraph 2, of a reference to the intervention of the competent authority for specifying other transmission parts. The Committee adopted the text unanimously.

23. On the other hand, the Drafting Committee modified the text of the paragraph with a view to including shafting (including journal ends) amongst the parts which could be specified by the competent authority; in addition, it added the word "all" before the list of parts (Article 2, paragraph 3, of the proposed Convention).

24. The Government member of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the scope of paragraph 3 should be limited to control gear and transmission machinery which were only used as such and, consequently, not used also as working parts, the complete protection of which would hinder their operation.

Article 3

25. Since the Committee had decided that Part II of the Convention should apply to transfer in any other manner, Article 3 was completed to include this notion and was adopted unanimously (Article 4 of the proposed Convention).

26. The Committee considered an amendment submitted by the Workers' members proposing that the manufacturer, with a view to his own protection, should, himself, be required to use machines guarded in conformity with the provisions of Article 2. It was recognised that this question was implicitly covered by Article 6.

Article 4

Paragraph 1.

27. The Government member of France submitted an amendment proposing that the competent authority, and not the vendor, should be the person to decide whether machinery could, by virtue of its installation or position, be as safe as if it were guarded by appropriate safety devices. Some members objected that such a provision would place an added burden on the competent authority and would lead to the need for a special system of authorisation. In their opinion it was sufficient to carry out inspection at the level of the users rather than at that of the vendors or of those who let out on hire. The Committee rejected the amendment by 2,499 votes to 2,563, with 542 abstentions (Article 3, paragraph 1, of the proposed Convention).
Paragraph 2.

28. The Government members of Nigeria and the United Kingdom submitted an amendment proposing the deletion of this paragraph. The authors considered that the provision in question might encourage the manufacturers to construct machinery without guards using as a pretext the needs for lubrication and maintenance. On the other hand, it was argued in favour of the retention of this paragraph that it was preferable to design guards which facilitated lubrication, for instance, rather than to provide guards which would have to be removed for the purpose and run the risk of not being put back into place after lubrication.

29. Another amendment submitted by the Employers' members sought to introduce the notions of "adjustment" and "setting-up".

30. The Working Party was asked to review paragraph 2 in the light of the various amendments made to it. Two proposals were made to the Committee. The first required that the manufacturers or vendors should be bound to put on the market machinery for which lubrication and other maintenance operations and adjustments could be carried out safely, while allowing the exemptions from the provisions of Article 2 for that purpose. The second retained the text of Report IV (2), which was drafted in the form only of an exemption, adding to it a reference to operations of setting-up and adjustment. This last proposal was adopted by the Committee by 4,128 votes to 204, with 153 abstentions (Article 3, paragraph 2, of the proposed Convention).

31. The Employers' member of Rumania submitted an amendment proposing that appropriate accident-prevention training for workers should be provided periodically. The Committee referred the amendment to the Working Party, which considered that the question of training could not be dealt with in Part II of the Convention.

Paragraph 3.

32. The Committee considered an amendment submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom proposing to exclude from the scope of the Convention machinery intended to be placed in storage. It was argued against this amendment that such an exemption could lead to acts of bad faith when a machine was in reality intended for export. The amendment nevertheless was adopted by 3,961 votes to 1,156, with 204 abstentions (Article 3, paragraph 3, of the proposed Convention).

Article 5

33. The Government member of Nigeria submitted an amendment intended to delete Article 5, the object being to avoid recourse to temporary exemptions which would allow of unguarded machinery being exported to certain countries. Members opposing the amendment considered that, if exemptions were not provided for, the Convention would become too rigid and would not be open to wide ratification. They stressed particularly in this respect the delays which would be required for the adaptation of second-hand machinery or of machinery in the process of manufacture to the relevant requirements of the Convention. The Committee rejected this amendment by 153 votes to 4,997, with 307 abstentions (Article 5, paragraph 1, of the proposed Convention).

Paragraph 2.

34. The Government member of India proposed to delete the reference to the maximum duration of any temporary exemption, whilst two other amendments submitted by the Employers' members and the Government member of Austria respectively sought to prolong this period from two to five years. It was argued in support of these amendments that it was necessary to ensure due flexibility to the instrument, particularly in view of the technical difficulties which would be associated with the transformation of machinery already made or in course of manufacture. There was, however, general agreement on the need to fix a limit to temporary exemptions, and the Committee finally decided on a maximum of three years, with the exception of the Government member of the U.S.S.R., who considered that a period not exceeding two years was sufficient in order to comply with the Convention (Article 5, paragraph 2, of the proposed Convention).

Paragraph 3.

35. Paragraph 3 was not the object of any discussion (Article 5, paragraph 3, of the proposed Convention).

PART III. USE

Article 6

Paragraph 1.

36. The Government members of Norway and Sweden submitted an amendment proposing that the prohibition of use referred to in paragraph 1 should be specified in respect of use "by workers". The object of this amendment was to delete from the scope of Part III of the Convention, on the one hand, self-employed workers in respect of whom, in the opinion of the authors, an adequate inspection would meet with considerable difficulties, and, on the other hand, the employer himself, as far as his own safety was concerned. The Government member of Cyprus opposed this amendment which would allow of numerous undertakings of the type operated by self-employed workers avoiding inspection. Some members observed that, in any case, each country was entitled to apply to such workers the provisions of the Convention concerning use. The Committee also noted that, at the 46th Session of the Conference, the Committee on Unguarded Machinery had rejected with a considerable number of abstentions a proposal to make Part III of the Convention applicable to wage-earning workers only. The Committee, in rejecting the amendment by 2,219 votes to 2,399, with 459 abstentions,
recognised that the instrument should specifically mention persons who were self-employed. It was with this in mind that the Committee adopted by 4,395 votes to 0, with 273 abstentions, a subamendment submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom specifying that the provisions of this Part of the Convention concerning the obligations of employers and workers should, to such extent as the competent authority may determine, also apply to self-employed persons (Article 13 of the proposed Convention).

37. The Committee considered an amendment submitted by the Government member of the United States, which sought to make paragraph 1 applicable specifically to dangerous parts (points of operation) of machinery. The amendment was adopted by 3,077 votes to 2,040, with 51 abstentions.

38. The Government member of the United Kingdom submitted an amendment not to require the complete protection of the working parts when such protection would prevent the use of machinery. Those opposing this amendment considered that such a provision could lead to dishonest practices and that, in any case, the concept of "appropriate guard" as included in the text offered all desirable latitude. The Committee adopted the amendment by 2,838 votes to 2,075, with 255 abstentions (Article 6, paragraph 1, of the proposed Convention).

Paragraph 2.

39. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Australia, which raised a point of terminology in the English version, was referred to the Drafting Committee. The amendment proposed to replace the word "hygiene" by the word "health". The Drafting Committee did not agree with the proposal as it considered that it tended to enlarge the scope of the provision (Article 6, paragraph 2, of the proposed Convention).

40. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Iran proposed to specify that machinery should conform to the standards of the countries in which they were to be used. In order to avoid the ambiguity introduced by the expression "Member" in the text prepared by the Office, the Drafting Committee, which had examined the amendment, introduced the word "national" qualifying "regulations and standards".

Article 7

41. No discussion took place in respect of this Article (Article 7 of the proposed Convention).

Article 8

Paragraph 1.

42. This paragraph did not give rise to any discussion (Article 8, paragraph 1, of the proposed Convention).

Paragraph 2.

43. The Committee considered an amendment submitted by the Employers' members which proposed the addition of the operations of setting-up and adjustment to those for which exemption could be granted in respect of the provisions of Article 6, and furthermore to extend the exemption to the provisions of Article 9 concerning the use of machinery by workers. This amendment was unanimously adopted by the Committee (Article 8, paragraph 2, of the proposed Convention).

Article 9

Paragraphs 1 and 2.

44. The Committee had before it 13 amendments concerning paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 9. It was first decided to delete from the Article the word "deliberately", in accordance with a proposal submitted by the Workers' members, by 4,981 votes to 0, with 102 abstentions.

45. Amendments, or parts of amendments, submitted by the Government members of the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden, were intended to exclude from the scope of the provision persons independent of an employer, i.e. who were not subject to labour legislation. Those opposing these amendments considered, on the contrary, that it was important to include self-employed workers, together with persons, for instance, who received no salary during apprenticeship in an undertaking.

46. The Committee decided to submit these amendments to the Working Party, which drafted a text based on the amendments in question. The text was adopted unanimously (Article 11 of the proposed Convention).

47. In order to take into account self-employed workers the Committee adopted by (as indicated in paragraph 36 above) 4,395 votes to 0, with 273 abstentions, a subamendment submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom requiring that the provisions of the Convention concerning use, with particular reference to the obligations and responsibilities of employers and workers, should apply to self-employed workers, if the competent authority so determined (Article 13 of the proposed Convention).

Paragraph 3.

48. The Committee examined an amendment submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom in accordance with which the employer should take measures (posting, etc.) to bring to the notice of workers the national laws or regulations concerning the guarding of machinery and to instruct them as to the dangers arising in connection with the use of machinery and the precautions to be taken.

49. A second amendment, submitted by the Government member of Australia, proposed that the employer should not be required to provide appropriate working conditions in relation to machinery.

50. A third amendment, submitted by the Government member of Austria, was intended mainly to relieve the employer of responsibility
in case of infringement by workers of shop rules.

51. A fourth amendment, submitted by the Workers' members, proposed to set up training programmes for workers.

52. The Committee requested the Working Party to examine these various proposals. A text was drafted on the basis of the proposal of the Government member of the United Kingdom with the addition of the obligation on the part of the employer to establish and maintain such environmental conditions (lighting, etc.) as would not endanger workers employed on machinery. The Working Party considered, in addition, that this provision, which dealt with the obligations of the employer, should constitute a separate Article. The Committee adopted the text unanimously (Article 10 of the proposed Convention).

Article 10

53. A fairly long discussion took place on Article 10. The Government member of France pointed out that the Article, as proposed in the Office text, could be interpreted in a very wide manner and include questions of civil liability and criminal law. It was noticed that the original intention had been modified and made more general by successive redraftings. The intention of the paragraph, which had its origin in an amendment submitted by the Workers' members at the 46th Session of the Conference, was to provide that the ratification of the Convention should not affect the rights of workers under national laws or regulations concerning social security and social insurance. A new draft of the Article including the appropriate modifications on the basis indicated above was adopted by the Committee unanimously (Article 12 of the proposed Convention). The Government member of France stated that he could approve the decision only if it were well understood that it would not lead to any modification of the provisions concerning the notion of "inexcusable fault," which appeared in certain national laws or regulations. The Committee confirmed that it should be understood that there was no intention of asking for modification of the national laws and regulations in force, as regards this point.

New Articles

54. The Employers' members submitted an amendment with a view to inserting a new Article providing in respect of Part III of the Convention temporary exemption similar to that adopted in respect of Part II (Article 5). The Committee adopted the amendment unanimously (Article 9 of the proposed Convention).

55. Some members remarked that in the legislations of some countries the responsibility of the employer concerning the use of machinery can be delegated to an agent. The Committee was of the opinion that a provision on this matter should be included in the proposed Convention, and referred the matter to the Drafting Committee. The text provided that for the purpose of Part III of the Convention the term "employer" should include, where appropriate under national laws or regulations, a prescribed agent of the employer. The Drafting Committee considered that the provision should be in a separate Article (Article 14 of the proposed Convention).

PART IV. MEASURES OF APPLICATION

Article 11

56. The Committee adopted Article 11 unanimously without discussion (Article 15, paragraph 1, of the proposed Convention).

Article 12

57. The Government member of Iran submitted an amendment proposing that the wording of Article 1 should be in a less imperative tone, while keeping to the intent of the provision. The Drafting Committee accepted the amendment (Article 16 of the proposed Convention).

New Article

58. The Government member of the U.S.S.R. submitted an amendment intended to add a new Article inviting Members which ratified the Convention to provide appropriate inspection services for the purpose of supervising the application of the provisions or to satisfy itself that appropriate inspection was carried out. The Committee adopted the amendment unanimously (Article 15, paragraph 2, of the proposed Convention).

PART V. SCOPE

Articles 13 and 14

59. The Committee had before it 12 amendments relating to Articles 13 and 14. After a discussion which led to the withdrawal of several amendments, the Committee examined a subamendment submitted by the Employers' members and an amendment submitted by the Government member of Italy. The first proposed, by the deletion in Article 14 of the words "concerning use," to provide a common scope for Parts I and II of the Convention. The second proposed to delete from the notion of "undertakings", in paragraph 2 of Article 14, the qualifying words "covered by labour inspection" and to add the mention of "branches of economic activity". The Committee adopted these proposals by 4,809 votes to 0, with 153 abstentions, on the understanding that inclusion be made of the wording specifying that consultation by the competent authorities with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned could be undertaken at the initiative of such organisations. The Drafting Committee had expressed doubts as to the meaning of the term "extensively used" in connection with machinery, in subparagraph (a) of paragraph 2 of Article 14. In considering the question the Committee decided, by 4,387 votes to 0, with 102 abstentions,
that the competent authority, in determining
the undertakings and sectors of activity to
which the Convention should apply, should first
consult the labour inspection services.

Article 15

60. The Committee adopted Article 15 with­
out discussion (Article 17, paragraph 3, of
the proposed Convention).

Article 16

61. Amendments proposing the deletion of
Article 16 were submitted by the Government
members of Nigeria, the Netherlands and the
U.S.S.R., and by the Workers' members. The
Employers' members agreed with the deletion
of Article 16 following the modifications made
by the Committee to Articles 13 and 14. The
Committee unanimously decided to delete
Article 16.

Discussion of the Proposed Recommendation

62. The Committee decided that all the
modifications made to the proposed Conven­tion
should also be introduced in the proposed
Recommendation, adapted, as required, to the
form appropriate to a Recommendation. Con­
sequently the amendments to the proposed
Recommendation, the substance of which had
already been examined in connection with the
proposed Convention, were not submitted for
discussion.

I. MANUFACTURE, SALE, HIRE
AND EXHIBITION

Paragraph 1

Subparagraph (1).

63. An amendment submitted by the Gov­
ernment member of Austria proposed to
exclude from the prohibition laid down in this
subparagraph the manufacture of machinery.
In the opinion of the author it was not necessary
to mention manufacture here, as it did not
appear in the wording of the fourth item on the
agenda of the Conference; it would, moreover,
be impossible to supervise the application of a
prohibition concerning manufacture. Objec­
tion was made to the proposal on the grounds
that the manufacturer was in the best position
to know which guards were most suitable for
his machines and that it was at his level that
supervision could be most effective. On the
other hand, the prohibition of manufacture
placed on the country of origin the obligation
of supervision; this in itself constituted an
advantage to importing countries. Finally, it
was as a result of a compromise that it was
decided, in the first discussion, not to mention
"manufacture" in the text of the proposed
Convention and to retain it in the proposed
Recommendation. The amendment was re­
jected by 51 votes to 3,476, with 240 ab­
stentions.

Subparagraph (2).

64. The Workers' members submitted an
amendment proposing that account should be
taken at the design stage of machinery, not
only of the prohibition applying to machinery
having dangerous working parts (point of
operation) which were without appropriate
guards, but also of the provisions of Para­
graph 2. The Employers' members were of the
opinion that it was at the stage of manufacture
that these latter requirements should be taken
into consideration. The amendment was
adopted by 2,516 votes to 1,301, with 273 ab­
stentions.

Paragraph 2

65. Clause (d) of this Paragraph was the
object of two amendments. The first, presented
by the Government member of Austria, pro­
posed the replacement of the mention of the
risks by a wider notion embodying these
various risks without going into detail, such as
by referring simply to the nature of the
materials used and to the source of danger.
The second, submitted by the Workers' mem­
ers, sought on the contrary to complete the
enumeration of risks by mentioning noise and
harmful vibrations.

66. The Employers' members were in favour
of the first of these amendments, which, in their
view, had the merit of avoiding too long a list
of risks to which persons using machinery were
exposed. The Workers' members agreed to
withdraw their amendment if it were under­
stood that the proposal put forward in that of
the Government member of Austria covered
both the risks enumerated in the Office text
and those mentioned in their own proposal.
Certain Government members expressed, on the
contrary, their preference for a text which
specified the different risks.

67. Finally, the Committee agreed to a text
recommending that machinery should be so
constructed as to avoid as far as possible all
danger—other than dangers which were speci­
fied in the first three clauses of Paragraph 2—
to which persons who used the machines could
be exposed, according to the nature of the
materials or the source of danger. It was
understood that this proposal covered the risks
enumerated in clause (d) of the Office text, i.e.
the risks due to explosion and the action of
toxic substances, dust, flying particles, liquids,
heat, ionising radiations and the risks due to
noise and harmful vibrations.

Paragraphs 3 to 5

68. These Paragraphs did not give rise to any
discussion.

Paragraph 6

69. This Paragraph was the object of an
amendment submitted by the Workers' mem­
ers. It was proposed that the operating
instructions for the use of machines should not
only "include suggestions" based on safe
methods of operation, but "be based" on
these methods. This amendment was adopted
unanimously.

II. USE

Paragraphs 7 to 11

70. These Paragraphs were not the subject
of any discussion (Paragraphs 7 to 15 of
the proposed Recommendation).
III. Scope

Paragraph 12

71. This Paragraph did not give rise to any discussion (Paragraph 16 of the proposed Recommendation).

IV. Miscellaneous Provisions

Paragraph 13

72. This Paragraph was not the subject of any discussion (Paragraph 17 of the proposed Recommendation).

Paragraph 14

Subparagraph (2).

73. The Workers' members submitted an amendment with a view to specifying that the standards in respect of which the subparagraph provided for uniformity should be applicable to occupational hygiene and not only to safety. The amendment was submitted to the Drafting Committee, which embodied the notion of occupational hygiene in the text of the subparagraph (Paragraph 18, subparagraph 2, of the proposed Recommendation).

Subparagraph (3).

74. Two amendments to the subparagraph were submitted. The first, which was submitted by the Employers' members, sought to reinstate the text, as adopted at the first discussion of the proposed Recommendation, in accordance with which, when entering into the international arrangements referred to in subparagraph (1), Members should "take into account" Model Codes of Safety Regulations and Codes of Practice published by the International Labour Office, and not "comply" with them as suggested in the Office text. The second, submitted by the Government member of France, was essentially similar in meaning. The amendment of the Employers' members proposed in addition to mention the standards established by international organisations for standardisation, while the Office text referred only to the International Organization for Standardization. The Drafting Committee, to which the Committee had referred these two questions, modified the final text in accordance with the two amendments (Paragraph 18, subparagraph 3, of the proposed Recommendation).

Paragraph 15

75. This Paragraph was not the subject of any discussion (Paragraph 19 of the Recommendation).

Adoption of the Report and of the Proposed Convention and Recommendation

76. The present report, together with the proposed Convention and Recommendation, was adopted unanimously by the Committee for submission to the Conference for consideration.


(Signed) G. DRACHMANN, Chairman.
(Signed) S. AZIMI, Reporter.

(4) Text of the Proposed Convention concerning the Guarding of Machinery, Submitted by the Committee on Guarding of Machinery:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened at Geneva by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Forty-seventh Session on 5 June 1963,

and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an international Convention,

adopts this day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three the following Convention, which may be cited as the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963:

PART I. General Provisions

Article 1

1. All power-driven machinery, new or second-hand, shall be considered as machinery for the purpose of the application of this Convention.

2. The competent authority in each country shall determine whether and how far machinery, new or second-hand, operated by manual power presents a risk of injury to the worker and shall be considered as machinery for the purpose of the application of this Convention. This decision shall be taken after consultation with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned. The initiative as regards this consultation can be taken by any such organisation.

3. The provisions of this Convention—(a) apply to road and rail vehicles during locomotion only in so far as these provisions relate to the safety of the operator or operators; (b) apply to mobile agricultural machinery only in so far as they relate to the safety of workers employed in connection with such machinery.

PART II. Sale, Hire, Transfer in Any Other Manner and Exhibition

Article 2

1. The sale, hire and, to such extent as the competent authority may determine, the transfer in any other manner and exhibition of machinery, of which the dangerous parts specified in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article are without appropriate guards shall be prohibited by national laws or regulations or
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prevented by other equally effective measures. During the exhibition of machinery, the temporary removal of the guards in order to demonstrate the machinery shall not be deemed to be an infringement of this provision as long as appropriate precautions to prevent danger to persons are taken.

2. All set-screws, bolts and keys, and such other projecting parts of any moving part of machinery also liable to present danger to any person coming into contact with them—when they are in motion—as may be prescribed by the competent authority, shall be so designed, sunk or protected as to prevent such danger.

3. All flywheels, gearing, cone and cylinder friction drives, cams, pulleys, belts, chains, pinions, worm gears, crank arms and slide blocks and such shafting (including the journal ends), and other transmission machinery, also liable to present danger to any person coming into contact with them—when they are in motion—as may be prescribed by the competent authority, shall be so designed, sunk or protected as to prevent such danger. Controls also shall be so designed or protected as to prevent danger.

### Article 3

1. The provisions of Article 2 do not apply to machinery or dangerous parts thereof specified in that Article which—
   
   (a) are, by virtue of their construction, as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices; or
   
   (b) are intended to be so installed or placed that, by virtue of their installation or position, they are as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices.

2. The prohibition of the sale, hire, transfer in any other manner or exhibition of machinery provided for in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 2 does not apply to machinery by reason only of the machinery being so designed that the requirements of paragraphs 2 and 3 of that Article are not fully complied with during maintenance, lubrication, setting-up and adjustment, if such operations can be carried out in conformity with accepted standards of safety.

3. The provisions of Article 2 do not prohibit the sale or transfer in any other manner of machinery for storage, scrapping or reconditioning, but such machinery shall not be sold, hired, transferred in any other manner or exhibited after storage or reconditioning unless protected in conformity with the said provisions.

### Article 4

The obligation to ensure compliance with the provisions of Article 2 shall rest on the vendor, the person letting out on hire or transferring the machinery in any other manner, or the exhibitor and, where appropriate under national laws or regulations, on their respective agents. This obligation shall apply to the manufacturer when he sells machinery, lets it out on hire, transfers it in any other manner or exhibits it.

### Article 5

1. Any Member may provide for a temporary exemption from the provisions of Article 2.

2. The duration of such temporary exemption, which shall in no case exceed three years, and any other conditions relating thereto, shall be prescribed by national laws or regulations or other equally effective measures.

3. In the application of this Article the competent authority shall consult the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned and, as appropriate, manufacturers' organisations.

### Article 6

1. The use of machinery, any dangerous part of which, including the point of operation, is without appropriate guards shall be prohibited by national laws or regulations or prevented by other equally effective measures: Provided that where this prohibition cannot fully apply without preventing the use of the machinery, it shall apply to the extent that the use of the machinery permits.

2. Machinery shall be so guarded as to ensure that national regulations and standards of occupational safety and hygiene are not infringed.

### Article 7

The obligation to ensure compliance with the provisions of Article 6 shall rest on the employer.

### Article 8

1. The provisions of Article 6 do not apply to machinery or parts thereof which, by virtue of their construction, installation or position, are as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices.

2. The provisions of Article 6 and Article 11 do not prevent the maintenance, lubrication, setting-up or adjustment of machinery or parts thereof carried out in conformity with accepted standards of safety.

### Article 9

1. Any Member may provide for a temporary exemption from the provisions of Article 6.

2. The duration of such temporary exemption, which shall in no case exceed three years, and any other conditions relating thereto, shall be prescribed by national laws or regulations or other equally effective measures.

3. In the application of this Article the competent authority shall consult the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned.

### Article 10

1. The employer shall take steps to bring national laws or regulations relating to the guarding of machinery to the notice of workers and shall instruct them, as and where ap-
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propriate, regarding the dangers arising and the precautions to be observed in the use of machinery.

2. The employer shall establish and maintain such environmental conditions as not to endanger workers employed on machinery covered by this Convention.

Article 11

1. No worker shall use any machinery without the guards provided being in position, nor shall any worker be required to use any machinery without the guards provided being in position.

2. No worker using machinery shall make inoperative the guards provided, nor shall such guards be made inoperative on any machinery to be used by any worker.

Article 12

The ratification of this Convention shall not affect the rights of workers under national social security or social insurance legislation.

Article 13

The provisions of this Part of this Convention relating to the obligations and responsibilities of employers and workers shall, if and in so far as the competent authority so determines, apply to self-employed workers.

Article 14

The term "employer" for the purpose of this Part of this Convention includes, where appropriate under national laws or regulations, a prescribed agent of the employer.

PART IV. MEASURES OF APPLICATION

Article 15

1. All necessary measures, including the provision of appropriate penalties, shall be taken to ensure the effective enforcement of the provisions of this Convention.

2. Each Member which ratifies this Convention undertakes to provide appropriate inspection services for the purpose of supervising the application of the provisions of the Convention, or to satisfy itself that appropriate inspection is carried out.

Article 16

Any national laws or regulations giving effect to the provisions of this Convention shall be prepared by the competent authority after consultation with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned and, as appropriate, manufacturers' organisations.

PART V. SCOPE

Article 17

1. The provisions of this Convention apply to all branches of economic activity unless the Member ratifying the Convention specifies a more limited application by a declaration appended to its ratification.

2. In cases where a declaration specifying a more limited application is made—

(a) the provisions of the Convention shall be applicable as a minimum to undertakings or branches of economic activity in respect of which the competent authority in conjunction with the labour inspection services, after consultation with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned, determines that machinery is extensively used; the initiative as regards this consultation can be taken by any such organisation;

(b) the Member shall indicate in its annual reports under article 22 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation any progress which may have been made with a view towards wider application of the provisions of this Convention.

3. Any Member which has made a declaration in pursuance of paragraph 1 of this Article may at any time cancel that declaration in whole or in part by a subsequent declaration.

(5) Text of the Proposed Recommendation concerning the Guarding of Machinery, Submitted by the Committee on Guarding of Machinery.

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened at Geneva by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Forty-seventh Session on 5 June 1963, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of a Recommendation supplementing the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963,

adopts this day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three the following Recommendation, which may be cited as the Guarding of Machinery Recommendation, 1963:

I. MANUFACTURE, SALE, HIRE, TRANSFER IN ANY OTHER MANNER AND EXHIBITION

1. (1) The manufacture, sale, hire, and, to such extent as the competent authority may determine, the transfer in any other manner and exhibition of specified types of machinery should be prohibited by national laws or regulations or prevented by other equally effective measures when this machinery, as defined in Article 1 of the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963, comprises, in addition to the parts specified in Article 2 thereof, dangerous working parts (at the point of operation) which are without appropriate guards.
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(2) The provisions of subparagraph (1) of this Paragraph and of Paragraph 2 should be considered in the design of the machinery in question.

(3) The types of machinery referred to in subparagraph (1) should be specified by national laws or regulations or other equally effective measures.

2. In specifying the types of machinery covered by Paragraph 1 account should also be taken of the following provisions:

(a) all working parts of machinery which, while in operation, may produce flying particles should be adequately guarded in such a manner as to ensure the safety of the operators;

(b) all parts of machinery which are under dangerous electrical pressure should be protected in such a manner as to give complete protection to the workers;

(c) wherever possible, automatic safeguards should protect persons when machinery is being started, is in operation or is being stopped;

(d) machinery should be so constructed as to exclude as far as possible any danger other than those specified in this Paragraph to which a person working on the machines may be exposed, taking account of the nature of the materials or the type of danger.

3. The obligation to ensure compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 1 should rest on the manufacturer, the vendor, the person letting out on hire or transferring the machinery in any other manner, or the exhibitor, and, where appropriate, their respective agents.

4. (1) The provisions of Paragraph 1 do not apply to machinery or working parts thereof specified in that Paragraph which—

(a) are, by virtue of their construction, as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices; or

(b) are intended to be so installed or placed that, by virtue of their installation or position, they are as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices.

(2) The prohibition of the manufacture, sale, hire, transfer in any other manner, or exhibition of machinery provided for in Paragraph 1 does not apply to machinery by reason only of the machinery being so designed that the requirements of that Paragraph concerning guarding are not fully complied with during maintenance, lubrication, setting-up or adjustment, if such operations can be carried out in conformity with accepted standards of safety.

(3) The provisions of Paragraph 1 do not prohibit the sale or transfer in any other manner of machinery for storage, scrapping or reconditioning, but such machinery should not be sold, hired, transferred in any other manner or exhibited after storage or reconditioning unless protected in conformity with the said provisions.

5. (1) Any Member may provide for a temporary exemption from the provisions of Paragraph 1.

(2) The duration of such temporary exemption, which should in no case exceed three years, and any other conditions relating thereto, should be prescribed by national laws or regulations or other equally effective measures.

(3) In the application of this Paragraph the competent authority should consult the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned and, as appropriate, manufacturers' organisations.

6. Any operating instructions for machinery should be based on safe methods of operation.

II. Use

7. (1) The use of machinery, any dangerous part of which, including the point of operation, is without appropriate guards, should be prohibited by national laws or regulations or prevented by other equally effective measures: Provided that where this prohibition cannot apply without preventing the use of the machinery, it should apply to the extent that the use of the machinery permits.

(2) Machinery should be so guarded as to ensure that national regulations and standards of occupational safety and hygiene are not infringed.

8. The obligation to ensure compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 7 should rest on the employer.

9. (1) The provisions of Paragraph 7 do not apply to machinery or parts thereof which, by virtue of their construction, installation or position, are as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices.

(2) The provisions of Paragraph 7 and Paragraph 12 do not prevent the maintenance, lubrication, setting-up or adjustment of machinery or parts thereof carried out in conformity with accepted standards of safety.

10. (1) Any Member may provide for a temporary exemption from the provisions of Paragraph 7.

(2) The duration of such temporary exemption, which should in no case exceed three years, and any other conditions relating thereto, should be prescribed by national laws or regulations or other equally effective measures.

(3) In the application of this Paragraph the competent authority should consult the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned.

11. (1) The employer should take steps to bring national laws or regulations relating to the guarding of machinery to the notice of workers, and should instruct them as and where appropriate regarding the dangers arising in the use of machinery and the precautions to be observed.

(2) The employer should establish and maintain such environmental conditions as not to endanger the workers employed on machinery covered by this Recommendation.
12. (1) No worker should use any machinery without the guards provided being in position, nor should any worker be required to use any machinery without the guards provided being in position.

(2) No worker using machinery should make inoperative the guards provided, nor should such guards be made inoperative on any machinery to be used by any worker.

13. The adoption of this Recommendation should not affect the rights of workers under national social security or social insurance legislation.

14. The provisions of this part of this Recommendation relating to the obligations and responsibilities of employers and workers should, if the competent authority so determines, apply to self-employed workers.

15. The term "employer" for the purpose of this part of this Recommendation includes, where appropriate under national laws and regulations, a prescribed agent of the employer.

III. Scope

16. This Recommendation applies to all branches of economic activity.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

17. (1) All necessary measures should be taken to ensure the effective enforcement of the provisions of this Recommendation. Such measures should include the fullest possible detailed specification of the means by which machinery or certain types thereof may be regarded as appropriately guarded, provision for effective inspection and provision for appropriate penalties.

(2) Each Member should provide appropriate inspection services for the purpose of supervising the application of this Recommendation, or satisfy itself that appropriate inspection is carried out.

18. (1) Members exporting or importing machinery should enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements providing for mutual consultation and co-operation concerning the application of the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963, and this Recommendation in respect of transactions having an international character for the sale or hire of machinery.

(2) Such arrangements should provide, in particular, for uniformity in occupational safety and hygiene standards relating to machinery.

(3) In making such arrangements, Members should have regard to the relevant Model Codes of Safety Regulations and Codes of Practice published from time to time by the International Labour Office, and to the appropriate standards of international organisations for standardisation.

19. National laws or regulations giving effect to the provisions of this Recommendation should be prepared by the competent authority after consultation with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned and, as appropriate, manufacturers' organisations.

(6) Text of the Convention concerning the Guarding of Machinery, Submitted by the Drafting Committee.

(The text submitted by the Drafting Committee was adopted by the Conference without modification.¹ For the authentic text see Appendix XIV, p. 642.)

(7) Text of the Recommendation concerning the Guarding of Machinery, Submitted by the Drafting Committee.

(The text submitted by the Drafting Committee was adopted by the Conference without modification.² For the authentic text see Appendix XIV, p. 652.)

¹ See Second Part, p. 398.
² See Second Part, p. 399.
APPENDIX VII

Fifth Item on the Agenda:
Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer

(1) Text of the Proposed Recommendation concerning Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer, Prepared by the International Labour Office.

(This text is given in Report V (2) prepared by the International Labour Office for the 47th Session of the Conference.)

(2) Report of the Committee on Termination of Employment.

1. The Committee on Termination of Employment, set up by the Conference at its third sitting on 6 June 1963, consisted of 177 members (72 Government members, 45 Employers' members and 60 Workers' members). In order to ensure equality of voting strength, each Government member had five votes, each Employers' member eight votes and each Workers' member six votes.

2. At the fourth sitting of the Committee, on 12 June 1963, two new Employers' voting members were added to the Committee in accordance with a decision of the Appeals Board, thus raising the total membership of the Committee to 179. To achieve equality of voting, it became necessary to multiply each Government member's vote by 235, each Employers' member's vote by 360 and each Workers' member's vote by 282. The modification of the composition led to a statement by a spokesman of the Employers' members to the effect that any subsequent statement made to the Committee on behalf of that group would be in the name of those Employers' members only who had been listed as voting members prior to the decision of the Appeals Board. One of the two new Employers' members, in reply, said that as a full member of the Committee, with full rights, he would state his own opinions.

3. The Committee appointed its officers as follows:

Chairman: Mr. Bland, Government member, Australia.

Vice-Chairmen: Mr. Yllanes Ramos, Employers' member, Mexico; Mr. Geijer, Workers' member, Sweden.

Reporter: Mr. Douty, Government member, United States.

4. The Drafting Committee was composed of the Chairman; the Reporter; Mr. Adams, Government member, Canada; Mr. Leblanc, Employers' member, France; and the Workers' Vice-Chairman.

5. At its ninth sitting on 17 June the Committee appointed a Working Party, consisting of the Chairman, the Reporter, three Employers' members, three Workers' members and one Government member. The Working Party held two meetings at which it discussed the formulation of various proposals which were then submitted to the full Committee for final decision.

6. The Committee held 13 sittings.

7. The Committee had before it the two Reports V (1) and V (2) prepared by the International Labour Office on the fifth item on the agenda of the Conference: Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer.

General Discussion

8. Since the general problems connected with the elaboration of an international instrument on principles to be observed and procedures to be followed on termination of employment at the initiative of the employer had been thoroughly discussed at the 46th Session of the Conference in 1962, the Committee held only a short general discussion. Most speakers stated that the text submitted by the Office constituted a satisfactory basis for discussion. Certain members, however, expressed the desire that the text should be made more flexible, while others would have preferred it to be more rigid. An important divergence of opinion became apparent between those members of the Committee who favoured the exclusion of public servants engaged in the administration of the State from the scope of the instrument and those who did not.

9. In the course of the general discussion, many speakers emphasised the importance of the subject from the point of view both of labour-management relations and of economic development. It was stressed, for instance, that international standards should be formulated in such a way as to protect the workers against arbitrary action while, at the same time, preserving to the employer the means for the efficient conduct of the undertaking.

Several speakers pointed to the usefulness of the adoption of international standards on
termination of employment at the initiative of the employer in the promotion of social peace and as a valuable guide to sound labour-management relations. The particular importance of such standards for developing countries was stressed. The view was also expressed that the international instrument should refrain from imposing undue restrictions on employers which might lead to management and/or economic difficulties for undertakings and result in a decrease of employment in general. It was also pointed out that, in a dynamic economy, termination of employment could contribute to a more efficient deployment of labour resources; that manpower mobility was indispensable for raising living standards; and that, when reduction of the work force was necessary, equitable procedures tended to cushion the effect of such termination on the workers involved and facilitate their re-employment. Reference was made to the fact that absolute job security might have an adverse effect on discipline and might even result in a deterioration of labour-management relations. Other speakers laid particular stress on the hardship which the loss of employment would create for the worker and his family, and indirectly also for the employers in terms of decreased purchasing power. They also pointed out that social hardships stemming from termination of employment were particularly great in those countries which had no adequate social security systems, unemployment benefit schemes, and efficient employment services.

10. The Committee stressed again the consensus of opinion expressed in its report of last year that the proposed Recommendation dealt only with termination and not with temporary suspension of the employment relationship. In so far as lay-off or suspension remained purely temporary they would therefore be excluded from the scope of the instrument. To the extent, however, that lay-off or suspension might involve effective termination, they would come within the purview of the Recommendation and would be covered by the expression "termination of employment". It was noted, moreover, that the Recommendation referred to the termination of employment relationships and would not cover business relationships between the employer and third parties.

Discussion of the Proposed Instrument

Preamble and Paragraph 1

11. Before the Committee started discussing the form which the proposed instrument should take, it held a procedural debate as to whether, in view of the title of the agenda item and the resolution on this subject passed by the Conference last year which stated that the question was placed on the agenda "with a view to the adoption of a Recommendation", it was permissible to consider or adopt a Convention and, if so, whether this year's discussion would constitute the first or second discussion on the subject. On this question the Committee sought the opinion of the Legal Adviser of the Conference.

12. In his statement before the Committee, the Legal Adviser of the Conference recalled that the Governing Body, at its 147th Session (November 1960), had decided to place the question of "Termination of Employment (Dismissal and Lay-Off)" on the agenda of the 46th Session of the Conference. Paragraph 4 of article 34 of the Standing Orders of the Conference provided that "Unless the Governing Body has otherwise decided, a question placed on the agenda of the Conference shall be regarded as having been referred to the Conference with a view to a double discussion ". At its 46th Session the Conference had adopted a resolution placing the question of "Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer" on the agenda of the 47th Session of the Conference. This resolution indicated that the question was so placed "with a view to the adoption of a Recommendation ". Despite the form thus proposed, the practice in the past had been to allow an exchange of views on the question of the form of the international instrument during the second discussion. In his conclusion the Legal Adviser stated that, while the Committee was juridically free to proceed with such an exchange of views, it would certainly wish to take full account of the resolution adopted by the Conference last year and should give to it the weight that it merited; if members of the Committee were to consider that a Convention would be the more appropriate form for the instrument, the first discussion of last year should, nevertheless, still be considered as constituting the first discussion towards this end.

13. On the basis of this statement the Committee decided to enter into a discussion as to whether the instrument should take the form of a Recommendation or a Convention.

14. The Committee had before it a proposal of the Workers' members to replace in the Preamble, and wherever it appeared in the proposed text, the word "Recommendation" by the word "Convention" and an amendment, which was also supported by some Government members, it was stated that job security was a fundamental human right, and that, since other basic rights such as freedom of association, equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value, prohibition of forced labour and prohibition of discrimination had been embodied in Conventions, the appropriate form of the international instrument to be adopted in this case was also that of a Convention; this Convention might perhaps be limited to the general principles, while the detail of practices and procedures might be included in a Recommendation. In favour of the adoption of a Convention stress was also laid on the necessity of providing realistic guarantees for the workers and imposing definite obligations on employers in order effectively to protect the workers. Other supporters of a Convention argued that this form of instrument could best take account of the special needs of developing countries, where legal guarantees of job security for the workers could contribute to the success of national development plans since job security contributed to workers' efficiency and constituted a factor in promoting social peace. It was observed that Conventions often served as a guide in the preparation of labour legislation.
in the new countries. Finally, it was pointed out that problems of automation and unemployment made the need for a Convention even more imperative. The Employers' members, as well as a number of Government members, were opposed to the idea of a Convention and preferred a Recommendation. The main arguments advanced related to the complexity of the subject and the great differences existing among national concepts and practices, and between highly industrialised and developing countries. In view of these factors a Recommendation would be more effective. It could contain a series of broadly phrased and flexible principles and procedures, the practical application of which could be adapted to the requirements of individual countries. It was also pointed out that very few countries would be in a position to ratify a Convention which contained the standards set out in the proposed text and that a Recommendation would be preferable to a Convention that would obtain only a minimum number of ratifications. Moreover, some speakers, referring to certain passages of the Report of the Director-General, submitted to the present session of the Conference, stressed that there was no inherent virtue in a Convention and that the practical importance of the reporting arrangements of article 19, paragraph 6 (d), of the I.L.O. Constitution should not be underestimated. Finally, several members felt that it was inopportune to change the form of the instrument at this stage, since the subsequent considerations by most governments of last year's detailed discussion had been given in the expectation that a Recommendation would be adopted. The amendment was rejected by 402 votes to 520, with 15 abstentions. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Poland proposing the adoption of a Convention supplemented by the Recommendation was defeated by 403 votes to 505, with 30 abstentions.

15. The Employers' members of Australia, Ceylon, Malaya and Tanganyika proposed an amendment of the English text of Paragraph 1 so that the words "as may be appropriate under national conditions" should appear after the word "Recommendation" instead of at the end of the paragraph. They argued that these words should qualify the whole of the Paragraph. A lengthy discussion ensued, but when it was evident that the majority opinion in the Committee was that the text should remain as it was, the proposal was withdrawn. The Workers' members proposed to modify Paragraph 1 to substitute for the words "consistent with national practice as may be appropriate under national conditions" in the text under consideration the words "as is established by national practice", arguing that the text was too flexible on this point and should be strengthened. The amendment was withdrawn after it became obvious that a large majority of the Committee was opposed on the grounds, among others, that the possibilities of implementing the Recommendation would be limited since amendment presupposed already established practice, while a Recommendation should be capable of inspiring changes in national practice.

16. Paragraph 2 was adopted without discussion, with two Employers' members abstaining.

17. The Committee had before it an amendment presented by the Employers' members in which it was proposed to replace clause (a) by a text according to which "joining a union or participating in union activities outside working hours, or with the consent of the employer, within working hours, or the failure or refusal to join or remain a member of a union" should not constitute valid reasons for termination of employment. In favour of this amendment, which was also supported by some Government members, emphasis was laid on the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was stated that the proposed new wording aimed at protecting individual liberty and the individual's right to choose his employment by making it clear that the right of association also included the right not to associate. This amendment was opposed by the Workers' members and several Government members, whose main argument was that the proposal was contrary to freedom of association and to the fundamental principle of the I.L.O., that workers who refused to join a trade union did not deserve special protection and that the proposed new text, if adopted, could be used against the unions. It was also pointed out that in certain countries legislation permitted collectively bargained arrangements requiring union membership as a condition of employment. In these conditions the addition of "the failure or refusal to join or remain a member of a union" to the grounds mentioned which should not constitute valid reasons for termination of employment would be incompatible with such national systems, while the omission from the instrument of "the failure or refusal to join or remain a member of a union" would not prevent the recognition in certain countries of this ground as not justifying termination of employment, as the enactment in the proposed instrument was not exhaustive. After lengthy discussion on the principle involved, the Employers' members withdrew their amendment in favour of a proposal made by the Government member of Afghanistan, which proposed the insertion of the words "or non-membership" after the words "union membership" in the draft Recommendation. This proposal was rejected by 21,495 votes to 23,108, with 235 abstentions. This and the subsequent votes were taken under the revised system of calculations referred to in paragraph 2 of the present report.

18. The Government member of Tunisia proposed to delete the words "or participation in union activities outside working hours or, with the consent of the employer, within working hours" and to replace them by "or participation within or outside working hours in union activities as authorised by laws, collective agreements, custom or any other arrangements in conformity with national practice or, in matters relating to rights ". This amendment was withdrawn after both the Employers' and the Workers' members
had indicated that they could not accept it. An amendment presented by the Workers' members which proposed the deletion of the words "outside working hours or, with the consent of the employer, within working hours" was rejected by 21,479 votes to 22,310, with 830 abstentions, after it had been noted that the text of the draft instrument reproduced the wording of Article 1 of the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98).  

19. The Committee had before it two further amendments on clause (a), one submitted by the Government member of Honduras to insert at the beginning of the text the words "facts related to the organisation of a union" and one presented by the Government member of Pakistan to add at the beginning of the clause the words "application for formation or registration of a union". The objective of both amendments was to make clear that the protection of workers against termination of their employment for participation in union activities was not confined to the period after the actual establishment of the union, but covered also activities undertaken by workers with a view to the creation of a union. After the discussion had made clear that it was the general agreement of the Committee that the expression "participation in union activities" was to be understood to include steps taken by workers to establish a trade union, the two amendments were withdrawn.  

20. The Government member of Czechoslovakia, supported by the Workers' members, proposed the deletion of the words "in good faith" in clause (c), arguing that this term was unclear and ambiguous, that it was subject to different interpretation by workers, employers and lawyers, and that it weakened the text, the purpose of which should be the protection of the workers. The Employers' members and those Government members who were opposed to the amendment pointed to the wide use of the term "good faith" in legal systems throughout the world and to the important role of the concept of "good faith" in labour-management relations. The proposal was rejected by 20,570 votes to 24,065, with 235 abstentions.  

21. The Government member of the U.S.S.R. proposed to insert after clause (c) a new clause with the words "participating or having participated in any other lawful activity" and to delete at the beginning of the whole of Paragraph 3 the words "inter alia". After the discussion had shown that there was little support for this amendment, since, among other things, an activity which might be lawful in itself could still be prohibited in an undertaking, it was withdrawn.  

22. A representative of the International Federation of Business and Professional Women, who had been invited by the Conference as a technical expert in accordance with article 18 of the Constitution of the Organisation, made a statement before the Committee in which she expressed the wish that in Paragraph 3 of the proposed Recommendation "civil status" be added to the grounds which should not constitute valid reasons for termination of employment; it was also stated that the International Federation of University Women, the St. Joan's International Social and Political Alliance and the International Alliance of Women—Equal Rights, Equal Responsibilities had asked to be associated with this statement.  

23. The Committee had an extensive discussion on whether the enumeration of grounds not constituting valid reasons for termination of employment contained in clause (d) should also include "civil status" or "marital status". The inclusion of the former expression was proposed by the Government member of Poland, while the insertion of the latter expression was moved by the Government member of Afghanistan. In this connection several members of the Committee pointed out that the question was among other things one of preventing the termination of employment of a woman by reason of her marriage, while other members thought it useless to prolong the list of grounds which should not constitute valid reasons for termination of employment, or argued that the term "sex" included in the proposed instrument already provided sufficient protection in this respect. There was a lengthy discussion of the meaning of the expression "civil status" as compared with the expression "marital status" and the equivalent terms in other languages. This discussion revealed the existence of a variety of definitions and interpretations in different countries. The Committee rejected the inclusion of "civil status" by 20,131 votes to 20,400, with 1,675 abstentions, and adopted the insertion of "marital status" by 22,418 votes to 1,880, with 18,660 abstentions, it being understood that for the purpose of the Recommendation the expression "marital status" referred to such things as being single or getting married or divorced or becoming a widower or widow or the establishing of other permanent forms of domestic relationships. The precise meaning of some of these expressions may vary from country to country.  

Paragraph 4  

24. The Committee had before it three amendments affecting the substance of this Paragraph. The Employers' members proposed to delete the whole paragraph and to replace it by the following text: "A worker who feels that his employment has been unjustifiably terminated should be entitled, unless the matter has been determined through such procedures within the undertaking, establishment or service, as may exist or are prescribed under the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1, to appeal, within a reasonable time, and with the assistance where appropriate and if he so desires, of a person representing him, to a body agreed or established by collective bargaining or where no such body exists, to a neutral body such as a court, an arbitrator, an arbitration committee, or similar body." The Employers' member of the United Kingdom proposed the insertion, after the words "to appeal," of "within a reasonable time." The Workers' members submitted an amendment to replace the words "where appropriate, of a person representing him" by
the words "where the worker deems it appropriate, of a workers' representative or a person representing him . . .".

25. The discussion of these amendments showed that there was no opposition against including in the text the words "within a reasonable time", it being generally agreed that grievances on termination of employment should be raised quickly. Another change in the text over which there was no controversy was the incorporation of the principle that the assistance given to the worker of a person representing him should be made dependent on his request. After having received the assurance that the Committee understood that the expression "a person representing him" referred to a representative of the workers such as, in particular, a trade union representative, or, depending on the nature of the case, to an individual representative of the worker concerned such as, for instance, a lawyer, the Workers' members withdrew their proposal to add "workers' representative" to the text.

26. In connection with the amendment submitted by the Employers' members an extensive discussion was held on the order of priority of the different procedures existing in the various countries for the adjustment of grievances over the justification of termination of employment. The Employers' members argued in support of their amendment that preference should be given to settlement procedures which might exist at the undertaking level in order to avoid to the fullest extent possible reference of such complaints to bodies outside the undertaking. Where cases could not be resolved through such settlement machinery at the undertaking level, they should be resolved by other joint bodies established by collective agreements at the industry-wide or national level. Only in the absence of such procedures should appeals against termination of employment be lodged with a neutral body such as a court, an arbitrator, an arbitration committee or a similar body. In adopting this text it was the understanding of the Committee that, as a matter of principle, complaints concerning the justification of termination of employment should normally be dealt with in the first place by machinery which might exist at the undertaking level or which might have been established by collective agreement, but it was recognised that this could not deprive a worker of his right to appeal directly to the competent court or other competent neutral body where such right was guaranteed under national legislation.

Paragraph 5

28. The Employers' members proposed to replace in subparagraph (2) the words "the neutral body" by "such bodies" in order to bring this subparagraph into conformity with subparagraph (1). The Workers' members opposed this amendment as they felt that it changed considerably the substance of the provision. They pointed out that the present text a body established under a collective agreement such as, for instance, a joint committee, might be consulted on questions relating to the size of the work force of the undertaking, while the Employers' proposal seemed to be intended to exclude such possibility. The amendment was finally withdrawn. The Paragraph was adopted with four Employers' members expressing their opposition.

Paragraph 6

29. The examination of this Paragraph gave rise to a lengthy discussion which revealed the existence of two divergent concepts concerning the appropriate remedy in case of unjustified termination of employment. The Workers' members, supported by some Government members, proposed to change the present text in a way which would make reinstatement the normal remedy for unjustified termination of employment. In support of this proposed modification it was pointed out that the loss of a job without valid reason involved a series of personal factors related to the dignity of the worker concerned which could be neither assessed nor compensated financially, that in developing countries with a high degree of unemployment a worker whose employment had been unjustifiably terminated had little prospect of finding another job, and that the Employers' members need not be afraid of a reference to reinstatement as the normal remedy since the instrument was only a Recommendation. The Employers' members recognized that there might be cases of unjustified termination in which the continuation of the
employment relationship might not be appropriate, but they stressed that it should be for the neutral body and not for the employer to determine the cases of unjustified termination in which the employment relationship should be dissolved with payment of compensation. The Employers' members were opposed to this concept. They argued that it would be contrary to harmonious employer-worker relations in the undertaking if employers could be forced to continue working relations with a worker they considered as undesirable; as a matter of principle they could not accept compulsory reinstatement to a job in the undertaking if the Employers' Vice-Chairman, the Representative of the Secretary-General referred to a statement he had made to the Committee last year in which he had pointed out that "in drafting the point the Office had taken into account the practice in various countries. In certain countries the neutral body could reinstate an unjustifiably dismissed worker, while in others compensation was the only remedy. Since the Recommendation was to be a guide for all countries it had to be edited in general terms, presenting the two possibilities, with slightly greater emphasis on compensation, as this was the more current practice as regards remedies for unjustified dismissals." Another question on which the Workers' and Employers' members disagreed concerned the payment of unpaid wages in cases in which the neutral body found the termination of employment unjustified. While the Workers' members emphasised that in such cases unpaid wages should always be payable, the Employers' members thought that it would be unfair to pay such wages to a worker who already received other payments such as unemployment benefits or remuneration for another job which he might have found during the period concerned. Finally, the Workers' members stated that under certain systems provision was made for benefits and other forms of relief in addition to reinstatement or compensation, and they requested that this possibility should be taken into account in the text of the Recommendation, whereas the Employers' members stated their preference for the present text, which provided for the possibility of affording other forms of relief instead of reinstatement or compensation and which was, because of its flexible language, in conformity with the practice in the various countries. The Workers' members, in an effort to have their various views included in the Recommendation, proposed to modify its text after the words " worker concerned " to read as follows: " shall be reinstated, with payment of unpaid wages, or if he does not agree be paid adequate compensation .... " This amendment was withdrawn in favour of another proposal submitted by the Workers' members in which it was proposed to modify the text after the words " worker concerned " to read as follows: " should, subject to his agreement, be either reinstated, with payment of unpaid wages, or be paid adequate compensation .... " This amendment was rejected by 13,536 votes to 18,725, with 1,065 abstentions. A proposal made by the Government member of Cyprus to substitute the word " and " for the words " and/or " was withdrawn after the discussion had shown that it was not supported.

**Paragraph 7**

30. The Employers' members proposed to modify subparagraph (2) of this Paragraph to read as follows: " During the period of notice the employer shall, in so far as practicable, endeavour to grant the worker a reasonable amount of time off in order to seek other employment. " In support of this amendment it was pointed out that it was not appropriate to give the worker an absolute right to time off during the period of notice, as there might be cases where such a requirement might adversely affect the operation of the undertaking. Particularly in cases in which a worker's employer's view, warranted summary dismissal. Finally, social security benefits and severance allowances which were intended to mitigate the hardship which might result from termination would also have to be taken into account. The main arguments advanced by the Employers' members and those Government members who stated their opposition to the amendment were that its adoption would weaken the text too much, that it deleted from the instrument the expression " without loss in pay " , which should be retained as an important principle, and that the present wording was in conformity with the law and practice of many countries. In view of the reaction to this amendment it was withdrawn. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Senegal to delete in subparagraph (2) the words " as far as practicable " was rejected by 14,758 votes to 16,955, with 595 abstentions.

**Paragraph 8**

31. An amendment submitted by the Workers' members to replace in subparagraph (1) the words "The worker ... from the employer" by the words " The employer shall, at the time of terminating the employment of the worker, deliver to that worker a certificate " was withdrawn after the Committee, accepting a suggestion made by the Chairman, had agreed to insert the words " at the time of the termination of his employment " after " on request " in the text of the proposed Recommendation. The Employers' member of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed the insertion in subparagraph (2) of " unless the certificate provides more than is listed in the preceding subparagraph " in order to make clearer, in the opinion of the Employer's member of the U.S.S.R. proposed to modify the text after the words " worker concerned " to read as follows: " shall be either reinstated, with payment of unpaid wages, or if he does not agree be paid adequate compensation .... " This amendment was withdrawn on the understanding that
in the opinion of the Committee subparagraph (2) had to be read in connection with subparagraph (1) and that the Recommendation did not prohibit the issuance of a different type of certificate if this was requested by the worker concerned. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Pakistan to add in subparagraph (2) the words "unless dismissal has taken place for serious misconduct" before the words "should be inserted in such certificate" was not seconded.

**Paragraph 9**

32. The Employers' members proposed to insert at the beginning of the Paragraph the words "With the exceptions established in this Recommendation:". They feared that without such an addition the citation of Paragraph 9 outside of its context in the instrument might give the impression that the benefits mentioned therein might be considered as applicable even in the event of dismissal for serious misconduct, although Paragraph 11 (1) provided for exceptions in this case. This amendment was withdrawn because it was the general view of the Committee that the Paragraphs of the proposed Recommendation could not be taken separately but that the instrument should be read in its entirety.

33. An amendment proposed by the Employers' member of the Congo (Leopoldville) to delete the words "or severance allowance or other types of separation benefits paid for by the employer" was withdrawn in favour of a proposal made by the Employers' member of the Federal Republic of Germany to delete the remainder of the paragraph after the words "has been terminated" and to substitute the following: the form of such income protection should be determined at the national level in accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Recommendation." The Employers' members, in supporting this amendment, stressed that its objective was to render the text more flexible by stating that the form of income protection should be left to national methods of implementation without mentioning in the instrument any particular form such income protection might take. It was also stated in this connection that severance allowances payable by the employer, which were mentioned in the present text of the proposed Recommendation, were not a common practice in certain countries, where it was recognised that the employer had no further obligation to afford financial benefits to a worker whose employment relationship was severed. The Workers' members and some Government members opposed the amendment on the grounds that the enumeration of various possible forms of income protection contained in the text of the proposed Recommendation gave useful guidance, that the Recommendation should not simply maintain the status quo but should point the way to social progress, and that it would be regrettable if the reference to severance allowances resulting from collective bargaining, which had an increasing importance in a number of countries, were to be omitted from the Recommended text. In reply to a question raised by the Government member of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the relationship between this Paragraph of the proposed Recommendation and other international instruments adopted under the auspices of the I.L.O. which dealt specifically with social security, the Representative of the Secretary-General stated that it was clear that conditions concerning the payment of social security benefits were governed by I.L.O. standards on social security. The present text gave examples of various forms of income protection in case of termination of employment—those to be paid by the employer, e.g. severance allowances and other forms of income protection, including social security schemes—so as to make clear that in order to assess the degree of income protection existing in a given country account must be taken of all forms such protection might take. As a result of this extensive discussion the amendment was withdrawn.

34. An amendment submitted by the Employers' member of the United States proposed the addition of the following sentence at the end of the Paragraph: "Entitlement to any separation allowance or other type of separation benefit paid for directly by the employer may be made conditional on a minimum period of service in the undertaking, establishment or service; in the determination of the amount of the benefit, consideration should be given to the length of service of the worker concerned and of such other criteria as may be appropriate under national conditions and practices." The main argument advanced in favour of this amendment was that under those systems which provided for the payment by the employer of severance allowances it would be appropriate to require a certain minimum period of service. Furthermore, in determining the amount of such benefits, length of service should also be taken into account. The amendment was rejected by 15,200 votes to 17,907, with 1,175 abstentions.

**Paragraph 10**

35. The Committee had before it an amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R., aimed at replacing the present text of this Paragraph by the following words: "Employers should consult with workers' representatives before a final decision on reduction of the work force is taken and, where appropriate, on individual dismissals." This proposal was supported by the Workers' members. In support of this amendment, which corresponded with the language adopted by the Conference last year, it was stated that consultation was very desirable as a means of preventing rather than remedying unjustified termination of employment; that it was also in the interest of employers since it afforded an opportunity to explain to the workers' representatives the reasons for termination and thus would permit the action to take place without discord if these reasons were justified; that such consultation with workers' representatives on termination of employment was successfully practised in several countries; that the instrument which had only the form of a Recommendation was merely setting out certain general principles; and that, in general, consultation was a sound principle of labour-
management relations. The Employers' members, opposing this amendment, feared that consultation would almost inevitably open the way to the conclusion that an agreement had to be reached with the workers' representatives, that employers had to retain disciplinary powers and hence should not be required to consult with workers' representatives before they could take appropriate action; that in many countries workers' representatives did not wish to share in such managerial decisions; and that there was no need for changing the present text which did justice to the wide variety of national practices. In this regard as it neither counted nor imposed consultation contrary to national practice.

36. Since the discussion revealed certain doubts about a possible misinterpretation of the term "consultation" the Committee decided to state in its report that the term "consultation" as used in the proposed Recommendation referred to a process whereby the workers' representatives were notified in advance of the employer's intention to proceed to a termination of employment and were given an opportunity to formulate and express their views on the proposed action as well as to discuss such action with the employer; it implied no interference on the part of the workers' representatives with the employers' ultimate power of decision subject to the worker's right of appeal in accordance with Paragraph 4. It was also the understanding of the Committee that the expression "workers' representatives" might refer to elected workers' representatives at the undertaking level as given an opportunity to formulate and express their views on the proposed action as well as to discuss such action with the employer; it implied no interference on the part of the workers' representatives with the employers' ultimate power of decision subject to the worker's right of appeal in accordance with Paragraph 4. It was also the understanding of the Committee that the expression "workers' representatives" might refer to elected workers' representatives at the undertaking level as well as at plant level or higher levels, depending on the circumstances the amendment was withdrawn.

Paragraph 11

38. The Committee had before it an amendment submitted by the Employers' members, in which it was proposed to replace the whole of Paragraph 11 by the following text:

"(1) A worker may be dismissed without a period of notice or wages in lieu thereof if he conducts himself that the employer cannot in good faith be expected to take any other course; in such a case the severance allowance or other type of separation benefits paid for by the employer, if any, may be withheld.

(2) Before a decision to dismiss a worker in accordance with subparagraph (1) becomes finally effective, the worker should be given an opportunity to state his case promptly, with the assistance where appropriate and if he so desires of a person representing him.

(3) An employer should be deemed to have waived his right to dismiss in accordance with subparagraph (1) if such action has not been taken within a reasonable time after he becomes aware of the cause of dismissal.

(4) A worker should be deemed to have waived his right to appeal against dismissal in the terms of subparagraph (1) if he has not appealed within a reasonable time after he has been notified of dismissal."

In support of this proposal it was stated that it would arrange the Paragraph in a more logical order and that it sought to avoid the use of the expression "serious misconduct" which would be difficult to define in an international instrument. The amendment was withdrawn for lack of support. A proposal submitted by the Government member of Senegal to insert after the word "misconduct" the words "the determination of which should be left to the appreciation of the competent body" was not seconded.
39. The Government member of the United States proposed to replace subparagraph (5) by the following text: "Unless there are grounds for summary action in the case of a dismissal for serious misconduct, the worker concerned should promptly be given an opportunity to state his case before the dismissal becomes finally effective, with the assistance where appropriate of a person representing him." The main purpose of this amendment was to bring additional flexibility to the provision by taking into account those exceptional cases in which it was impracticable to afford the time necessary for the worker to state his case. After some discussion in the course of which the Employers' members expressed their support while the Workers' members indicated their objection, the author of the amendment withdrew it in favour of a proposal made by the Government member of Cyprus to insert in subparagraph (5) of the present text the words "as far as practicable" after the words "the worker should". This proposal was rejected by 15,905 votes to 17,719, with 1,065 abstentions. The Committee adopted by 20,542 votes to 2,068, with 12,079 abstentions, a proposal made by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. to add a new subparagraph as follows: "In the implementation of this Paragraph the definition or interpretation of 'serious misconduct' as well as the determination of 'reasonable time' should be left to the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1."

Paragraph 12

40. Paragraph 12 was adopted without opposition. The Committee agreed that the expression "reductions of the work force" as used in the proposed Recommendation referred to termination of employment based on economic reasons which were independent of the capacity or conduct of the worker and, as pointed out in paragraph 10 above, referred only to termination and not to temporary suspension of the employment relationship.

Paragraph 13

41. The Committee decided without opposition to replace in subparagraph (1) in the English text the word "envisaged" by "contemplated". The Employers' members proposed to insert after "workers' representatives" the words "in the undertaking, establishment or service" in order to make sure that consultation in connection with a reduction of the work force took place at the undertaking level; they considered it undesirable to require employers to deal in such cases with trade union officials who were not involved in the affairs of the undertaking concerned. This proposal was withdrawn after the Workers' members and several Government members had stated their opposition on the grounds that the amendment would open the way to avoiding consultation with trade union leaders, that national practices differed greatly in this respect and that in certain countries it was considered desirable for regional or national trade union officials to participate in such consultations. The Employers' member of Peru expressed his opposition to the proposed text of Paragraph 13 (1) because he did not consider that previous consultation was appropriate.

42. In respect of subparagraph (2) the Committee had before it two amendments proposed by the Employers' members. One of these amendments, in which it was proposed to insert after "retraining" the words "and transfers between departments", was adopted without opposition. The other amendment aimed at deleting the expression "restriction of overtime" and to replace it by the words "the practicability of restricting overtime worked by the classes of workpeople to be affected". In support of this amendment it was argued that, while everything possible should be done to avoid working overtime when a reduction of the work force was taking place, there should not be undue rigidity in applying this principle, particularly in cases in which the workers working overtime belonged to different occupational categories than the workers affected by the reduction of the work force. After the Workers' members had stated their agreement with the idea behind the amendment, it was withdrawn because it was the view of the Committee that the measures enumerated in subparagraph (2) had all to be qualified in the sense of their practicability.

43. There were two basic proposals to modify subparagraph (3). The Government member of Canada submitted an amendment to delete this subparagraph and to include the following in the text: "By mutual agreement between the employer and workers' representatives, the competent public authorities may be invited to assist them in such consultation." The Employers' members proposed to delete the subparagraph as well as Paragraph 14 and to replace these provisions by the following text: "The extent to which the competent public authorities should be notified of the situation, particularly where a proposed reduction of the work force is on such a scale as to have a significant bearing on the manpower situation of a given area or branch of economic activity, should be a matter for determination in the light of national practices in accordance with Paragraph 1." In the course of the discussion on these amendments two further proposals were made: one by the Government member of the United States to replace the subparagraph by "As and when consultation takes place both parties may invite the public authorities to assist them in such consultation", the other by the Government member of the United Kingdom, proposing the insertion of the following text in place of subparagraph (3): "As and when consultation takes place both parties should bear in mind the advisability of their inviting the competent public authorities, preferably by mutual agreement, to assist them in such consultation." These various proposals were the object of a lengthy discussion in the course of which no agreement could be reached.

The matter was therefore submitted to the Working Party which proposed the following text to the Committee: "As and when consultation takes place both parties should bear in mind that there may be public authorities which might assist the parties in such con-
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50. The Workers' members proposed that in place of clause (c) the following new Paragraph be introduced between Paragraphs 18 and 19: "Workers engaged on a casual basis for a short period may be excluded from the scope of Paragraphs 12 to 17 of this Recommendation." Those who supported the amendment argued that while casual workers could not suitably be covered by the supplementary...
provisions concerning reduction of the work force, there was no reason not to grant them the protection of Paragraphs 2 to 11. The Employers' members opposed the amendment, noting that it would be unfair to require employers to provide severance allowances or time off with pay to seek other employment for casual workers who had perhaps worked only a few weeks. Furthermore, it was argued, a result of the amendment would be to discourage employers from hiring casual labour to the detriment of employment possibility for workers. It was also pointed out by certain members of the Committee that the proposed text did not necessarily exclude from its scope casual workers but merely allowed for the possibility of such exclusion.

51. An exchange of views took place concerning the inherent difficulty in defining the concept of casual employment, during which the Employers' members proposed that a new Paragraph be inserted providing that "the length of service or other qualifications to be associated with the application of all or any of the provisions of the Recommendation shall be laid down under the methods of implementation referred to in Paragraph 1". Such addition, they felt, could avoid problems of definition of various terms involving a time factor such as casual workers, probationary periods, etc.

52. Both the Employers' and the Workers' proposals were withdrawn, after the discussion had shown that there was general agreement in the Committee that casual workers should enjoy, as far as this was compatible with their peculiar status, at least some of the protection afforded by the proposed Recommendation. At the same time the Committee recognised that such matters as length of service which were not confined to casual workers could be very relevant to the subject-matter of the Recommendation. The Committee felt itself unable in the time available to reach any conclusions upon the complex issues involved and considered that these matters should be left for further examination in each country.

53. The Committee had an extensive discussion on whether public servants should be included in the scope of the proposed Recommendation or excluded from its scope. The basis for this discussion was an amendment submitted jointly by the Government members of Cyprus, Ireland, Japan, Pakistan and Vietnam, which proposed to insert a new Paragraph after Paragraph 10 to read as follows: "The extent to which this Recommendation applies to public servants engaged in the administration of the State whose employment is governed by statutory provisions should be left to determination by the competent national authorities." While the Employers' and Workers' members expressed their opposition to the proposed exclusion of public servants from the scope of the proposed Recommendation, a number of Government members explained the legal and constitutional difficulties which prevented the application of the proposed Recommendation to public servants in their countries. After the discussion had shown the difficulties of reconciling different national preoccupations in this regard, the Government member of the U.S.S.R. moved a proposal, which had previously been advanced by the Government member of the United States and thereafter withdrawn, to replace the above-mentioned amendment by the inclusion of a new clause (d) in Paragraph 18 which would read as follows: "(d) public servants engaged in the administration of the State, but only to the extent that constitutional provisions preclude the application of one or more provisions of this Recommendation." After a sub-amendment submitted by the Government member of Pakistan to insert "and national legislation" after "constitutional provisions" had been rejected by 3,055 votes to 18,604, with 2,130 abstentions, the Committee adopted by 10,994 votes to 9,565, with 2,960 abstentions, the amendment of the Government member of the U.S.S.R. on the understanding that the term "constitutional provisions" would include constitutional practices that had grown up in countries which did not have a written constitution. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members to insert in Paragraph 18 the following new clause "(d) such other classes or categories as may be laid down under the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1", was previously rejected by 10,190 votes to 14,006, with no abstentions.

New Paragraph

54. The Government member of France proposed the addition of a new Paragraph to read as follows: "The Recommendation should be considered as having been implemented, in respect of certain categories of workers covered by special statutory provisions where such provisions ensure such categories a body of guarantees at least as favourable as those provided in the Recommendation." The object of this amendment was to cover the situation where statutes afforded protection and benefits to special categories of workers which, taken in their entirety, were as or more favourable than the entirety of the guarantees provided for in the proposed Recommendation, although one or another particular statutory benefit might be less than what was provided for in the proposed Recommendation. If such were the case, then, according to the amendment, the Recommendation would be considered as implemented.

55. In response to a question concerning the relation between the amendment and article 19, paragraph 8, of the I.L.O. Constitution, the Representative of the Secretary-General explained that the purpose of article 19, paragraph 8, was to avoid the possibility that an international instrument might affect more favourable provisions for the workers than those provided for in that instrument. The situation envisaged in the amendment, however, was quite distinct, as it referred to a body of benefits and protective measures, the sum total of which would be at least as favourable to the workers concerned as those of the Recommendation.

56. The Committee agreed that the idea behind the amendment should be included in the proposed Recommendation in a form to be worked out by the Drafting Committee.
Adoption of the Report

57. The Committee considered its report at its thirteenth sitting and agreed to certain changes suggested by the members during the course of the discussion. The report was adopted unanimously.

58. The proposed Recommendation concerning termination of employment at the initiative of the employer, as settled by the Committee and finalised by the Drafting Committee, is appended and is submitted to the Conference for consideration.


(Signed) H. A. BLAND, Chairman.
(Signed) H. M. DOUTY, Reporter.

(3) Text of the Proposed Recommendation concerning Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer, Submitted by the Committee on Termination of Employment:1

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation, Having been convened by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Forty-seventh Session on 5 June 1963, and Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to termination of employment at the initiative of the employer, which is the fifth item on the agenda of the session, and Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of a Recommendation, adopts this day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three the following Recommendation, which may be cited as the Termination of Employment Recommendation, 1963:

I. METHODS OF IMPLEMENTATION

1. Effect may be given to this Recommendation through national laws or regulations, collective agreements, works rules, arbitration awards, or court decisions or in such other manner consistent with national practice as may be appropriate under national conditions.

II. STANDARDS OF GENERAL APPLICATION

2. (1) Termination of employment should not take place unless there is a valid reason for such termination connected with the capacity or conduct of the worker or based on the operational requirements of the undertaking, establishment or service.

(2) The definition or interpretation of such valid reason should be left to the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1.

3. The following, inter alia, should not constitute valid reasons for termination of employment:

(a) union membership or participation in union activities outside working hours or, with the consent of the employer, within working hours;
(b) seeking office as, or acting or having acted in the capacity of, a workers' representative;
(c) the filing in good faith of a complaint or the participation in a proceeding against an employer involving alleged violation of laws or regulations; or
(d) race, colour, sex, marital status, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin.

4. A worker who feels that his employment has been unjustifiably terminated should be entitled, unless the matter has been satisfactorily determined through such procedures within the undertaking, establishment or service, as may exist or be established consistent with this Recommendation, to appeal, within a reasonable time, against that termination with the assistance, where the worker so requests, of a person representing him, to a body established under a collective agreement or to a neutral body such as a court, an arbitrator, an arbitration committee or a similar body.

5. (1) The bodies referred to in Paragraph 4 should be empowered to examine the reasons given for the termination of employment and the other circumstances relating to the case and to render a decision on the justification of the termination.

(2) The provision of subparagraph (1) should not be construed as implying that the neutral body should be empowered to intervene in the determination of the size of the work force of the undertaking, establishment or service.

6. The bodies referred to in Paragraph 4 should be empowered, if they find that the termination of employment was unjustified, to order that the worker concerned, unless reinstated, where appropriate with payment of unpaid wages, should be paid adequate compensation and/or afforded such other relief as may be determined under the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1.

7. (1) A worker whose employment is to be terminated should be entitled to a reasonable period of notice or compensation in lieu thereof.

(2) During the period of notice the worker should, as far as practicable, be entitled to a reasonable amount of time off without loss in pay in order to seek other employment.

8. (1) The worker whose employment has been terminated should be entitled to receive, on request, at the time of the termination, a certificate from the employer specifying the dates of his engagement and termination and the type or types of work on which he was employed.

(2) Nothing unfavourable to the worker should be inserted in such certificate.

9. Some form of income protection should be provided for workers whose employment has been terminated; such protection may include
unemployment insurance or other forms of social security, or severance allowance or other types of separation benefits paid for by the employer, or a combination of benefits, depending upon national laws or regulations, collective agreements and the personnel policy of the employer.

10. The question whether employers should consult with workers' representatives before a final decision is taken regarding the termination of employment should be left to the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1.

11. (1) In case of dismissal for serious misconduct, a period of notice or compensation in lieu thereof need not be required, and the severance allowance or other types of separation benefits paid for by the employer, where applicable, may be withheld.

(2) Dismissal for serious misconduct should take place only in cases where the employer cannot in good faith be expected to take any other course.

(3) An employer should be deemed to have waived his right to dismiss for serious misconduct if such action has not been taken within a reasonable time after he has become aware of the serious misconduct.

(4) A worker should be deemed to have waived his right to appeal against dismissal for serious misconduct if he has not appealed within a reasonable time after he has been notified of the dismissal.

(5) Before a decision to dismiss a worker for serious misconduct becomes finally effective, the worker should be given an opportunity to state his case promptly, with the assistance where appropriate of a person representing him.

(6) In the implementation of this Paragraph the definition or interpretation of "serious misconduct" as well as the determination of "reasonable time" should be left to the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1.

III. SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISIONS CONCERNING REDUCTION OF THE WORK FORCE

12. Positive steps should be taken by all parties concerned to avert or minimise as far as possible reductions of the work force by the adoption of appropriate measures, without prejudice to the efficient operation of the undertaking, establishment or service.

13. (1) When a reduction of the work force is contemplated, consultation with workers' representatives should take place as early as possible on all appropriate questions.

(2) The questions on which consultation should take place might include measures to avoid the reduction of the work force, restriction of overtime, training and retraining, transfers between departments, spreading termination of employment over a certain period, measures for minimising the effects of the reduction on the workers concerned, and the selection of workers to be affected by the reduction.

(3) As and when consultation takes place both parties should bear in mind that there may be public authorities which might assist the parties in such consultation.

14. If a proposed reduction of the work force is on such a scale as to have a significant bearing on the manpower situation of a given area or branch of economic activity, the employer should notify the competent public authorities in advance of any such reduction.

15. (1) The selection of workers to be affected by a reduction of the work force should be made according to precise criteria, which it is desirable to establish wherever possible in advance, and which give due weight to the interests both of the undertaking, establishment or service and of the workers.

(2) These criteria may include—
(a) need for the efficient operation of the undertaking, establishment or service;
(b) ability, experience, skill and occupational qualifications of individual workers;
(c) length of service;
(d) age;
(e) family situation; or
(f) such other criteria as may be appropriate under national conditions,
the order and relative weight of the above criteria being left to national customs and practice.

16. (1) Workers whose employment has been terminated owing to a reduction of the work force should be given priority of re-engagement, to the extent possible, by the employer when he again engages workers.

(2) Such priority of re-engagement may be limited to a specified period of time; where appropriate, the question of the retention of seniority rights should be determined in accordance with national laws or regulations, collective agreements or other appropriate national practices.

(3) Re-engagement should be effected on the basis of the principles set out in Paragraph 15.

(4) The rate of wages of re-engaged workers should not be adversely affected as a result of the interruption of their employment, regard being had to differences between their previous occupation and the occupation in which they are re-engaged and to any intervening changes in the structure of wages in the undertaking, establishment or service.

17. There should be full utilisation of national employment agencies or other appropriate agencies to ensure, to the extent possible, that workers whose employment has been terminated as a result of a reduction of the work force are placed in alternative employment without delay.

IV. SCOPE

18. This Recommendation applies to all branches of economic activity and all categories of workers, provided that the following may be excluded from its scope:
(a) workers engaged for a specified period of
time or a specified task in cases in which,
owing to the nature of the work to be
affected, the employment relationship can­
not be of indeterminate duration;
(b) workers serving a period of probation
determined in advance and of reasonable
duration;
(c) workers engaged on a casual basis for a
short period; and
(d) public servants engaged in the administra­
tion of the State to the extent only that
constitutional provisions preclude the ap­
lication to them of one or more pro­
visions of this Recommendation.

19. In accordance with the principle set
forth in article 19, paragraph 8, of the Consti­
tution of the International Labour Organisa­
tion, this Recommendation does not affect any
provisions more favourable to the workers con­cerned than those contained herein.

20. This Recommendation should be con­sidered as having been implemented in respect
of workers whose conditions of employment
are governed by special laws or regulations
where those laws or regulations provide for
such workers conditions which, in their entirety,
are at least as favourable as the totality of
those provided in this Recommendation.

(4) Text of the Recommendation concerning
Termination of Employment at the Initiative
of the Employer, Submitted by the Drafting
Committee.

(The text submitted by the Drafting Committee
was adopted by the Conference without modifica­
tion.¹ For the authentic text see Appendix XIV,
p. 658.)

¹ See Second Part, p. 436.
Sixth Item on the Agenda: Hygiene in Shops and Offices

(1) Text of the Proposed Conclusions concerning Hygiene in Shops and Offices, Prepared by the International Labour Office.

(This text is given in Report VI (2), prepared by the International Labour Office for the 47th Session of the Conference.)

(2) Report of the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices.

1. The Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices, set up by the Conference at its third sitting, consisted of 90 members (48 Government members, 18 Employers' members and 24 Workers' members). To ensure equality of voting, each Government member had three votes, each Employers' member had eight votes and each Workers' member had six votes.

2. The Committee elected its Officers as follows:

   Chairman: Mr. Gurinovich (Government member, Byelorussia).

   Vice-Chairmen: Mr. Végh-Garzón (Employers' member, Uruguay); and Mr. Fitzpatrick (Workers' member, Ireland).

   Reporter: Mr. Uytdenhoef (Government member, Belgium).

3. The Committee elected a Drafting Committee consisting of the Reporter, Mr. Smart (Government member, United Kingdom), Mr. Perez (Employers' member, France) and in his absence Mr. De Bruyn (Employers' member, Belgium), and Mr. Willems (Workers' member, Netherlands).

4. The Committee held 19 sittings. Reports VI (1) and VI (2) prepared by the Office for the sixth item on the agenda of the Conference, Hygiene in Shops and Offices, were submitted to it. The Committee took the conclusions proposed in Chapter II of Report VI (2) mentioned above as the basis for its discussion.

General Discussion

5. The Committee first held an exchange of views on the main aspects of the question which had been submitted to it. Attention was drawn to the growing importance following technological developments of the occupational sectors to which the proposed instruments are to be applied. It was thought that the question was of particular interest and that the adoption by the Conference of one or more instruments on the subject under consideration would undoubtedly contribute, very appreciably, to improving hygienic conditions in these sectors, where, in the opinion of some members, they were still sometimes quite inadequate.

6. Further, some members stated that though there was no doubt that this was the moment for adopting instruments of this kind for shops and offices, it had to be recognised that it was in other sectors of at least equal importance, such as industry and agriculture, that the problems of hygiene were generally most serious, and that it was regrettable, in consequence, that similar and equally detailed instruments had not been provided for these other sectors on these questions. In order to fill this gap, the Government member of Belgium and certain other members suggested that the attention of the Governing Body be drawn to the need for also considering the drafting of instruments similar to those proposed for shops and offices for these other sectors.

7. It was also stressed that the development of the general education among the population itself helped the application of measures of hygiene and that the improvement of conditions of hygiene was likely to contribute to increasing productivity and the national income.

8. On the question submitted to the Committee, many of its members insisted on the need for defining, in a Recommendation, a group of measures designed to serve as a guide to all countries, but in particular to the developing countries both for rural and for urban areas whatever the stage of development reached.

9. Other members of the Committee expressed the opinion that it would be better if the meeting concentrated on the drafting of a detailed Convention. This point of view came up against a broad opposition, but a majority seemed to be clearly in favour of a detailed Recommendation and a Convention containing only general principles, with a view to obtaining the greatest possible number of ratifications.

10. It was decided by common agreement among the Government members, the Employers' members, and the Workers' members to discuss one by one all the Proposed Conclusions contained in Chapter II of Report VI (2), starting with Point 3, the Employers' members having given the assurance that after proceeding with an examination of the text of the proposed Recommendation they would not be opposed to envisaging the adoption of a Convention containing only general principles.

1 See Second Part, p. 393.
11. A number of members stressed that the Conclusions proposed by the Office formed a series of provisions which they felt were particularly well drafted and basically sensible, which later on proved to be correct, as these provisions raised very few differences of opinion in the course of the debate.

Discussion of Provisions for Inclusion in the Recommendation

SCOPE

Point 3

12. The meeting was reminded that various governments had wished to have a precise definition of the words “shops” and “offices,” but since a definition of this kind had proved impossible, the Office had preferred to define the scope of the instrument as clearly as possible, drawing on the corresponding texts of the Weekly Rest (Commerce and Offices) Convention, 1957 (No. 106).

13. Several members wondered how they should refer to the offices of the liberal professions, if they should consider that these offices had already been mentioned elsewhere and that in consequence the words “including the offices of the liberal professions” should be deleted (an amendment along these lines submitted by the Employers’ members was rejected by 154 votes to 254, with 6 abstentions), or alternatively, if it was necessary to make a separate heading (an amendment on these lines submitted by the Government member of the United Arab Republic was rejected by 9 votes to 369, with 12 abstentions). Finally, the text proposed for subparagraph 3 (a) and (b) was retained.

14. Various Government members felt that while it was justifiable to include “shops and all other establishments” in the scope of the instrument, it would, on the other hand, be better to omit clause 3 (c) (iii), which ran “mixed commercial and industrial establishments.” Otherwise it would be necessary to apply the provisions of the Recommendation to all parts as well as to the personnel of industrial establishments which had a commercial department, however insignificant. This would be an abuse in view of the fact that the provisions of the instrument should logically apply only to trading establishments or the trading branches of other establishments. The Government member for the U.S.S.R. proposed that any establishment whose commercial branch made up over 50 per cent. of its activities should fall within the scope of the instrument, but this proposal was not retained.

15. Two amendments for the deletion of clause 3 (c) (iii), presented by the Employers’ members and the Government member of Belgium respectively, were adopted by 375 votes to 0, with 18 abstentions. On the other hand, an amendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium for the deletion in subparagraph 3 (c) of the words “in so far as they are not subject to national laws or regulations, or other arrangements, concerning hygiene in industry, mines, transport or agriculture” (reservations similar to those contained in Convention No. 106) was rejected by 309 votes to 15, with 45 abstentions. In consequence the text of subparagraph 3 (c) including the two clauses (i) and (ii) were adopted without amendment.

Point 4

16. Several members felt that the numbering as given in Point 4 (modelled on that of Convention No. 106) was superfluous. But others felt that the numbering was indispensable for the avoiding of all ambiguity. In addition, an amendment for the deletion of Point 4 submitted by the Employers’ members was rejected by 182 votes to 210, with 21 abstentions.

17. The Committee recognised that some precision was necessary in defining “other refreshment houses” mentioned in subparagraph 4 (d). An amendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium which added the word “similar” after “other establishments” was adopted by 375 votes to 0, with 18 abstentions. Point 4 as amended was adopted.

Point 5

18. Point 5 of the Proposed Conclusions was adopted without discussion.

METHODS OF APPLICATION

Point 6

19. Point 6 was adopted with the wording proposed in the Office text after the Government member for the United Kingdom recognised, following the debate, that the proposed text covered the methods of application in use in his country.

CLEANLINESS

Point 7

20. The Government member for Belgium considered that, in Point 7, maintenance should go together with cleaning, and put forward an amendment for the addition of this notion which was adopted by 189 votes to 177, with 12 abstentions.

21. An amendment for the introduction, in the text of Point 7, of the following explanatory sentence: “workplaces and equipment as well as the area in which establishments, institutions and administrative services are situated,” presented by the Government member of the U.S.S.R., was rejected by 6 votes to 354, with 27 abstentions.

22. Several members were of the opinion that in the case of premises the expression “to maintain in a state of cleanliness” would give a better idea of what was required than the expression “regularly cleaned.” An amendment to substitute the first of these phrases for the second was submitted by the Government member of Australia and was adopted by 207 votes to 156, with 12 abstentions. The words “regularly cleaned” were replaced by “kept clean.”

23. The text of Point 7 was adopted as amended.
Point 8

24. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members to replace the words "in particular" by "as far as possible" in Point 8 was rejected by 144 votes to 231, with 18 abstentions. An amendment for the deletion of "every working day" in the same clause, also presented by the Employers' members, was adopted by 252 votes to 126, with 12 abstentions, the majority of members accepting the idea that the condition described by the words "regularly enough to ensure its remaining constantly clean" was applicable to all cases and was sufficient in itself to guarantee cleanliness.

25. The Government member of Austria having pointed out that in subparagraph 8 (a) the word "constant" was superfluous and having proposed an amendment along these lines, the amendment was adopted by 342 votes to 24, with 18 abstentions.

26. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. added subparagraph (e) worded as follows: "the walls, ceiling and equipment should be regularly cleaned." This was adopted by 228 votes to 0, with 156 abstentions.

27. The text of Point 8 as amended and completed was adopted.

Point 9

28. Point 9 was adopted without discussion.

Point 10

29. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium, which required that old rags intended for cleaning machines, equipment or other objects could only be used for cleaning after having been washed and disinfected, was rejected by 15 votes to 357, with 18 abstentions.

30. Point 10, requiring that cleaning should be done outside working hours, seemed inapplicable in America in view of the working hours of cleaners. An amendment submitted by the Government delegate of Canada deleting this Point was adopted by 192 votes to 174, with 12 abstentions.

Point 11

31. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the Netherlands to add the words "in good working order and" before the word "disinfected" was rejected by 18 votes to 351, with 15 abstentions.

32. Point 11 was adopted in the text put forward by the Office.

Point 12

33. Point 12 was adopted with the addition at the end of the text of the words "or be a source of infection" in accordance with an amendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium, which was adopted without a vote.

Natural and Artificial Ventilation

Point 13

34. An amendment to Point 13 presented by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. required air-expelling ventilation devices; this was rejected by 6 votes to 351, with 27 abstentions. A second amendment put forward by the same member for equipping kitchens and similar premises with a system for bringing in fresh air was also rejected by 9 votes to 366, with 39 abstentions. An amendment submitted by the Government member for Australia requesting that the words "in sufficient quantity" should be added to the end of Point 13 was adopted without vote. The text of Point 13 was adopted with this addition.

Point 14

35. An amendment to subparagraph (a) of Point 14 was submitted by the Employers' members, to replace the Office text by one which contained no reference to the figure 30 m², as follows: "(a) where there is artificial ventilation, that fresh or purified air should be introduced in the said premises in sufficient quantity." This amendment was adopted by 205 votes to 159, with 3 abstentions. However, the Committee was unanimous in preferring a text which applied to natural as well as artificial ventilation, after considering an amendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium running as follows: "(a) that the apparatus ensuring natural or artificial ventilation should be designed in such a way as to allow a sufficient quantity of fresh air or purified air to be introduced, per person and by the hour, the working conditions being taken into account." This text, subamended after a member had requested that the words "working conditions" should be replaced by "the nature of work", was adopted by 186 votes to 156, with 21 abstentions.

36. An amendment was submitted by the Workers' members for the addition to Point 14 of a new subparagraph running as follows: "(b) arrangements should be made to render harmless fumes, dust and any other impurities which may be generated during the course of work." This was adopted by 207 votes to 165, with 18 abstentions. On the other hand, an amendment submitted by the same members which required that all sources creating direct air pollution be provided with an individual filter for the elimination of this pollution was rejected by 153 votes to 192, with 12 abstentions.

37. An amendment presented by the Government member of Australia to replace in the text of Point 14, subparagraph (b), as put forward by the Office the general idea of discomfort, without further qualification, by the following more restricted notion: "uncomfortable or physiologically harmful", was rejected by 185 votes to 213, with 6 abstentions. Another amendment had been incorporated in this amendment, proposed by the Government member of the United Kingdom, who desired to have the word "discomfort" qualified by the adjective "considerable".
38. In consequence the text proposed by the Office for subparagraph (b) of Point 14 was adopted and will be included under (c).

39. In view of the extreme difficulty of fixing maxima and minima for the hygrometric level of the air as envisaged by subparagraph (c) of Point 14 as drafted by the Office, the Employers' members proposed an amendment to delete this text. This amendment was rejected by 168 votes to 213, with 6 abstentions.

40. However, an amendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium to modify the same subparagraph (c), running as follows: "in as far as is possible and in so far as conditions require, appropriate measures should be taken so as to ensure that in enclosed premises a reasonable hygrometric level in the air is maintained", was adopted by 333 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions. The text thus amended will be found in subparagraph (d).

41. Point 15 was adopted without discussion.

42. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium proposing new wording for subparagraph (a) of Point 16, and running as follows: "(a) All measures should be taken to ensure visual comfort (i) by an appropriate distribution and sufficient surface of the openings for natural lighting; (ii) by an appropriate choice and appropriate distribution of sources of artificial lighting; (iii) by an appropriate choice of colours for the walls of the premises and the equipment", was adopted without a vote. A member had, however, suggested the deletion from (iii) of the words "walls of", as the word "wall" did not perhaps extend to either the ceiling or the floor of the premises.

43. An amendment of the Government member of the United Kingdom to replace in subparagraph (b) of Point 16 the words "to the greatest possible extent" by "as far as is practicable" was adopted by 204 votes to 141, with 12 abstentions.

44. The text of Point 16 was adopted with due regard to these amendments.

45. With regard to Point 17 a discussion took place among several members concerning the advantage of natural lighting and the undesirable consequences of a tendency which is becoming more and more widespread among architects to design buildings in which the rooms are either insufficiently lighted or entirely deprived of natural light. The supporters of this trend considered that there was nothing from either the medical or the technical point of view against replacing daylight by suitable artificial light. The Workers' members and the majority of the Government members considered that though these new developments in architecture and lighting were spreading it was, none the less, a most regrettable development. These members insisted upon the advantages of natural light both from the physiological and from the psychological point of view, and they were of the opinion that, as the Office text of Point 17 (1) stated, the accent should be upon the superiority of natural light.

46. Two amendments for the deletion of paragraph (1) of Point 17 put forward by the Employers' members and the Government member of Canada respectively were rejected by 145 votes to 207.

47. Another amendment, submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom to replace in paragraph (1) of Point 17 the word "possible" by "reasonable" was adopted by 178 votes to 109, with 18 abstentions.

48. Paragraph (1) of Point 17 was adopted in the text thus amended.

49. Paragraph (2) of Point 17 was deleted as the majority of members considered that the standard defined in this clause was without practical value and in this respect the fixing of lighting levels, as provided in paragraph (1) of Point 18, offered better guarantees. Three amendments were introduced for this deletion, by the Employers' members, by the Government member of Canada and by the Government member of Belgium, and these were adopted simultaneously by 199 votes to 156.

50. Paragraph (1) of Point 18 was adopted in the text proposed by the Office.

51. Two amendments for deleting paragraph (2) of Point 18, submitted respectively by the Employers' members and by the Government member of Belgium, were adopted simultaneously by 193 votes to 141, with 8 abstentions. Many members were in agreement with the authors of these amendments in considering that it was unnecessary to fix such rigid rules in a domain where unanimity of ideas was far from being realised and which was therefore very vague.

52. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Canada for the deletion of the words "so as to ensure that it is as adequate as possible" at the end of paragraph (1) of Point 19, was rejected by 29 votes to 171, with 149 abstentions.

53. The text put forward by the Office was adopted.

54. Three identical amendments for suppressing paragraph (2) of Point 19, submitted respectively by the Employers' members, the Government member of Canada, and the Government member of Belgium, were simultaneously adopted by 199 votes to 144, with 6 abstentions, it being generally felt that provisions of this kind might lead to undesirable facile solutions and that they should not, therefore, appear in the text of the instrument.

**LIGHTING**

**Point 15**

41. Point 15 was adopted without discussion.

**Point 16**

42. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium proposing new wording for subparagraph (a) of Point 16, and running as follows: "(a) All measures should be taken to ensure visual comfort (i) by an appropriate distribution and sufficient surface of the openings for natural lighting; (ii) by an appropriate choice and appropriate distribution of sources of artificial lighting; (iii) by an appropriate choice of colours for the walls of the premises and the equipment", was adopted without a vote. A member had, however, suggested the deletion from (iii) of the words "walls of", as the word "wall" did not perhaps extend to either the ceiling or the floor of the premises. It was decided that this question would be submitted to the Drafting Committee.

43. An amendment of the Government member of the United Kingdom to replace in subparagraph (b) of Point 16 the words "to the greatest possible extent" by "as far as is practicable" was adopted by 204 votes to 141, with 12 abstentions.

44. The text of Point 16 was adopted with due regard to these amendments.

**Point 17**

45. With regard to Point 17 a discussion took place among several members concerning the advantage of natural lighting and the undesirable consequences of a tendency which is becoming more and more widespread among architects to design buildings in which the rooms are either insufficiently lighted or entirely deprived of natural light. The supporters of this trend considered that there was nothing from either the medical or the technical point of view against replacing daylight by suitable artificial light. The Workers' members and the majority of the Government members considered that though these new developments in architecture and lighting were spreading it was, none the less, a most regrettable development. These members insisted upon the advantages of natural light both from the physiological and from the psychological point of view, and they were of the opinion that, as the Office text of Point 17 (1) stated, the accent should be upon the superiority of natural light.

46. Two amendments for the deletion of paragraph (1) of Point 17 put forward by the Employers' members and the Government member of Canada respectively were rejected by 145 votes to 207.

47. Another amendment, submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom to replace in paragraph (1) of Point 17 the word "possible" by "reasonable" was adopted by 178 votes to 109, with 18 abstentions.

48. Paragraph (1) of Point 17 was adopted in the text thus amended.

49. Paragraph (2) of Point 17 was deleted as the majority of members considered that the standard defined in this clause was without practical value and in this respect the fixing of lighting levels, as provided in paragraph (1) of Point 18, offered better guarantees. Three amendments were introduced for this deletion, by the Employers' members, by the Government member of Canada and by the Government member of Belgium, and these were adopted simultaneously by 199 votes to 156.

50. Paragraph (1) of Point 18 was adopted in the text proposed by the Office.

51. Two amendments for deleting paragraph (2) of Point 18, submitted respectively by the Employers' members and by the Government member of Belgium, were adopted simultaneously by 193 votes to 141, with 8 abstentions. Many members were in agreement with the authors of these amendments in considering that it was unnecessary to fix such rigid rules in a domain where unanimity of ideas was far from being realised and which was therefore very vague.

52. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Canada for the deletion of the words "so as to ensure that it is as adequate as possible" at the end of paragraph (1) of Point 19, was rejected by 29 votes to 171, with 149 abstentions.

53. The text put forward by the Office was adopted.

54. Three identical amendments for suppressing paragraph (2) of Point 19, submitted respectively by the Employers' members, the Government member of Canada, and the Government member of Belgium, were simultaneously adopted by 199 votes to 144, with 6 abstentions, it being generally felt that provisions of this kind might lead to undesirable facile solutions and that they should not, therefore, appear in the text of the instrument.
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Point 20

55. Point 20 was adopted without discussion.

Point 21

56. Paragraph (1) of Point 21 was adopted without discussion.

57. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members for deleting in Point 21 (2) the words "other than climatic" which followed the words "variations in temperature", was rejected by 144 votes to 225, with 3 abstentions. The text proposed by the Office was adopted.

58. An amendment to add a new paragraph referring to sales counters presented by the Workers' members and modified by a sub-amendment proposed by the Government member of the United Kingdom was adopted by 213 votes to 144, with 6 abstentions, and ran as follows: "(3) No worker should be required to work at an open sales counter in front of a sales establishment in temperatures likely to cause discomfort, unless appropriate means to warm himself be placed at his disposal."

59. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members to add to paragraph (3) of Point 21 of the proposed Office text after the words "to health" the words "and considered so by the competent authorities" was adopted by 192 votes to 153, with 18 abstentions. Another amendment submitted by the Government member of Australia wishing to replace the restriction stressed in the second part of this paragraph by the following text: "unless provided with equipment or appropriate protective clothing offering protection against the risks arising from work under such conditions" was adopted by 204 votes to 3, with 162 abstentions. The text of paragraph (3) as amended will be renumbered (4).

60. Paragraphs (4) and (5) of Point 21 were adopted without modification and will be renumbered (5) and (6).

61. An amendment submitted by the Workers' members for a new paragraph (7) to Point 21 ran as follows: "(7) When carrying out work in conditions of very low or very high temperature, workers should be given breaks included in the working hours or a shortened working day. Where breaks are given, rest rooms with normal temperature should be provided. This was adopted by 183 votes to 144, with 39 abstentions.

Drinking Water

Point 22

62. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Australia which added in Point 22 after the words "adequate supply of wholesome drinking water or" the words "if this is not available" was adopted without vote.

63. The text of paragraph 22 as amended was adopted.

Point 23

64. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members aiming to add the words "and where appropriate, fitted with a tap" to the end of subparagraph (1) (a) was adopted without voting.

65. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom on the text of Point 23 (2) provided for the possibility of collective use of drinking vessels, on the condition that these are rinsed in clean water after each usage. It was stressed, on this subject, that the meaning of common drinking vessel was a drinking vessel placed close to a drinking-water tap, for example, which the workers use in rotation. Certain members had remarked that, in such conditions and taking into account general characteristics of the workplace, one would not be able to expect that drinking vessels would always be carefully and systematically rinsed by each user. For this reason it was thought that the adoption of the amendment presented by the Government member of the United Kingdom would in effect continue and even favour an unhygienic practice which, on the contrary, must be combated as effectively as possible, in view of the serious consequences which it is likely to have. This amendment was rejected by 180 votes to 183, with 6 abstentions.

66. Believing that the text of paragraphs 23 (3) and (4) might be in contradiction with British practices, the Government member of the United Kingdom submitted an amendment limiting the provisions formulated by these paragraphs to a simple "right of inspection". This amendment was rejected by 156 votes to 201, with 6 abstentions.

67. Point 23 of the text proposed by the Office was adopted, with the understanding that modifications concerning the tap would be added to subparagraph (1) (a).

Seating

Point 24

68. The Government member of the United Kingdom submitted in an amendment a new draft for Point 24, which he considered to be clearer and more effective, in which he nevertheless included the qualification "as far as practicable". In view of the latter it was considered advisable to divide the amendment into two parts. The part including this qualification was rejected by 48 votes to 192, with 145 abstentions; the remaining part was adopted by 204 votes to 12, with 142 abstentions; consequently, the text of Point 24 as adopted should read as follows: "24. Seats should be supplied for workers and they should be given opportunities of using them."

Point 25

69. Point 25 was adopted without discussion.

Point 26

70. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members, suggesting the deletion at the
end of the Point of the words "If necessary, foot-rests should be provided for the same purpose", was withdrawn and, after an exchange of views, this Point was adopted without modification.

**CHANGING ROOMS**

**Point 27**

71. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members to make the provision of simple facilities or changing rooms dependent on the number of workers employed was rejected by 147 votes to 214, with 3 abstentions. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom providing that the installation of changing rooms could be decided on without waiting for the intervention of the competent authority in the matter, was adopted by 168 votes to 165, with 9 abstentions. Point 27 was adopted, the words "by the competent authority" being replaced by the words "where necessary".

**REST ROOMS**

72. The Workers' members presented an amendment proposing to mention also in Point 27 the provision of rest rooms which should be subject to the regulations laid down in the Point.

73. Since some members felt that rest rooms can be an aspect of occupational hygiene, and other members expressed varying opinions on this point, the Committee decided to vote on this question. It was decided by 210 votes to 150, with 6 abstentions, that appropriate provisions concerning rest rooms did come under occupational hygiene and consequently it was necessary to insert them in the instrument. Consequently a new amendment was presented by the Workers' members, with a view to adding a new text, based on the provisions of the Welfare Facilities Recommendation, 1956 (No. 102), but slightly modified in some respects. After discussing this amendment, the Employers' members proposed a subamendment to the text of the amendment which would make it identical to Recommendation No. 102. This suggestion was accepted by the Workers' members. As the Government members were also in agreement with this proposal, the following text was adopted without vote:

"**REST ROOMS**

(1) In an undertaking where alternative facilities are not available for workers to take temporary rest during working hours, a rest room should be provided, where this is desirable, having regard to the nature of the work and any other relevant conditions and circumstances. In particular, rest rooms should be provided to meet the needs of women workers; of workers engaged on particularly arduous or special work requiring temporary rest during working hours; or of workers employed on broken shifts.

(2) National laws or regulations should, where appropriate, empower the competent authority to require the provision of rest rooms in particular undertakings or classes of undertakings in which this is considered desirable by the competent authority owing to the conditions and circumstances of employment.

(3) The facilities so provided should include at least—

(a) a room in which provision suited to the climate is made for relieving discomfort from cold or heat;

(b) adequate ventilation and lighting;

(c) suitable seating facilities in sufficient numbers."

**EMERGENCY EXITS**

74. The Workers' member of the United Kingdom submitted an amendment making it, in the first place, obligatory to provide emergency fire exits and in the second, prohibiting the employment of persons in establishments which have not taken the necessary measures in this respect. Several members, while expressing agreement with the ideas expressed, considered that this question did not concern hygiene in the strict sense and that it should not, therefore, be included in the instrument. Other members, however, were of the opinion that protective measures against fire were, from several points of view, concerned with hygiene, in particular, by protecting the personnel against the disastrous effects of panic.

75. Consequently it was decided that a separate vote would be taken on each of the points expressed in the amendment. The first part of the text was adopted by 289 votes to 30, with 15 abstentions, with the following text:

"Provisions should be made and maintained for adequate means of escape in case of fire."

The second part, concerning the prohibition of employing personnel in establishments not protected against fire, was rejected by 141 votes to 184, with 24 abstentions.

**PROTECTION AGAINST DANGEROUS MACHINERY**

76. An amendment submitted by the Workers' member for the Netherlands to introduce a text concerning protection against dangerous machinery was withdrawn by its author following an exchange of views, in the course of which it became apparent that this question was exclusively one of occupational safety, i.e. prevention of accidents at work, and that therefore its inclusion in the instrument was not justified.

**Point 28**

77. It was pointed out that the words "changing rooms" were used in the sense of "special premises where clothes are hung" and that Point 28 was concerned with changing rooms only as provided for in the second part of Point 27. It was also pointed out that in certain countries changing rooms, where obligatory, could be furnished with coat-stands and small individual lockers which could be locked. An amendment which sought to authorise the provision of clothes hangers, submitted by the Government member of Australia, was rejected by 154 votes to 180, with 12 abstentions.

78. The text proposed by the Office for Point 28 was consequently adopted.
WASHSTANDS AND SHOWERS

Point 29

79. The text proposed by the Office was adopted.

Point 30

80. A first amendment submitted by the Employers' members, which sought to replace, at the beginning of Point 30, the words “to the greatest possible extent” by the words “whenever practicable and feasible”, was rejected by 135 votes to 201 following comments, in particular by the Government member of Belgium, who pointed out that the restriction contained at the beginning of Point 30 should apply only to the first two subparagraphs and submitted an amendment to that effect. This amendment was adopted by 204 votes to 136, the text now reading as follows: “(1) These facilities should include, to the greatest possible extent, washstands with hot water, if necessary. (2) These facilities should include, to the greatest possible extent, showers, if the nature of the work makes it necessary, with hot water.” In consequence, the other subparagraphs (e) to (h) become paragraphs numbered (3) to (8).

81. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Canada was designed explicitly to include in the regulations that facilities should be provided with hot as well as cold water, or a mixture of the two as required. Such provisions were considered by the majority of the members as superfluous. The amendment was rejected, the quorum not having been attained.

82. An amendment to paragraph (5), formerly subparagraph (e), presented by the Government member of Belgium, to complete its provisions by prohibiting the use of volatile solvents or other dangerous products for purposes of personal cleanliness, was adopted, with a slight modification, by 357 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions, with the following wording: “(5) Appropriate products (detergents, special creams or powders, for example) should be placed at the disposal of workers when the nature of work requires it; the use, for the purposes of personal cleanliness, of volatile solvents or other products dangerous to health, should be prohibited.”

83. The Employers' members submitted an amendment to delete in paragraph (6), formerly subparagraph (f), the words “preferably individual”. This amendment was rejected by 144 votes to 240, with 6 abstentions. An explanation following the vote stated that the exclusive purpose of the amendment was to avoid the use of a common towel on which all workers dry themselves at the same place. This explanation gave satisfaction to those members who had introduced or supported the amendment because they had interpreted “preferably individual” in too restrictive a sense. Another amendment in the opposite sense, presented by the Government member of Australia, which required that only individual towels could be used, was also rejected by 163 votes to 177, with 9 abstentions.

84. With regard to the former subparagraph (g), which had become paragraph (7), the Government member of Australia presented the following new draft: “(7) Separate washing facilities should be provided for men and women, except in very small establishments where, after approval by the competent authority, common facilities may be provided.” This amendment was adopted by 195 votes to 148, with 14 abstentions.

85. The Government member of Mexico wished to point out that the text permitted practices contrary to use in his country, where men and women were provided, even in the smallest of undertakings, with separate washing facilities.

86. The addition of a supplementary paragraph submitted by the Government member of Belgium was adopted by 195 votes to 0, with 145 abstentions, with the following wording: “(8) Water provided for washstands and showers should not endanger health.” The former subparagraph (h) will become paragraph (9). The text of the other subparagraphs put forward by the Office, numbered as paragraphs, was adopted without amendment.

SANITARY CONVENIENCES

Point 31

87. The original text, at the end of which the words “for their use” had been added at the request of the Government member of Australia, was adopted without vote by the Committee.

Point 32

88. The Government member of Australia thought that it was preferable, in paragraph (1), to determine more precisely the small undertakings to which the provisions were not applicable. He presented an amendment to this paragraph worded as follows: “(1) Separate conveniences should be provided for men and women, except, with the approval of the competent authority, in establishments where not more than five persons were employed or in purely family undertakings.” This amendment was adopted by 180 votes to 153, with 15 abstentions.

89. Paragraph (2) was adopted without amendment.

Point 33

90. The first two paragraphs were adopted without modification.

91. In the third paragraph the Government member of Australia proposed to insert after the word “lids” the words “or other suitable disposal units such as incinerators”. The original text with this addition was adopted without vote.

Point 34

92. Considering that the text of this Point covered too many details, the Employers' members requested its deletion. The amendment which they presented for this purpose was rejected by 144 votes to 177, with 24 abstention
tions. Another amendment, submitted by the Government member of Australia, for providing one W.C. per group of 20 instead of 15 women was rejected by 150 votes to 162, with 30 abstentions; the text proposed by the Office was thus adopted without amendment.

**Point 35**

93. For this Point the Government member of Australia proposed in an amendment a new drafting which would be more formal in character, while providing details concerning the rules to be observed with regard to the rational design of sanitary facilities. The following new text was adopted by 162 votes to 23, with 161 abstentions: “35. Sanitary conveniences should not communicate directly with the working premises but should be separated therefrom by a separately ventilated airlock or by an open space. Approaches to conveniences should be roofed to protect users from inclement weather.”

**UNDERGROUND AND SIMILAR PREMISES**

**Point 36**

94. The text of Point 36 was adopted without discussion.

**Point 37**

95. Considering that the use of underground premises was becoming increasingly frequent, the Government member of the United Kingdom and the Government member of the United States submitted amendments with a view to deleting the Point. In reaction to this state of affairs several members spoke against the amendments, deploring the growing tendency to install shops and offices in premises where natural daylight was quite inadequate or even non-existent. These amendments were rejected by 149 votes to 159, with 18 abstentions. The text submitted by the Office was adopted without change.

**Point 38**

96. The Government members of Canada and the United States considered that the provisions of the two previous paragraphs provided sufficient regulations for the use of underground or similar premises as well as the work carried on there, and each submitted an amendment to delete Point 38. These amendments were adopted by 158 votes to 153, with 15 abstentions.

97. As had been the case during the examination of Point 19 (2) some members thought that the retention of Point 38 might lead to misunderstandings which would lead to facile solutions. Other members, however, observed that the two cases were in no way similar and that the situation described in Point 38 justified the application of special measures such as those provided for in the Point.

**WORKING SPACE PER WORKER**

**Point 39**

98. Point 39 was adopted without discussion.

**Point 40**

99. The Employers' members submitted an amendment for the deletion of subparagraph (a) of Point 40. In support of their proposal they considered that the figures mentioned in the three subparagraphs of this Point were not in agreement when they were applied to the volume obtained in a room by multiplying the floor surface by the height. The objection to this formula was that three figures should be taken separately, as indeed several national regulations did, and that, in fact, the three figures constituted minima quite independent of each other. The amendment was rejected by 156 votes to 162, with 21 abstentions.

100. In another amendment the Government member of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed a new draft of Point 40 to exclude figures but nevertheless respecting the spirit of the text proposed by the Office. After reminding the meeting that, in their reply to the Office's questionnaire, the governments had submitted figures which were often very different, varying in proportions which sometimes reached 1:2, and that the standards relative to height could be considered as answering to particular factors depending on whether they applied to hot countries or to those having temperate or cold climates, the Government member of the Federal Republic of Germany considered that the provisions of the instrument should preferably be limited on this subject to general but precise indications. The amendment was adopted by 228 votes to 123, with 6 abstentions. Consequently, the text of Point 40 will be as follows: "The competent authority should specify—(a) the minimum unobstructed volume of space to be provided in any enclosed premises for each worker regularly working there; (b) the minimum height of new enclosed premises in which work is regularly performed; (c) in enclosed premises, the surface for each person regularly employed there."

**OBNOXIOUS, UNHEALTHY OR TOXIC SUBSTANCES, PROCESSES AND TECHNIQUES**

**Point 41**

101. Point 41 was adopted in the Office text after an exchange of views.

**Point 42**

102. The Employers' members considered that subparagraph (a) entered into more details than the corresponding text in the Protection of Workers' Health Recommendation, 1955 (No. 97), and accordingly submitted an amendment deleting it. This amendment was rejected by 131 votes to 105, with 3 abstentions. In consequence the text proposed by the Office was adopted.

103. The Government member of Belgium proposed for subparagraph (b) the following new text, which was adopted by the Committee without a vote: “the measures of substitution referred to in subparagraph (a) should be encouraged by the competent authority; with regard to retail sales, the authority should encourage processes and containers which exclude all danger.”
104. The Government member of the United Kingdom thought that for shops and offices a single provision combining subparagraphs (c) to (f) would suffice, and he proposed the following new text: "all appropriate and practicable measures should be taken to protect workers against risks resulting from knocking over, spilling, emanation or splashing of substances which are noxious, unhealthy or toxic or for any reason injurious to workers' health." This amendment was adopted by 173 votes to 153, with 6 abstentions.

105. The Government member of the United States introduced an amendment in the text of subparagraph (g) to insert before the words "or to put on make-up" the words "to eat, to drink". The Committee adopted this modification without a vote. The subparagraph so modified will be relettered (d).

106. The Government member of the U.S.S.R. proposed to insert in the instrument a special provision providing compensation for personnel occupied in work in which toxic substances were handled. Other members were opposed to this proposal as they considered that the precautions required by Points 41 and 42 should ensure satisfactory working conditions. The amendment was rejected by 135 to 192 votes, with 18 abstentions.

107. Another amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. was to add a new provision concerning antidotes and certain neutralising substances which might be administered to workers exposed to some kinds of risk of intoxication or skin disease. An exchange of views took place on this subject, and it was felt that methods of preventing occupational diseases by the administering of particular medicaments and substances to workers were within the sphere of competence of a doctor. It was judged, in addition, that the question had been implicitly dealt with in the Occupational Health Services Recommendation, 1959 (No. 112). The amendment was rejected by 133 votes to 183, with 6 abstentions.

108. After a brief exchange of views, Point 43 was adopted as proposed.

INDIVIDUAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

Point 44

109. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members proposing to replace the word "and" by "or" in the last two lines of the Point was considered as being a change of drafting and was adopted as such.

110. The Government member of Belgium proposed an amendment which completed the Point by the following sentence: "the competent authority should fix minimum standards for individual protective equipment." The Government member of the U.S.S.R. recalled that he had also presented an amendment to the same end, modifying Point 45, paragraph (1). He suggested, together with other members, that it might be used as a basis for clarifying the new provision which was proposed. Certain members remarked that the adoption of the amendment to Point 45 would in effect mean the replacement of the provision of paragraph (1) of this Point by another relating to a quite different matter. The answer to a question raised by an Employers' member, who wished to know whether levels of efficiency were meant, was in the affirmative. Finally, the amendment submitted by the Government of Belgium was adopted without vote, it being understood that the necessary drafting changes would be made by the Drafting Committee as appropriate. Point 44, modified and completed accordingly, was adopted.

Point 45

111. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members aiming at deleting paragraph (2) was rejected by 129 votes to 155, with 6 abstentions. After an exchange of views in which the Government member of the U.S.S.R. and other members took part, the Committee adopted the text of paragraph (1) proposed by the Office, the words "for example" being inserted in it.

112. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members proposing to delete paragraph (2) as superfluous was rejected by 120 votes to 146. In consequence the text of paragraph (2) was adopted in the form presented by the Office.

NOISE, VIBRATION

Point 46

113. The Employers' members considered that the first subparagraph of this Point referred more to factories, while the second went against practices which were being developed more and more. They proposed an amendment for deletion of all the text of the paragraph after the words "harmful effects". Other members insisted upon the necessity of reducing noise as much as possible and also certain musical broadcasts. The amendment was rejected by 168 votes to 207, with 9 abstentions.

114. The first part of an amendment presented by the Workers' member of Ireland for rewording subparagraph 46 (a), designed to define the way in which noise should be reduced, was rejected by 141 votes to 202, with 6 abstentions. The second part of this amendment proposed to add a subparagraph (c) as follows: "(c) to the provision of sound-insulating equipment where appropriate to keep the noise of workshops, elevators, conveyors or the street away from offices." This was adopted by 189 votes to 145, with 24 abstentions. The third part of this amendment, which provided special measures against noise, where required, in work necessitating "intellectual effort or intense concentration", was rejected by 156 votes to 160, with 12 abstentions.

115. A proposal to replace the words "in particular musical broadcasts" by "including musical broadcasts" in subparagraph (b) was adopted without vote. Consequently, and taking this modification into account, the Office text was adopted with the addition of the new subparagraph (c) above.
Point 47

An amendment presented by the Employers' members proposing to delete Point 47 was rejected by 132 votes to 189, with 24 abstentions.

An amendment was presented by the Government member of Australia proposing to add to the Office text a subparagraph (c) worded as follows: "(c) workers should be supplied with suitable ear protectors when they are exposed to sound emissions likely to produce harmful effects." This was adopted by 189 votes to 171, with 6 abstentions.

The Office text so completed was adopted.

It should be noted that the attention of the Drafting Committee was drawn to the fact that ear protectors were already mentioned in Point 45, paragraph (1).

EXCESSIVE PACE OF WORK

Point 48

In order to improve the text of the Point, the Government member of Australia submitted an amendment proposing to redraft the provision as follows: "Appropriate measures should be taken to ensure that the mechanisation of operations does not impose a work rate likely to produce harmful effect on workers—in particular, physical fatigue and typical nervous fatigue (giving rise to medically recognisable disorders)—because of the concentrated attention or rapid movements required." Considering that excessive pace of work could result, as foreseen in the original text of the Office, from non-mechanical operations as well as mechanical, the Government member of Belgium proposed to reintroduce the idea in the text of the amendment presented by the Government member of Australia by inserting, after the word "mechanisation", the words "or by accelerated methods" which was accepted.

Subamended in this way, the amendment was adopted by 213 votes to 144, with 12 abstentions.

The Workers' deputy member of the Federal Republic of Germany presented an amendment which sought to complete the Point by providing that workers effecting the operations required should not be less than 16 years of age. The vote on this amendment did not succeed in clarifying the position. The Committee considered nevertheless that the principle of the proposal should not be rejected and it was in agreement to examine a more flexible text which would be submitted to it at a later stage.

A new amendment drafted accordingly was submitted by the Government member of the Federal Republic of Germany as follows: "A minimum age for employment on such work should be laid down by the competent authority when the conditions of work make it necessary." This was adopted by 210 votes to 0, with 104 abstentions.

The Committee adopted without vote an amendment presented by the Employers' members combining the two subparagraphs (a) and (b) as follows: "49. In order to prevent such harmful effects or to limit them to the greatest possible extent, there should be either breaks or, where possible, systems of distribution or rotation of jobs."

FIRST AID

Point 50

Point 51

The Government member of Australia submitted an amendment to subparagraph (2) of this Point, being of the opinion that the contents of first-aid cupboards, boxes or kits should be verified every month and not every three months. This was adopted by 177 votes to 153, with 6 abstentions.

The text of Point 51, as amended, was adopted.

Point 52

The Government member of Australia submitted an amendment providing that it would be the role of the competent authority to determine whether a person was capable of giving first aid. The attention of members was directed to a lack of conformity between the English and French text of the paragraph. It was decided that the expression "designated person" should not be understood in the sense of "a person having followed an apprenticeship" (i.e. trained) to render first aid. It referred only to a person who was designated as being permitted access to infirmaries, first-aid posts, cupboards, boxes or kits and who possessed elementary knowledge in the giving of first aid. Such a direction could be given by the competent authority. In consequence the amendment was adopted by 174 votes to 155, with 12 abstentions.

The text of the Office, as amended, was adopted.

PLANNING

Point 53

An amendment submitted by the Government member of Australia seeking to replace the words "affecting the main structure of existing buildings" by the words "in existing buildings where substantial alterations are to be made" was adopted without vote. An amendment presented by the Government member of the United Kingdom seeking to replace the expression "should conform fully" by the words "should have regard" was rejected by 136 votes to 174, with 12 abstentions. In this regard certain members remarked that in the case of new installations one could not logically admit that they should only conform in part to the directives. A third amendment, submitted by the Workers' mem-
132. An amendment presented by the Employers' members proposing to delete Point 54 was rejected by 142 votes to 189, with 3 abstentions. Certain members observed that without the directions given in Point 54 the plans prescribed would not allow the competent authority to take a decision with full knowledge of the situation.

133. The Government member of Australia submitted an amendment which sought to replace the word "minimum" by the words "brief summary". It was stressed that it was in the nature of plans to give precise indications and that it could not therefore be a question of providing a "brief summary" of such indications. The amendment was rejected by 149 votes to 194, with 33 abstentions.

134. The same amendment also included a proposal to redraft subparagraph (d). This proposal was adopted by 168 votes to 136, with 15 abstentions, with the following wording: "(d) any items of machinery which may emit heat, vapour, gases, odours, light or noise in quantities to affect adversely the health, safety or comfort of workers, together with the measures proposed to combat such agents." This text was completed by a subamendment submitted by the Government member of Belgium which sought to introduce the word "equipment" after "any items of machinery". This subamendment was adopted without vote.

135. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R., proposing to insert the words "rest room" after the words "emergency exits" in subparagraph (a) of Point 54, was not kept as a quorum was not attained, the result of the voting being 108 to 0, with 169 abstentions.

136. The text of Point 54 presented by the Office, due regard being had to the redrafting of clause (d), including the word "equipment", was adopted.

137. An amendment presented by the Government member of the United Kingdom replacing the last words of Point 55 by "provisions of this Recommendation" instead of "hygiene regulations" was adopted without vote.

138. The text of Point 55 was adopted as amended.

**New Point**

139. The Workers' members submitted an amendment which required that where the floor was of stone, concrete, etc., it should be suitably covered to protect workers against the cold. Certain members observed that in their countries floors which were cool were preferred. Nevertheless, the terms of the amendment were of interest, and certain members proposed that a more general scope should be accorded it, maintaining that in certain cases floors could be covered with coating or material more or less harmful to health. A subamendment presented in this sense allowed the drafting of a text, adopted without vote, indicating that as far as possible the floor should be covered in such a way as to provide no risk to health.

140. A large number of members observed nevertheless that such a text was out of place in Point 54, which was concerned only with what should be indicated in the plans, and that it should therefore be inserted in some other part of the Recommendation.

**Measures Against the Spread of Diseases**

**Point 56**

141. An amendment was submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom to add at the end of the first sentence the words "and between the public and the workers" and to delete Point 57, which he considered would be a useless repetition of the terms of the previous one if the words he proposed were added. Certain members supported this amendment, as they considered that there was not after all a great difference in substance between the two Points. Others were of the opinion that this difference was not negligible and that the provisions proposed by the Office did well to make the distinction between the risk of contagion amongst personnel and the risks of contagion between the public and the personnel or vice versa. The Committee nevertheless adopted the amendment by 133 votes to 99, with 3 abstentions. A second amendment, presented by the Government member of Mexico, sought to add the words "and endemic" after the word "contagious" in Point 56. This was adopted without vote. Another amendment, also presented by the Government member of Mexico, which sought to complete the list of harmful animals, was subamended by the Government member of Belgium, who sought to answer the wish of the author of the amendment by adding the words "and other harmful animals" at the end of subparagraph (a), of Point 56. This proposal was accepted, and the end of this subparagraph would read as follows: "...against insects, rodents, and other harmful animals."

142. The text of the Office completed by the three amendments indicated above was adopted.

143. The Government member of Mexico submitted an amendment to add a new subparagraph concerning kindergartens. In support of this proposal he indicated that in his country kindergartens helped to protect the children of workers against certain contagious
diseases. The majority of the members were against such an argument and declared that, all considerations taken into account, the problem could not be covered in this instrument. The vote on this amendment did not attain the quorum, the result of the vote being 3 votes to 163, with 114 abstentions.

**Point 57**

144. As already indicated, Point 57 was deleted.

**INSTRUCTION IN HYGIENE MEASURES**

**Point 58**

145. Point 58 was adopted without discussion, as submitted by the Office.

**Point 59**

146. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the Federal Republic of Germany aiming at clarifying paragraph (1) of Point 59 to the effect that the worker should receive information before he starts work was not retained. The quorum was not attained, the result of the vote being 30 votes to 115, with 21 abstentions.

147. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Canada proposing the deletion of subparagraphs (1) (b) and (d) of Point 59 was voted on separately subparagraph by subparagraph. The deletion of subparagraph (1) (b) was decided by 171 votes to 147, with 9 abstentions, while the deletion of subparagraph (1) (d) was rejected by 33 votes to 297. With the deletion of subparagraph (1) (b) the rest of Point 59 was adopted as it had been submitted in the Office text. Subparagraphs (1) (e) and (d) became (1) (b) and (e).

**COLLABORATION IN THE FIELD OF HYGIENE**

**Point 60**

148. The Government member of the United Kingdom submitted an amendment suggesting the deletion of the first paragraph of Point 60 because in his opinion it added nothing to the second paragraph. This amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 161, with 156 abstentions.

149. The Government member of Mexico believed that the text of paragraph (2) of Point 60 might be interpreted as an infringement of the sovereignty of the State and proposed an amendment suggesting the deletion of this paragraph. Several members pointed out that this paragraph only mentioned consultation, that is to say, an opinion to be requested of the representatives of employers and workers. The competent authority remained entirely free to decide whether to follow it or not, and this right was not in any way infringed. The amendment was rejected by 21 votes to 303, with 9 abstentions.

150. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Australia to give a less formal character to the provision of paragraph (2) by adding the words “as far as practicable” was rejected by 30 votes to 294, with 3 abstentions.

151. The text of Point 60 submitted by the Office was adopted.

**Point 61**

152. The first two paragraphs were adopted without discussion.

153. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Australia, to replace the expression “full information, advice and counsel” in paragraph (3) by “basic information, advice and counsel”, did not attain the quorum. The result of the vote was 18 votes to 144, with 165 abstentions.

154. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Canada provided a new and more compact drafting of paragraph (3) in order to give this a more general scope. Certain members pointed out that it would be difficult, in a number of countries, to obtain what paragraph (3) requested, owing to the insufficient number of competent personnel, while other members were of the opinion that it was essential to be able to obtain the desired information. The amendment was adopted by 174 votes to 135, with 24 abstentions, with the following text: “(3) Full information, advice and counsel on all subjects dealt with in this instrument should be available from the competent authority.”

**Point 62**

155. An amendment submitted by the Employers’ members suggesting the deletion of paragraph (2) which recommends the setting-up of hygiene committees in certain cases was rejected by 144 votes to 156, with 24 abstentions. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Australia to replace the text of paragraph (2) by another text to the effect that the setting-up of hygiene committees should be encouraged was seconded by the Workers’ members. The amendment was rejected by 147 votes to 164, with 6 abstentions.

156. An amendment was submitted by the Workers’ deputy member of the Federal Republic of Germany to delete paragraph (3) and substitute the following text: “(3) Hygiene delegates or officials should co-operate closely with the employers and workers in eliminating risks to workers’ health and to this end should, in particular, maintain consultation with the employers and with the workers’ representatives.” The amendment was adopted by 150 votes to 144, with 21 abstentions. Taking into account the new text of paragraph (3), the other paragraphs of Point 62 were adopted as submitted by the Office.

157. It was specified that in the text envisaged the hygiene delegates were workers and that the expression “hygiene committees on which employers are represented” was intended to mean the hygiene committees of the undertaking, or hygiene committees common to several undertakings, on which employers are necessarily represented. The expression did not mean any other organ dealing with occupational hygiene outside the undertaking.
Point 63

158. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the United Kingdom aiming at replacing the idea of "collaboration" by that of "consultation" was rejected by 15 votes to 294, with 6 abstentions. It was pointed out that the term "collaboration" implied the idea of trust and was considered perfectly suitable.

159. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. proposing to add to the end of Point 63 the following text: "...and with a view to instituting provisions to eliminate the causes and conditions which provoke these diseases" was adopted without vote.

160. The Office text of Point 63 was adopted with the addition indicated above.

ENFORCEMENT

Point 64

161. The text of Point 64 submitted by the Office was adopted without discussion.

Point 65

162. The text of Point 65 submitted by the Office was adopted without discussion.

* * *

163. The Chairman submitted the Provisions for Inclusion in a Recommendation as a whole to the Committee, and they were adopted as a whole.

164. It was understood that the text would be submitted to the Drafting Committee with regard to those questions concerning drafting which had been raised during the discussion.

Discussion of Provisions for Inclusion in a Convention

165. In the course of the general discussion which took place before the Point-by-Point examination of the provisions which the Office proposed to include in a Convention—Points 66 to 83—several members indicated that the scope of the Convention should be the same as that of the Recommendation; others thought that to take into account the practical possibilities of ratification the scope should not be the same.

166. In this connection, during the general discussion on Points 1 and 2 of the Proposed Conclusions submitted by the Office (which had preceded the discussion of the Recommendation) the Workers' members had expressed their preference for a Convention containing certain of the Points of the Provisions for Inclusion in a Recommendation. However, in the course of the examination of the provisions of the Recommendation it was seen that the opinion of governments seemed to be more or less divided on several points.

167. During the general discussion of Points 66 to 83 it appeared, in the light of the various opinions expressed, that the positions taken were such as would have led the Committee to express or take a vote against certain essential points of the Convention, while accepting possibly some points of lesser importance to the workers. In view of this situation the Workers' members preferred to envisage a compromise solution so as to achieve a well-balanced text dealing only with a certain number of questions of major importance. This text should be such that many governments could adopt the Convention with the aim of enacting legislation in a field in which very few laws or regulations exist.

168. After an exchange of views outside the sitting, it was decided that a compromise solution could be found between Workers and Employers. The Employers gave their agreement without reservation to a text covering a certain number of essential points to which the workers were attached. The latter abandoned a certain number of proposals which they had formulated in the various amendments presented to the Committee.

169. Agreement in principle was reached on the text submitted by the Office.

170. Following certain declarations made by the Employers' and Workers' members, several amendments submitted by various members were withdrawn. The Committee decided to examine, Point by Point, the Proposed Conclusions submitted by the Office (Points 66 to 83).

Point 66

171. An amendment submitted by the Workers' member of the Netherlands, referring to the scope (Point 66), and an amendment submitted by the Workers' member of Austria also referring to the scope, led to the submission of a subamendment by the Government member of Belgium which took into account an amendment presented by the Government member of the United Kingdom. The sub-amendment was worded as follows: "66. Except in cases in which the competent authority deems it necessary to make exceptions, the provisions of the Convention should apply to such trading establishments or trading branches of other establishments, and to such establishments, institutions or administrative services in which the persons employed are mainly engaged in office work or branches of establishments in which the persons employed are so engaged." This text was adopted unanimously without vote.

172. Certain Government members indicated that at first sight certain of the Provisions for Inclusion in a Convention proposed by the Office were contrary to the legislation existing in their countries.

Point 67

173. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. sought to modify subparagraph (a) as follows: "ensuring the application of the provisions of the present Convention." The amendment was rejected by 3 votes to 294, with 40 abstentions.

174. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Mexico, withdrawn by its author and resubmitted by the Government
member of Ireland, sought to delete subparagraph (b) of Point 67. It was rejected by 6 votes to 313, with 15 abstentions.

175. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Austria, which was subsequently withdrawn, aimed at the insertion, in subparagraph (b), after the words “appropriate authority”, of the words “if such authority does not exist already”.

176. Point 67 was adopted as submitted by the Office.

**Point 68**

177. After an exchange of views, Point 68 was adopted as submitted by the Office.

**Point 69**

178. Point 69 was adopted as submitted by the Office.

**Point 70**

179. Point 70 was adopted as submitted by the Office.

**GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

**Point 71**

180. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. to add at the end of the paragraph the words “conforming to the requirements of hygiene” was rejected by 3 votes to 292, with 27 abstentions.

181. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. to add to the text proposed by the Office Points 11 and 12 of the Provisions for Inclusion in a Recommendation was rejected by 3 votes to 304, with 18 abstentions.

182. The text of Point 71 of the Office text was adopted without change.

**Point 72**

183. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. to add to the end of Point 72 the words “in sufficient quantity” was rejected by 42 votes to 228, with 3 abstentions.

184. The text of Point 72 as proposed by the Office was adopted without modification.

**Point 73**

185. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. to replace Point 73 of the proposed Office text by Point 15 of the text adopted for the Recommendation, was rejected by 3 votes to 252, with 6 abstentions.

186. The Office text of Point 73 was adopted without modification.

**Point 74**

187. After an exchange of views the Office text of Point 74 was adopted without modification.

**Point 75**

188. The Office text of Point 75 was adopted without modification.

**Point 76**

189. After an exchange of views the Office text of Point 76 was adopted without modification.

**Point 77**

190. The Office text of Point 77 was adopted without modification.

**Point 78**

191. The Office text of Point 78 was adopted without modification.

**Point 79**

192. After an exchange of views the Office text of Point 79 was adopted without modification.

**Point 80**

193. After an exchange of views the Office text of Point 80 was adopted without modification.

**Point 81**

194. The Office text of Point 81 was adopted without modification.

**Point 82**

195. After an exchange of views the Office text of Point 82 was adopted without modification.

**Point 83**

196. The Government member of Austria remarked that there would be legal difficulties in ratifying this provision and that general discussion would take place on the subject next year.

197. After an exchange of views the Office text of Point 83 was adopted without modification.

**Supplementary Points**

198. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R., which sought to add Point 17 of the Provisions for Inclusion in a Recommendation to the Provisions for Inclusion in a Convention, was rejected by 3 votes to 273, with 9 abstentions.

199. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the U.S.S.R. to insert a new Point concerning protective equipment in the Provisions for Inclusion in a Convention was rejected by 3 votes to 258, with 21 abstentions.

**Point 76**

200. The Chairman submitted the Provisions for Inclusion in a Convention to the Committee, which adopted them as a whole. The text would be submitted to the Drafting Committee with regard to those drafting points which had been raised in the course of discussion.


(Signed) A. E. GURINOVIICH, Chairman.

(Signed) A. UYTDENHOEF, Reporter.

1 The report was adopted unanimously by the Committee.
Appendix VIII : Hygiene in Shops and Offices

(3) Text of the Proposed Conclusions *, submitted by the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices. 

I. FORM OF INSTRUMENTS

1. A detailed instrument covering hygiene in commerce and offices should take the form of a Recommendation.

2. An instrument containing general principles covering hygiene in commerce and offices should take the form of a Convention.

Provisions for Inclusion in a Recommendation

II. SCOPE

3. The Recommendation should apply to all the following establishments, institutions and administrative services, whether public or private :
   (a) trading establishments ;
   (b) establishments, institutions and administrative services in which the persons employed are mainly engaged in office work, including offices of persons engaged in the liberal professions ;
   (c) in so far as they are not included in establishments referred to in Point 4, and in so far as they are not subject to national laws and regulations, or other arrangements concerning hygiene in industry, mines, transport or agriculture—
      (i) the trading branches of any other establishments ;
      (ii) the branches of any other establishments in which the persons employed are mainly engaged in office work.

4. The Recommendation should also apply to the following institutions and administrative services :
   (a) establishments, institutions and administrative services providing personal services ;
   (b) postal and telecommunications services ;
   (c) newspaper and publishing undertakings ;
   (d) hotels, boarding houses, restaurants, clubs, cafés and other similar refreshment houses ;
   (e) theatres and places of public entertainment and other recreational services.

5. (1) Where necessary, appropriate arrangements should be made, after consultation with the representative organisations of employers and workers concerned, to define the line which separates the establishments, institutions and administrative services to which the Recommendation applies from other establishments.

   * As a result of amendments adopted in the Committee, the numbering of the Points in the Proposed Conclusions differs from the numbering in the document (Report VI (2)) to which reference is made in the Committee's report. (Note appended to the Proposed Conclusions submitted by the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices.)

   * See Second Part, p. 398.

(2) In any case in which it is doubtful whether an establishment, institution or administrative service is one to which the Recommendation applies, the question should be settled, after consultation with the representative organisation of employers and workers concerned, either by the competent authority or in any other manner which is consistent with national law and practice.

III. METHODS OF APPLICATION

6. Having regard to the diversity of national circumstances and practices, effect could be given to the provisions of the Recommendation, after consultation with the employers' and workers' organisations—
   (a) by national laws or regulations ;
   (b) by collective agreement or as otherwise agreed upon by the employers and workers concerned ; or
   (a) in any other manner approved by the competent authority.

IV. MAINTENANCE AND CLEANLINESS

7. All premises in which work is carried on, through which the workers may have to pass or which contain sanitary or other facilities provided for the common use of the workers, should be properly maintained and kept clean.

8. In particular—
   (a) the floor of the premises should be cleaned regularly enough to ensure that it remains clean ;
   (b) windows used for lighting, and sources of artificial lighting, should be regularly cleaned ;
   (a) the walls, ceilings, and equipment should be regularly cleaned.

9. Cleaning should be carried out by means raising the minimum amount of dust.

10. Cloakrooms, lavatories, washstands and, if necessary, other common facilities should be periodically disinfected.

11. All refuse and waste likely to give off obnoxious, toxic or dangerous substances, or be a source of infection, should be rendered harmless, removed or isolated at the earliest possible moment.

V. NATURAL AND ARTIFICIAL VENTILATION

12. In all premises in which work is carried on, or which contain sanitary or other facilities for the common use of the workers, there should be natural or artificial ventilation, or both, supplying the said premises with a sufficient quantity of fresh or purified air.

13. In particular—
   (a) the apparatus ensuring natural or artificial ventilation should be so designed as to allow a sufficient quantity of fresh or purified air per person and per hour to be introduced into an area, taking into account the nature of the work ;
(b) arrangements should be made to render
harmless fumes, dust and any other
impurities which may be generated in the
course of work;

(c) the normal speed of movement of air at
fixed working places should be such as not
to disturb the persons working there;

(d) as far as possible and in so far as con-
ditions require, appropriate measures
should be taken to ensure that in enclosed
premises a reasonable hygrometrical level
in the air is maintained.

VI. LIGHTING

14. In all premises in which work is carried
on, through which the workers may have to
pass or which contain sanitary or other facilities
provided for the common use of the workers,
there should be, as long as the premises are
likely to be used, adequate and suitable
lighting, natural or artificial, or both.

15. In particular, all practicable measures
should be taken—

(a) to ensure visual comfort—

(i) by an appropriate distribution and
sufficient surface of the openings for
natural lighting;

(ii) by a careful choice and appropriate
distribution of artificial lighting;

(iii) by a careful choice of colours for the
premises and their equipment.

(b) to prevent discomfort or disorders caused
by glare, excessive contrasts between light
and shade, reflection of light and over-
strong direct lighting;

(c) whenever artificial lighting is used, to
eliminate harmful flickering.

16. Wherever sufficient natural lighting is
reasonably practicable it should be adopted in
preference to any other.

17. Desirable levels of natural or artificial
lighting for the different types of work and
workplaces and the various occupations carried
on in establishments, institutions and adminis-
trative services to which the Recommendation
applies should be fixed by the competent
authority.

18. When a workplace is wholly or sub-
stantially deprived of natural light, the lighting
should correspond to standards laid down by
the competent authority so as to ensure that it
is as adequate as possible.

VII. TEMPERATURE

19. As comfortable and even a temperature
as circumstances permit should be maintained
in all places in which work is carried on,
through which the workers may have to pass,
or which contain sanitary or other facilities
provided for the common use of the workers.

20. (1) No worker should be required to
work regularly at less than a minimum tempera-
ture or at more than a maximum temperature
to be determined by the competent authority
having regard to the climate, the conditions
within the region and the nature of the establish-
ment, institution or administrative service and
the work.

(2) No worker should be required to work
regularly in conditions involving sudden vari-
atations in temperature which are considered by
the competent authorities to be harmful to
health.

(3) No worker should be required to work
at an open sales counter in front of a sales
establishment in low temperatures likely to be
harmful unless adequate means of warming
himself are available.

(4) No worker should be required to work
regularly in the immediate neighbourhood of
equipment radiating a large amount of heat or
causing an intense cooling of the surrounding
air, and considered harmful to health by the
competent authorities, unless he is provided
with suitable protective equipment or clothing
so as to prevent any injury arising from working
in such circumstances.

(5) Fixed or movable screens, deflectors or
other devices should be provided and used to
protect workers against any large-scale intake
of cold or heat, including the heat of the sun.

(6) The use of methods of heating or cooling
likely to cause dangerous or obnoxious fumes
in the atmosphere of the work premises should
be forbidden.

(7) When working in conditions of very low
or very high temperature, workers should be
given a shortened working day or breaks
included in the working hours. Where breaks
are given, rest rooms with suitable tempera-
tures should be provided.

VIII. DRINKING WATER

21. An adequate supply of wholesome drink-
ing water or if this is not available of some other
wholesome drink should be made available
for workers. Whenever the distribution of
running drinking water is practicable, prefer-
ence should be given to this system.

22. (1) Any containers used to distribute
drinking water or any other authorised drink
should—

(a) be tightly closed and where appropriate
fitted with a tap;

(b) be clearly marked as to the nature of their
contents;

(c) not be buckets, tubs or other receptacles
with a wide open top (with or without a
lid) in which it is possible to dip an instru-
ment to draw off liquid.

(2) The use of common drinking vessels
should be forbidden.

(3) If the water does not come from an
officially approved service, the competent
health authority should expressly authorise its
distribution as drinking water and hold perio-
dical inspections.

(4) Any method of distribution other than
that practised by the officially approved local
supply service should be notified to the com-
petent health authority for its approval.
(5) Any distribution of water not fit for drinking should be so labelled at the points where it could be drawn off.

IX. SEATING

23. Seats should be supplied for workers and they should be given reasonable opportunities of using them.

24. To the greatest possible extent, the place of work should be so laid out that, progressively, workers who work standing can discharge their duties sitting down whenever this is compatible with the nature of the work.

25. Seats supplied to workers should be of comfortable shape, design and dimensions, should be suited to the work performed, and should facilitate good working posture in the interest of the workers' health; if necessary, footrests should be supplied for the same purpose.

X. CLOTHING ACCOMMODATION AND CHANGING ROOMS

26. In order that workers may change, leave and, if necessary, dry clothing which is not worn at work, suitable facilities, such as hangers and cupboards, should be provided and properly maintained for workers.

27. Changing rooms should be provided and properly maintained where necessary, having regard to the number of workers in the establishment, institution or administrative service or parts thereof, and to the nature of their work.

28. (1) Changing rooms should contain—
(a) properly ventilated personal cupboards of sufficient dimensions, which can be locked;
(b) a sufficient number of seats.
(2) There should be separate changing rooms for men and women.
(3) Provision should be made for separate compartments for street clothes and working attire whenever the workers are engaged in operations necessitating the wearing of working attire which may be contaminated, heavily soiled, stained or impregnated.

XI. WASHSTANDS AND SHOWERS

29. Sufficient and suitable washing facilities should be made available and properly maintained in suitable places to enable workers to keep themselves clean.

30. (1) These facilities should include, to the greatest possible extent, washstands, with hot water if necessary, and, if the nature of the work so requires, showers with hot water.
(2) The number of washstands and showers should be fixed by the competent authority having regard to the number of workers and the nature of their work.
(3) Soap should be made available to workers.

31. Sufficient and appropriate sanitary conveniences should be provided for the use of workers in suitable places and should be properly maintained.

32. (1) Separate conveniences should be provided for men and women except, with the approval of the competent authority, in establishments where not more than five persons are employed or in establishments in which only members of the employer's family are employed.
(2) Sanitary conveniences should be partitioned off so as to ensure sufficient privacy.

33. (1) As far as possible, whenever the conveniences are not both close to the washstands referred to in Part XI, and on the same floor, washstands should be installed in sufficient number in each convenience or in an adjacent room.
(2) As far as possible, sanitary conveniences should be supplied with flushing systems, traps and toilet paper.
(3) Appropriately designed receptacles with lids or other suitable disposal units such as incinerators should be provided in the sanitary convenience reserved for women.

34. Wherever possible, for every group or fraction of a group of 25 men or 15 women there should be at least one W.C. and one urinal for the men and one W.C. for the women.

35. Sanitary conveniences should not communicate directly with the working premises but should be separated therefrom by a separately ventilated airlock or by an open space. Approaches to conveniences should be roofed to protect users from inclement weather.

XIII. REST ROOMS

36. (1) In an undertaking where alternative facilities are not available for workers to take temporary rest during working hours, a rest room should be provided, where this is desir-
able, having regard to the nature of the work and any other relevant conditions and circumstances. In particular, rest rooms should be provided to meet the needs of women workers; of workers engaged on particularly arduous or special work requiring temporary rest during working hours; or of workers employed on broken shifts.

(2) National laws or regulations should, where appropriate, empower the competent authority to require the provision of rest rooms in particular undertakings or classes of undertaking in which this is considered desirable by the competent authority owing to the conditions and circumstances of employment.

37. The facilities so provided should include at least—

(a) a room in which provision suited to the climate is made for relieving discomfort from cold or heat;
(b) adequate ventilation and lighting;
(c) suitable seating facilities in sufficient numbers.

XIV. UNDERGROUND AND SIMILAR PREMISES

38. Underground or windowless premises in which work is normally performed should conform to appropriate standards laid down by the competent authority.

39. (1) The competent authority may authorise the use of such underground or windowless premises only in the event of a manifest shortage of other accommodation or for overriding technical reasons.

(2) As far as circumstances allow, workers should not be required to work continuously in underground or windowless premises, but should work there in rotation.

XV. WORKING SPACE

40. (1) Each worker should have sufficient unobstructed working space to be able to perform his work properly and without any risk to his health.

(2) Workplaces should be laid out to ensure that work is performed not only with maximum efficiency but also with minimum fatigue.

41. The competent authority should specify—

(a) the minimum unobstructed volume of space to be provided in any enclosed premises for each worker regularly working there;
(b) the minimum height of new enclosed premises in which work is regularly performed;
(c) in enclosed premises, the surface for each person regularly employed there.

XVI. OBNOXIOUS, UNHEALTHY OR TOXIC SUBSTANCES, PROCESSES AND TECHNIQUES

42. All appropriate and practicable measures should be taken to protect workers against substances, processes and techniques which are obnoxious, unhealthy or toxic or for any reason injurious.

43. In particular—

(a) all appropriate and practicable measures should be taken to replace substances, processes and techniques which are obnoxious, unhealthy or toxic or for any reason injurious to workers' health by substances, processes and techniques which are not, or which are not to the same extent;

(b) the measures of substitution referred to in subparagraph (a) should be encouraged by the competent authority; with regard to retail sales, the authority should encourage processes and containers which are completely safe;

(c) all appropriate and practicable measures should be taken to protect workers against risks such as those resulting from knocking over, spilling, emanation or splashing of substances which are obnoxious, unhealthy or toxic or for any reason injurious to workers' health;

(d) it should be forbidden to smoke, eat, drink or put on make-up when toxic or for any reason injurious substances are handled.

44. Receptacles containing dangerous substances should bear a danger symbol in accordance with recognised international standards, and where possible—

(a) the name of the substance or an indication to identify it;

(b) the essential instructions giving details of the first aid that should be administered if the substance should injure an individual's health or physique.

XVII. INDIVIDUAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

45. When operations being performed are exceptionally dirty, or involve processes or the use, handling or manipulation of substances that are unhealthy, toxic or for any reason injurious then, depending on the extent and nature of the risks, workers should be protected by adequate protective clothing or such other individual protective equipment or devices as may be necessary. The competent authority should fix minimum standards of efficiency for individual protective equipment.

46. (1) Clothing, equipment and individual protective devices should include, for example, one or more of the following: coats, smocks, aprons, goggles, gloves, hats, helmets, masks, footwear, barrier creams and special powders.

(2) Whenever special public health measures or the protection of workers' health necessitate the wearing of protective clothing and other individual protective equipment or devices at work, this clothing and equipment should be supplied, cleaned and maintained at the employer's expense.

XVIII. NOISE AND VIBRATION

47. Appropriate measures should be taken to reduce, as far as possible, noise (including
sound emissions) and vibrations likely to have harmful effects on individuals, particular attention being paid—

(a) to the substantial reduction of noise and vibrations caused by machinery and sound-producing equipment and devices;
(b) to the reduction of intensity and duration of sound emissions, including musical emissions; and
(c) to the provision of sound-insulating equipment where appropriate to keep the noise of workshops, elevators, conveyors or the street away from offices.

48. If the measures referred to in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of Point 47 are insufficient to eliminate nervous fatigue which causes medically recognisable disorders—

(a) workers should be supplied with suitable ear protectors when they are exposed to sound emissions likely to produce harmful effects;
(b) regular breaks in sound-insulated premises should be granted to workers when they are exposed to sound emissions likely to produce harmful effects on them;
(c) systems of work distribution and rotation should be applied wherever possible.

XIX. EXCESSIVE PACE OF WORK

49. (1) Appropriate measures should be taken to ensure that the mechanisation of operations or methods of accelerating them do not impose a work rate likely to produce harmful effects on workers—in particular, physical fatigue or nervous fatigue which causes medically recognisable disorders—because of the concentrated attention or rapid movements required.

(2) A minimum age for employment on operations dealt with in paragraph (1) should be laid down by the competent authority, when the conditions of work make it necessary.

50. In order to prevent harmful effects or to limit them to the greatest possible extent, there should be either breaks or, where possible, systems of work distribution or rotation of jobs.

XX. FIRST AID

51. Every establishment, institution or administrative service to which the Recommendation applies should possess, depending on its size and the possible risk, a dispensary or first-aid post either on its own or shared with other establishments, institutions or administrative services, or should have one or more first-aid cupboards, boxes or kits.

52. (1) The composition of the equipment of the dispensaries, and first-aid posts, cupboards, boxes or kits referred to in Point 51 above should be determined by the competent authority having regard to the size of the staff and the nature of the risks.

(2) The contents of first-aid cupboards, boxes or kits should be checked at least once every month, and these cupboards or boxes should be restocked at such times or, where necessary, immediately after use.

(3) Each first-aid cupboard, box or kit should contain simple, straightforward instructions regarding the treatment to be given in emergency cases.

53. Dispensaries and first-aid posts, cupboards, boxes or kits should at all times be readily accessible and should be under the charge of a designated person able, by standards acceptable to the competent authority, to give first aid.

XXI. PLANNING

54. The plans of new buildings designed for use as establishments, institutions and administrative services to which the Recommendation applies, and of new installations designed for use as establishments, institutions and administrative services to which the Recommendation applies in existing buildings where substantial alterations are to be made, should conform fully to the provisions of the Recommendation and should, in cases prescribed by national laws or regulations, be submitted for prior approval to the competent authority.

55. The plans should contain a minimum of information concerning, in particular—

(a) the layout of the workplaces, movement areas, exits and sanitary facilities;
(b) the dimensions of the workplaces and of emergency exits, doors and windows, with details of the height of the window sills;
(c) the type of floor;
(d) machinery and installations which may emit heat, vapour, gases, odours, light or noise in quantities likely to affect adversely the health, safety or comfort of workers, together with the measures proposed to combat such agents;
(e) the type of heating and lighting used;
(f) any mechanical ventilation equipment;
(g) any sound-proofing measures.

56. The competent authority should grant reasonable time limits for any changes that it might require in order to make establishments, institutions and administrative services to which the Recommendation applies conform to the provisions of the Recommendation.

XXII. MEASURES AGAINST THE SPREAD OF DISEASES

57. Measures should be taken to prevent the spread of contagious and endemic diseases among persons working in the same establishment, institution or administrative service and between the public and the workers. Such measures should include, in particular—

(a) collective or individual technical and medical preventive measures, including the prevention of infectious diseases and action against insects, rodents and other noxious animals;
(b) medical supervisory measures.
XXIII. INSTRUCTION IN HYGIENE MEASURES

58. Concerted measures should be taken to give workers and employers the necessary elementary understanding of the hygiene measures the workers may be required to take during working hours.

59. (1) The workers should be informed in particular of—
   (a) the health risks inherent in certain harmful substances which the worker may be required to handle, manipulate or employ, even if these products are little used in the shop or office concerned;
   (b) their obligation to make good use of the devices and equipment provided for their protection;
   (c) their obligation to refrain from obstructing passages leading to exits, and access to extinguishers and other safety equipment.

(2) If full information on hygiene cannot be given in one of the languages understood by workers, they should at least be informed in those languages of the meaning of important terms and expressions.

XXIV. COLLABORATION IN THE FIELD OF HYGIENE

60. (1) The competent authority, employers and workers should establish mutual contacts, in order to ensure the hygiene of workers in connection with their work.

(2) The competent authority, in giving effect to the provisions of the Recommendation, should consult with representatives of employers and workers.

61. (1) The competent authority should encourage and, if necessary, itself undertake the study of any measures designed to ensure the hygiene of workers in connection with their work.

(2) The competent authority should give wide circulation to any documentation on means of ensuring the hygiene of workers in connection with their work.

(3) Full information, advice and counsel on all subjects dealt with in this Recommendation should be available from the competent authority.

62. (1) In establishments, institutions or administrative services employing more than a number of persons to be fixed by the competent authority having regard to the possible degree of risk, there should be at least one hygiene delegate or official.

(2) Hygiene delegates or officials should cooperate closely with employers and workers in eliminating risks to workers' health and to this end should, in particular, keep in touch with employers' and workers' representatives.

(3) In establishments, institutions or administrative services employing more than a number of persons to be fixed by the competent authority having regard to the possible degree of risk, a hygiene committee should be set up.

(4) Hygiene committees should endeavour, in particular, to eliminate risks to health of workers.

63. The competent authority, in collaboration with employers and workers, should carry out investigations, in a manner to be determined by the competent authority, with a view to assembling information regarding diseases likely to arise from work and with a view to instituting measures to eliminate the causes and conditions which provoke these diseases.

XXV. MISCELLANEOUS

64. As far as possible, floors should be so covered as not to present any health risk.

65. Adequate means of escape in case of fire should be provided and maintained.

XXVI. ENFORCEMENT

66. Appropriate measures should be taken to ensure the proper application of regulations or provisions concerning hygiene in establishments, institutions or administrative services to which the Recommendation applies, by means of adequate inspection or otherwise.

67. Where it is appropriate to the manner in which effect is given to the Recommendation, the necessary measures in the form of penalties should be taken to ensure the enforcement of its provisions.

Provisions for Inclusion in a Convention

XXVII. OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES

68. Except in cases in which the competent authority deems it necessary to make exceptions, the provisions of the Convention should apply to trading establishments or trading branches of other establishments, and to establishments, institutions or administrative services in which the persons employed are mainly engaged in office work or branches of establishments in which the persons employed are so engaged.

69. Each Member which ratifies the Convention should undertake that it will maintain in force laws or regulations—

(a) which ensure the application of the General Principles set forth in Part XXVIII; and

(b) in virtue of which an appropriate authority has power to make regulations for the purpose of giving such effect as may be possible and desirable under national conditions to the provisions of, or provisions equivalent to the provisions of, the Recommendation concerning hygiene in commerce and offices.

70. The laws including regulations under Point 69 (b) should be framed after consultation with the organisations of employers and workers concerned, where such exist.
71. Appropriate measures should be taken, by means of adequate inspection or otherwise, to ensure the proper application of the laws, including regulations under Point 69 (b).

72. Where it is appropriate to the manner in which effect is given to the Convention, the necessary measures in the form of penalties should be taken to ensure the enforcement of the laws, including regulations under Point 69 (b).

XXVIII. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

73. The premises of establishments, institutions or administrative services to which the Convention applies should be properly maintained and kept clean.

74. Such premises should have natural or artificial ventilation, or both, supplying fresh or purified air.

75. Such premises should have adequate and suitable lighting.

76. As comfortable and even a temperature as circumstances permit should be maintained in such premises.

77. An adequate supply of wholesome drinking water or other wholesome drink should be made available to workers.

78. Seats should be supplied for workers and they should be given reasonable opportunities of using them.

79. Facilities for changing, leaving and drying clothing which is not worn at work should be provided and properly maintained.

80. Sufficient and suitable washing facilities and sanitary conveniences should be provided and properly maintained.

81. Underground or windowless premises in which work is normally performed should comply with appropriate standards of hygiene.

82. Workers should be protected against substances, processes and techniques which may be obnoxious, unhealthy or toxic or for any reason injurious by appropriate and practicable measures.

83. Noise and vibrations likely to have harmful effects on workers should be reduced as far as possible by appropriate and practicable measures.

84. Every establishment, institution or administrative service to which the Convention applies should, having regard to its size and the possible risk, possess a dispensary or first-aid post, individually or jointly with other establishments, institutions or administrative services, or one or more first-aid cupboards, boxes or kits.

85. The plans of new buildings designed for use as establishments, institutions and administrative services to which the Convention applies, and of new installations designed for use as establishments, institutions or administrative services to which the Convention applies and affecting the main structure of existing buildings, should conform fully to the provisions of the Convention.

(4) Text of the Resolution concerning the Placing on the Agenda of the Next Ordinary Session of the Conference of the Question of Hygiene in Commerce and Offices, Submitted by the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices.¹

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having adopted the report of the Committee appointed to consider the sixth item on the agenda, and

Having in particular approved as general conclusions, with a view to the consultation of governments, proposals for a Convention and a Recommendation relating to hygiene in commerce and offices;

Decides that the item entitled "Hygiene in Commerce and Offices" shall be included in the Agenda of its next Ordinary Session, with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a Recommendation.

Seventh Item on the Agenda: Benefits in Case of Employment Accidents and Occupational Diseases

(1) Text of the Proposed Conclusions, Prepared by the International Labour Office.

(This text is given in Report VII (2), prepared by the International Labour Office for the 47th Session of the Conference.)

(2) Report of the Committee on Social Security.¹

1. The Committee on Social Security was established by the Conference at its third sitting, on 6 June 1963, on the recommendation of the Selection Committee. At the outset it comprised 141 members: 66 Government members, 30 Employers' members and 45 Workers' members. The Committee held 21 sittings. In accordance with the usual practice, a system of weighting was applied to maintain the equality of voting strength among the three groups. To this end, each Government member had 15 votes, each Employers' member 33 votes and each Workers' member 22 votes. At the fifth sitting, two voting Employers' members were added to the list of members of the Committee in accordance with a decision of the Appeals Board, thereby raising the number of members of the Committee to 143. Thereafter, in order to maintain equality of voting strength, each Government member had 240 votes, each Employers' member 495 votes and each Workers' member 352 votes. In view of the change in the composition of the Committee, the spokesman for the Employers' group said that any declaration that he would subsequently make to the Committee on behalf of his group would be made in the name only of the Employers' members who were included in the voting section prior to the decision of the Appeals Board. One of the new Employers' members stated in reply that he and the other new member were full members of the Committee, that he intended to co-operate in the work of the Committee and, in this spirit, would cast his vote and speak on his own behalf.

2. The Committee appointed its officers as follows:

Chairman : Mr. Torres Cereceda, Government member, Chile.

Vice-Chairmen : Mr. Doherty, Employers' member, United States; Mr. Weissenberg, Workers' member, Austria.

Reporter : Mr. Juhl-Christensen, Government member, Denmark.

3. The Drafting Committee was composed of: Mr. Webb, Government member, Australia; Mrs. Seeuws, Employers' member, France; Mr. Mario, Workers' member, France; and Mr. Juhl-Christensen, Reporter of the Committee.

4. At its ninth sitting the Committee set up a subcommittee to examine the list of occupational diseases annexed to the Proposed Conclusions in Report VII (2) and to propose amendments to the Committee. The subcommittee comprised Government members of Cameroon, Chile, France, Italy, Turkey and the United Arab Republic, four Employers' members and four Workers' members.

Introduction

5. The consideration by the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference and by its Committee on Social Security of the question of "Benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases" represents the first in a series of examinations to be undertaken by the Conference of different branches of social security, each of which forms the subject of one or more of the international labour Conventions that were adopted before the Second World War.

6. The suggestion that these pre-war instruments be reviewed originated with the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations which, in evaluating the practical implementation of these Conventions following ratification and in examining the obstacles arising in this connection, came to the conclusion that modern developments in the field of social security were rendering these pre-war instruments obsolete. The Committee therefore recommended to the Governing Body that it seek advice on this matter from the I.L.O. Committee of Social Security Experts.

7. The Committee of Social Security Experts was therefore asked to undertake an examination of the pre-war Conventions concerned, including, in the field of employment injury insurance, the Workmen's Compensation (Accidents) Convention, 1925 (No. 17), the Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention, 1925 (No. 18), and the Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention (Revised), 1934 (No. 42), with particular reference to the provisions of the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102).
The Committee of Social Security Experts, at its meeting in 1959, found that these pre-war Conventions no longer corresponded to the concepts and practices of social security that had evolved since their adoption. It recommended that the Conventions dealing with employment injuries (including the Workmen's Compensation (Agriculture) Convention, 1921 (No. 12), with those mentioned above) should be "substantially altered to meet existing conditions" and that Convention No. 42 should be remodelled and made part of a general instrument dealing with the compensation of occupational risks.

The Governing Body favoured early action to implement these recommendations. Consequently, at its 150th Session (November 1961), it decided to place this item on the agenda of the 47th (1962) Session of the International Labour Conference.

General Discussion

10. The Committee, by unanimous agreement of its members, took as a basis for its discussion Report VII (2), prepared by the Office for submission to the 47th Session of the Conference. It also noted the findings and recommendations embodied in a report made by the Committee of Social Security Experts in 1962 on "Principles of international instruments concerning benefits in case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases", and in a resolution concerning employment injury benefits, adopted by the Committee on Conditions of Work in the Fishing Industry at its meeting in December 1962.

11. It was the unanimous opinion of the members of the Committee that consideration of this subject was important and timely. A number of members, particularly Government members, expressed the opinion that, in order to achieve the greatest possible degree of usefulness to Members at different stages of development and with different systems of providing employment injury benefits and/or social security, any new Convention should permit of considerable flexibility and should dispense with all unnecessary detail.

12. In particular, some Government members having stated that their countries had abandoned or were in the process of abandoning their special schemes of employment injury insurance in favour of general schemes of very broad coverage and providing benefits in a large number of contingencies, regardless of their origin, whether occupational or otherwise, called attention to the fact that this transition, even though in general highly beneficial for all those protected under the revised schemes, may, in some less important respects, involve a departure from previously accepted practices. Care should be taken not to jeopardize ratification of the new instrument by such Members by encumbering it with unduly specific requirements as to the nature of the benefits to be provided.

13. The Committee was of the opinion that the instrument should be so conceived that every country would be free to choose the systems and methods which it deemed best, on condition that the benefits guaranteed by its laws and regulations attained the level and extent prescribed by the instrument.

14. A further consideration, which was generally appreciated and accepted in support of such flexibility, was the special position of developing countries.

15. Yet another reason adduced by a Government member was the special situation of federal States which, by virtue of the fact that the relevant legislative responsibility as well as the powers of enforcement belonged to their constituent units rather than to the central government, encompassed a considerable variety of systems.

Examination of the Proposed Conclusions

I. FORM OF THE INSTRUMENTS

Point 1.

16. Arguing that the effectiveness of any international instrument was ultimately dependent upon national action to implement its provisions, the Employers' members proposed that the Committee abandon the idea of drafting a new Convention and, instead, concentrate all its efforts on the drafting of a truly comprehensive and progressive Recommendation, which could offer States at all stages of development appropriate guidance and could indicate for each State a path of sustained progress through the gradual attainment of ever higher standards of achievement. In support of this view, reference was made to the Report of the Director-General, in particular Chapter VIII.

17. In contrast to this view of the optimum role of a new instrument, other members, in particular the Workers' members, expressed the view that only an international Convention could be expected to exercise the moral pressure which past experience had shown to be necessary to produce significant state action on a wide scale. Nevertheless, taking account of political realities, some of the members subscribing to this view conceded that the content of any new Convention might usefully be limited to general tenets and basic principles while special provisions and technical details could be elaborated in a Recommendation supplementing the Convention.

18. An extensive discussion followed, in which the great majority of Government members took the position that the drafting and adoption of a new Convention were essential for the achievement of the purposes which the new international instrument was to serve, and that the pre-war Conventions Nos. 12, 17, 18 and 42 should be revised. An amendment submitted by the Employers' members, which proposed the adoption of a new Recommendation, but not of a Convention, was defeated by 921 votes in favour, 1,738 against, with 48 abstentions. Accordingly, Point 1 of the Proposed Conclusions, calling for two instruments—a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation—was adopted.

In line with the comments referred to, the Convention should cover general principles and essential requirements while the Recommendation should set
further advanced standards to which Members could refer in their efforts to perfect national legislation and from which they could derive inspiration and guidance.

II. CONVENTION

Point 2.

19. Pointing to the ever-present and ubiquitous risk of employment injury (this term being used to designate both industrial accidents and occupational diseases) in modern economic activities of any kind, the Workers' members moved the deletion of the proposed provisions authorising member States to exempt certain specified occupations from the coverage of the Convention. Any other course, they felt, would constitute discrimination.

20. Some Government members referred to the differences in working conditions of seafarers, which made special regulations on their behalf essential. They recalled to the Committee that special rules already existed under various national laws concerning social security for seafarers. They pointed out that the normal procedure was for the Joint Maritime Commission of the I.L.O. to deal with matters pertaining to seafarers, a procedure which could also be followed in the present case.

21. As regards the possibility of excepting agricultural workers from the application of the Convention, a number of Government members underlined the importance of these workers being covered against the risks in question but added that practical considerations might make it difficult to extend coverage to them at the same time or on exactly the same terms as to non-agricultural workers. Some Government members from developing countries considered that any attempt to eliminate the possibility of excluding agricultural workers from the application of the Convention would be tantamount, at least for some time to come, to preventing its ratification by such countries.

22. Other Government members, both from economically developed and from developing countries, countered the arguments in favour of leaving open the possibility of excepting either agricultural occupations or seafaring; they considered that the exclusion of agricultural workers or seafarers from the scope of the instrument was inequitable and outdated. Even if the Convention did not allow the exclusion of agricultural workers or seafarers it would not require that they should be covered by the same scheme as other workers. To the extent to which agricultural workers were independent (i.e. self-employed) — a large sector of the agricultural population of developing countries—the feasibility of coverage seemed doubtful to some members, but they pointed out that the Convention would not apply to the self-employed.

23. The Employers' members expressed strong opposition to the amendment submitted by the Workers' members and supported Point 2 as drafted in the Proposed Conclusions, i.e. as a basis for authorising, but by no means compelling, the exception from the application of the Convention of the occupations referred to.

24. It was decided to vote separately on the Workers' members' amendment with reference to subparagraph (a) and subparagraph (b) respectively of Point 2. On subparagraph (a) the vote was 1,473 in favour, 1,179 against, with 60 abstentions; and on subparagraph (b) it was 1,413 in favour, 1,134 against, with 135 abstentions. Consequently both subparagraphs were deleted from the Proposed Conclusions. Certain other amendments proposed by Government members to underline the temporary character of any exception under this Point were, therefore, not put to a vote.

Point 3.

25. Proposals to delete or to amend this Point of the Proposed Conclusions followed the pattern of those submitted in respect of Point 2. Arguments in support of the Proposed Conclusion on this Point, either in the form proposed or in a modified form, as well as the reasons given in favour of deleting the Point, followed similar lines. On the one hand, mention was made of the compelling and universal need of workers for protection in cases of occupational diseases; while, on the other hand, the practical difficulties standing in the way of implementing a general obligation of this sort, particularly in developing countries, were pointed out.

26. While the Workers' members had submitted an amendment to remove all possibility of excepting occupational diseases from the application of the Convention, some Government members sought by means of more limited amendments to afford developing countries a certain period of time before incurring the obligation to implement the occupational diseases provisions of the Convention. Other Government members felt, however, that new industrial processes, in particular the peaceful uses of atomic energy, permitted of no delay in extending such coverage. Other Government members, however, maintained that developing countries would have sufficient flexibility to adjust to the problems of providing coverage against occupational diseases if Point 4 of the Proposed Conclusions as drafted by the Office were adopted, particularly if the more detailed provisions pertaining to occupational diseases in later points of the Convention were simplified.

27. The Employers' members, while agreeing that, in principle, equal protection was necessary in respect of occupational diseases and industrial accidents, remained neutral on the question of whether or not to permit a universal, although temporary, exception. They considered that this question should be decided primarily by the Government members, since it would be for governments to implement the provisions adopted. This position was reflected in the result of the vote, which was 25,275 in favour, 2,880 against, with 12,345 abstentions. Point 3, like Point 2, was thus deleted from the Proposed Conclusions, as the other, less far-reaching, amendments were deemed to be no longer relevant.
Point 4.

28. The opinions voiced on this Point indicated beyond doubt that ratification by developing countries would need to be facilitated in many respects regarding compliance with certain requirements arising out of the obligations imposed by the Convention. The issue was whether temporary exceptions granted in respect of such countries should contain some limiting provision which would expedite full application. One approach suggested by a Government member was to limit exceptions to a definite period, e.g. five years. An alternative approach, incorporated in an amendment submitted by the Workers' members, was to stipulate that such governments, while not subject to any definite time limit—as the period of time required may vary according to national circumstances—must periodically demonstrate beyond doubt that ratification by developing countries would need to be facilitated to national circumstances—must periodically show not only “if” (as was provided in the Office draft) but “why” they had continued need to avail themselves of any special provisions.

29. The Employers' members also expressed the view that flexibility stopped being a virtue where it deprived a commitment of taking effect at a foreseeable point in time. Thus they suggested that the present report should explain the meaning which the Committee wished to attach to the term “temporary” appearing in this connection.

30. This proposal was favourably received and the sole amendment remaining to be voted on at the end of the discussion on this Point was adopted with this understanding. The vote was 41,280 in favour, 1,920 against, with 960 abstentions.

31. It is the intention of the Committee that the term “temporary” should be understood as affording to a developing country sufficient time in each individual case to develop the necessary premises for full compliance, by means of a sustained effort as evidenced by the growing allocation of national resources. To this end it would be desirable to explore the possibility of developing appropriate yardsticks with the help of which such evidence can be presented in quantitative terms and can be evaluated objectively.

Point 5.

32. The reference to Points 2 and 3 in the present Point were now irrelevant. Apart from these deletions, Point 5 was considered to be unanimously adopted since the proposed amendments pertained only to the deleted sections.

A. Persons to Be Protected

Point 6.

33. As this Point introduced that portion of the Convention dealing with the scope thereof, the fundamental question to be decided was whether, as a general principle, the Convention should apply to all persons in remunerated employment, i.e. all persons doing paid work and not being self-employed, or whether, in the interest of greater flexibility, its scope should be confined to a sizeable portion of the gainfully employed population.

34. The issue was broached by an amendment proposed by a Government member, whereby ratification would be open to member States protecting at least 50 per cent. of all employees. This percentage, according to one Government member supporting the amendment, might be considered as the absolute minimum, since anything less would fall below the standard provided for in Convention No. 102. After some discussion the author of the amendment associated himself with a subamendment whereby the percentage in question was raised to 75.

35. The reactions of the Workers' members and the Employers' members to this proposal were different. The Workers' members held that, just as there was no employment that did not entail a certain risk of incurring an employment injury, so there should not be any employment that did not carry with it protection against this risk. If a limitation were to be considered unavoidable, however, it should not be couched in terms of a mere percentage but should specifically enumerate those categories of workers in respect of which exceptions might be made.

36. The Employers' members did not deny the desirability of protecting all employees against employment injury risk. In fact, they moved an amendment to assure that neither the nature of the employing enterprise nor its status under national law should be allowed to interfere with the protection of its employees under the Convention and that persons employed in both the public and private sectors and in co-operatives should be covered. This was adopted by 19,155 votes in favour, 1,935 against, with 18,766 abstentions, being designated Point 6bis.

37. The Employers' members maintained that 100 per cent. coverage could not be achieved even in the most advanced countries. To make this ultimate goal a prerequisite in the Convention was, in their opinion, sure way of virtually precluding its ratification. Employers’ members would, on the contrary, leave it to member States to prescribe the categories of workers to be covered, without stipulating that their number make up any particular percentage of the total. An amendment to this effect, sponsored by the Employers' members, was, however, rejected by a record vote of 17,955 votes in favour, 21,855 against, with 1,440 abstentions.

38. With respect to the alternative formula, permitting exceptions of prescribed categories of employees while assuring coverage of substantial numbers, a Government member moved that the Convention should require 75 per cent. of all workers to be covered; he expressed the view that, if this percentage were adopted, the exceptions provided for in Point 8 could be deleted. Other Government members observed that Point 6 might well be left to state the principle of universal coverage—as it did in the Office text—while the exemptions might be enumerated in Point 8. This solution was ultimately adopted, the proposed amendment being rejected by 17,558 votes in favour, 19,558 against, with 1,455 abstentions.
39. In respect of the categories of survivors to be protected in case of the worker's death due to an employment injury, three different amendments to the Office text had been moved. One aimed at deleting the obligation to provide benefits for a dependent widower, as some national laws do not provide such a benefit. Another, on the contrary, was aimed at requiring that benefits be payable for a surviving spouse, without any further eligibility condition. In support of this position, it was agreed that out-dated and discriminatory distinctions based on sex ought not to be perpetuated; also, the proposed solution would prevent drastic cuts in family income due to the death of a working mother. Both amendments were sponsored by Government members. The Employers' members desired that Members should be left free, in their national laws and regulations, to determine which surviving dependants should be entitled to benefit, so as to accommodate countries with different family patterns. This was the solution adopted, by 20,100 votes in favour, 17,102 against, with 960 abstentions. The second part of Point 6 was accordingly amended.

Point 7.

40. The Employers' members and some Government members were critical of this Point, on the ground that a Convention setting standards for employed persons should not be encumbered with the permissive coverage of certain categories of self-employed persons. An Employers' members' motion to delete the Point was, however, rejected by 16,290 votes in favour, 22,478 against, with 2,400 abstentions. It was made clear that the Point would not in any way compel a Member to extend such coverage to any category of self-employed persons.

Point 8.

41. The Committee unanimously decided to amend the first line to enable even persons in the categories excepted in accordance with the provisions of the Convention to enjoy some protection, although such protection need not meet the standards set out in the instrument.

42. A second change was designed to add flexibility within limits that would not impair the provisions of Points 6 and 6bis for essential universal coverage. Some members felt that to the three categories enumerated in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) might be added some other categories of employees. The need for such a provision became evident from the numerous and different "special cases" that were cited by various members in respect of which coverage could not readily be effected, such as members of the armed forces, civil servants, domestic workers, etc. While it seemed clear that civil servants were included pursuant to Points 6 and 6bis, and members of the armed forces generally were not (in contrast to civilian personnel employed by the armed forces who, clearly, would be), a Government member submitted an amendment to permit the exception of a further 10 per cent. of employees, not including the categories specified. This amendment was rejected by a record vote of 19,650 in favour, 21,390 against, with 1,440 abstentions. As an alternative, some members favoured authorisation to except other groups of employees provided that the total number of employees excepted, including any enumerated in subparagraphs (a) to (c), did not exceed 10 per cent. of all employees. The amendment to this effect submitted by two Government members was adopted by 23,790 votes in favour, 16,020 against, with 1,440 abstentions, and Point 8 was thus adopted as amended.

43. Subparagraph (c) of Point 8, although not amended, was reworded to make it clear that the family workers referred to therein were excepted from coverage under the Convention only in respect of work they were doing for the family member in whose house they lived, but not in respect of paid work that they might be performing in the service of any other employer.

Point 9.

44. On this Point the Committee felt that the Office draft would cause or contribute to discriminatory treatment of persons employed in small firms. The Employers' members considered that the concept incorporated in the Office text was needed to provide flexibility for developing countries. A Government member thought that the exclusion should bear some relationship to the risk involved in the work, rather than to the size of the establishment. For this reason he moved that the term "industrial undertakings" be substituted for "workplaces employing 20 persons or more". The categories excluded should come under the commercial or agricultural sectors of the economy, and should not comprise persons working in factories, mines, quarries, railways, docks or similar establishments. This amendment was adopted by 20,651 votes in favour, 3,450 against, with 13,500 abstentions. As a result, a number of other amendments submitted on this Point were superseded and Point 9 was carried as amended.

B. Contingencies to Be Covered

Point 10.

45. This Point was adopted as formulated in the draft prepared by the Office, with two drafting changes, one to clarify that the contingencies referred to must have arisen from an industrial accident or occupational disease, the other to bring subparagraph (d) into conformity with the change adopted in amending Point 6.

46. The Committee considered it desirable to clarify that the term "loss of faculty", which has been translated in the French version as "perte . . . de l'intégrité physique", is to be understood as inclusive of any loss or diminution suffered in mental capacity. It was not considered necessary, therefore, to change the wording.

47. A further question of interpretation was raised in respect of the words "likely to be permanent". As is clearly apparent from subparagraph (b) in Point 16, cash benefits are to
be provided in case of temporary or initial incapacity, i.e. whether or not such incapacity is likely to be permanent. In Point 10, however, conditions of disablement other than those referred to in subparagraph (c) have been included under subparagraph (b). The case of a non-permanent reduction in earnings is covered under subparagraph (b) of Point 16 and entitles the injured person to cash benefits, on condition that the loss exceeds a prescribed degree. In view of the fact that the wording of both these Points follows verbatim the wording of Convention No. 102, no change in subparagraph (c) was thought necessary.

Point 11.

48. Point 11 was amended to require member States to include in their annual reports the essential points of any important judicial interpretations bearing on the definition of "industrial accident", which may have been handed down during the period being reported on. Some members considered this necessary in view of the fact that in some countries statutory definitions of this term are lacking or are very general in nature. Consequently, its scope and meaning depend on judicial interpretation. To avoid, however, placing an undue burden on ratifying member States in the matter of reports this requirement is to include only a summary of the leading court cases.

Points 12 and 13.

49. These two Points of the Proposed Convention as parsed by the Office were amalgamated, added emphasis being placed on the obligation on Members to regard, under prescribed conditions, the diseases listed in the Appendix to the Convention as occupational diseases, irrespective of whether the national system is based on a general definition of "occupational disease" or on a schedule of occupational diseases or a combination of both methods. The intended scope and implications of this proviso are discussed in greater detail in the report of the subcommittee which is annexed hereto. The amendment revising Points 12 and 13 was proposed by a Government member, subamended by another Government member, and was adopted by 29,546 votes in favour, 290 against, with 3,660 abstentions.

Point 14.

50. This Point was adopted with only such changes in wording as were necessary to bring it into line with the change made in the corresponding passage of Point 9, as amended.

Point 15.

51. The discussion of this Point was focused on the desirability of having different lists of occupational diseases, one for the States ratifying before a change in the list, the other for those States ratifying after the adoption of a change. The Committee recognised, however, that, unless this list remained unchanged until every State had ratified the Convention, different standards would exist. Since the solution proposed by the Office facilitated the adaptation of the list, whenever necessary, to developments in industrial techniques and to progress in diagnostic and therapeutic methods, the Point was adopted without change.

C. Benefits to Be Provided

Point 16.

52. This Point, which follows the wording of Convention 102, was adopted without change.

Point 17.

53. At the instance of the Workers' members, a change was made in subparagraph (b) to give greater emphasis to the primary aim of the vocational rehabilitation of employment injury victims, namely to enable them to resume their former gainful activity. The Employers' members maintained that subparagraph (a), dealing with the prevention of industrial accidents and occupational diseases, did not properly belong in a Convention concerning benefits. A further specification was added to underscore that, in cases where it is impossible to fit injured persons for their former occupations, the vocational rehabilitation effort should be aimed at developing their residual capacity with a view to enabling them to exercise such other gainful activity as most closely approximates to the previous one. This change was adopted unanimously.

Point 18.

54. Only one of several amendments was adopted: it adds to the types of medical and allied care to be provided the obligation to furnish, wherever possible at the place of work, emergency treatment in serious accidents as well as follow-up treatment, such as the application of disinfectants, application and renewal of dressings. Its author, a Government member, considered this as merely giving expression to a long-standing and widely established practice, followed in the interests of preventing any avoidable aggravation in the condition of the injured worker. The Employers' members opposed the amendment in so far as the follow-up treatment must necessarily be provided at the place of work, since better care could be furnished in centres specially equipped for the purpose. The amendment was adopted by a vote of 18,109 in favour, 14,905 against, with 2,430 abstentions.

55. Other amendments submitted by Employers' and Government members pertained to the meaning and scope of one or more of the types of care already enumerated in Point 18, as drafted by the Office. These amendments were withdrawn when it was stated that under the proposed Convention, as under Convention No. 102 on which this enumeration of services was modelled, each member State would be left free to prescribe the conditions subject to which the respective services were to be provided.

Point 19.

56. Discussion on this Point involved the ability of certain member States with limited medical manpower to provide for domiciliary...
visiting by doctors; also the question was raised whether—even if possible—such employment of the time of a limited number of doctors might not be uneconomical. Moved and seconded by two Government members, an amendment to exclude this obligation from the enumeration of services in subparagraph (a) was supported by Employers' members as a mere acknowledgment of existing limitations in medical care facilities and personnel which are common to all developing countries. The Workers' members opposed the amendment on the ground that victims who cannot leave their homes should not be left without proper professional care. The amendment was rejected by 13,530 in favour, 15,230 votes against, with 3,855 abstentions. Point 19 was consequently adopted without modification.

**Point 20.**

57. The Workers' members thought it desirable that this Point should set out more clearly the priorities in the aims to be pursued in rendering the services in question—the first priority being the restoration of the injured worker's health. They further desired that the Convention should be specific in providing that every reasonable effort should be made to put at the disposal of the injured worker such care as might be medically indicated. An amendment to this effect was adopted by 32,231 votes in favour, none against, with 1,455 abstentions.

58. A further amendment submitted by the Workers' members was unanimously adopted. It provided that the mere improvement of the injured worker's health should be acceptable as the objective of the medical treatment only where full restoration of his health proved impossible.

**Point 21.**

59. The Workers' group feared that the provisions of this Point might adversely affect the quality and quantity of medical care given to employment injury victims, but no amendment had been proposed. The Point was adopted without change.

60. A Government member stated that in his country medical care benefits were being provided by a system of reimbursement. Under this method, it was necessary to place certain ceilings on reimbursable expenses and he submitted an amendment in order to allow such limitations. Workers' members and some Government members opposed the amendment on the ground that it might lower the level of medical care. On the suggestion of a Government member, the amendment was subamended so as to assure that the standards set in Point 20 as amended would not be impaired. The amendment as subamended was adopted by 21,968 votes in favour, 4,109 against, with no abstentions. A new Point 21bis was thus added.

**Point 22.**

61. The Workers' members opposed non-payment of cash benefits during any initial period of incapacity, and moved the deletion of this Point. The Employers' members and a Government member felt that countries now stipulating a waiting period should not be obliged to abandon the practice. Other Government members supported the amendment as they considered a waiting period unnecessary in the case of an employment injury. The amendment was adopted by 14,414 votes in favour, 11,790 against, with 3,150 abstentions. Point 22 was thus deleted.

62. An amendment was moved by the Employers' members to permit the developing countries not to pay benefits for the first six days of incapacity for work in the case of agricultural workers. After some discussion they decided to withdraw this amendment.

**Point 23.**

63. This Point was adopted without amendment.

**Point 24.**

64. The Employers' members moved that in place of this and the following Point a single Point be inserted to allow Members to pay either periodical benefits or lump sums for loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty. The amendment was rejected by a vote of 11,370 in favour, 17,034 against, with 1,440 abstentions. Point 24 was thus adopted without modification.

**Point 25.**

65. The Workers' members moved that this Point be amended to permit conversion of periodical benefits to lump-sum payments only with the agreement of the injured person, and provided that the lump-sum payments represented the actuarial equivalent of the pension. The Government and Employers' members suggested that the payment of lump sums was sometimes in the workers' interest, e.g. when the disability was slight. Voted on in two parts, the condition that the injured person agree was approved by a vote of 15,374 in favour, 12,045 against, with 1,555 abstentions. The provision for the actuarial equivalent was likewise adopted by 16,686 votes in favour, 6,885 against, with 5,415 abstentions. Point 25 was thus adopted as amended.

**Point 26.**

66. This Point was adopted without change, as a Government members' amendment was withdrawn and a Workers' members' amendment, which aimed at providing that a disability rated at 20 per cent. should in any case be compensable, failed to obtain the necessary quorum.

**Point 27.**

67. Discussion of this Point centred on the lump-sum payment. The administrative costs of periodical payments in developing countries were cited and caused a Government member to withdraw a proposal for the deletion of subparagraph (b). The Workers' members presented an amendment composed of the same two phrases they had proposed in amending Point 25. In the present instance, however,
it was admitted that the condition of the agreement of the injured person did not apply to subparagraph (b) of Point 27. The amendment was adopted in principle and referred to the Drafting Committee.

**Point 28.**

68. This Point was adopted without amendment.

**Point 29.**

69. This Point was adopted without amendment.

**Point 30.**

70. Because of the comprehensive nature of this Point, its several subparagraphs were discussed separately and amendments were voted part by part. With regard to funeral benefits (subparagraph (a)), the issue was whether there was a compelling reason for such benefits to be paid. In respect of countries where funeral benefits were generally being paid, the question was raised whether to leave the amount to be determined by each Member, or to specify that it must cover minimum costs, or should exceed these. An amendment proposing that the obligation to provide a funeral benefit be deleted was submitted by Government members and was rejected by a record vote of 7,717 in favour, 13,007 against, with 8,692 abstentions. Another amendment, submitted by the Employers' members, to the effect that the rate of the funeral benefit be determined by each Member was rejected by 11,833 votes in favour, 14,655 against, with 1,680 abstentions. An amendment proposed by a Government member to leave the determination of the rate of funeral benefit to each Member, but on condition that it be not less than the normal cost of a funeral, was adopted by 13,471 votes in favour, 12,555 against, with 2,655 abstentions.

71. As regards subparagraph (b) the Workers' members felt that any widow, regardless of whether she was old, incapacitated for work or had children in her care, ought to be entitled to benefit on account of the loss she suffered in consequence of a fatal employment injury sustained by her husband. This contention was not shared by some Government members or by the Employers' members, on the ground that it went beyond social need. The general principle that widows should be paid a pension was approved by 12,965 votes in favour, 10,800 against, with 3,282 abstentions. In the discussion on the application of this principle and the exceptions to be provided, the Committee agreed unanimously that the provision for a periodical payment be limited to the case of a dependent widow.

72. The provision in subparagraph (d) for periodical payments to children of the deceased was broadened to include benefits for able-bodied children over the age of 15 but below an age prescribed by national laws and regulations who were apprentices or students. This change, proposed by a Government member, was carried by 14,064 votes in favour, 5,925 against, with 4,920 abstentions.

73. Subparagraph (e) was amended, on the proposal of a Government member, to leave the benefits for other dependants to be determined by national laws and regulations. This change was motivated by the desire to take account of differences in the schemes and in the conceptions of family membership in various countries. Point 30 was adopted as thus amended, the only paragraph remaining unchanged being subparagraph (e) providing a periodical payment for the disabled, dependent widower.

**Point 31.**

74. Pursuing the course taken in respect of the lump-sum payments provided for in Points 25 and 27, the Workers' members moved that the lump sums, which go in accordance with this Point may, in the case of developing countries, be paid in lieu of periodical payments, should correspond to the actuarial equivalent of the pension. However, as it was recognised that the computation of exact actuarial equivalents presents difficulties in such countries, the Workers' members stated that a reasonable approximation would be acceptable. This proposal was unanimously adopted.

**Point 32.**

75. This point was adopted without amendment.

**Point 33.**

76. The Workers' members stated their preference, as a matter of principle, for benefits related to earnings over flat-rate benefits. This statement was not to be understood as precluding such flat-rate benefits, but it was felt that flat-rate benefits might be better suited to contingencies other than employment injuries. An amendment to this effect submitted by the Workers' members was rejected by a record vote of 12,367 in favour, 13,980 against, with 1,440 abstentions. Point 33 was accordingly adopted without amendment.

**Point 34.**

77. This Point was adopted without amendment.

78. The Workers' spokesman stated that the percentages in the last column of the schedule of periodical payments to standard beneficiaries were too low, and therefore the Workers' members submitted an amendment to substitute 66⅔ per cent., 75 per cent. and 66⅔ per cent. respectively in the last column in the table. This amendment was rejected by 10,464 votes in favour, 11,520 against, with 1,935 abstentions. The schedule was therefore adopted without modification.

**Point 34bis.**

79. An amendment to insert in the Proposed Conclusions a new Point 34bis was moved by a Government member. In substance, the proposed new Point was closely connected with Point 30, in that the funeral benefits provided in subparagraph (a) were to be made payable subject to a means test, if the payments to sur-
vivors were substantially more favourable than stipulated in the Convention. The Workers' members declared their willingness to accept the proposal on condition that the reference to special conditions for entitlement substituted. This solution was accepted by the Committee.

Point 35.

80. The Employers' members, although in principle in favour of an adjustment of benefits to substantial changes in the cost of living or in the general level of wages, considered that the complexity of questions arising from such an adjustment called for a high degree of flexibility. They therefore felt that this Point should not be provided for in the Convention, but should be included in the Recommendation. The Workers' members and some of the Government members, however, maintained that the principle of adjustment of cash benefits to changes in the cost of living or the general level of wages should be embodied in the Convention. This was all the more justified since Convention No. 102 contained an appropriate provision applicable to employment injury benefits. The amendment submitted by the Employers' members was rejected by 14,550 votes in favour, 14,690 against, with 1,200 abstentions. Another amendment submitted by a Government member was referred to the Drafting Committee.

Points 36 to 57.

81. In respect of Points 36 to 57 of the Proposed Conclusions, some amendments were submitted by Government, Employers' and Workers' members. However, the Committee did not consider it possible to examine these amendments in detail at this stage, owing to lack of time. At the suggestion of the Employers' and Workers' members, it therefore adopted unanimously Points 36 to 57.

Examination of the Report of the Subcommittee

82. The report submitted by the Reporter of the subcommittee set up to examine the list of occupational diseases and which is annexed to this report, was unanimously approved by the Committee. The latter noted that the new wording of the right-hand column of the list guaranteed more complete protection of the workers. It was emphasised, however, that this did not preclude the possibility of each Member indicating in its national list the processes which definitely involved exposure to the hazard concerned.

83. The Committee recognised that the task of establishing a list of occupational diseases which took due account of the progress of medicine, technological advance, and the increase in the number of substances used, was difficult and very specialised. It would be greatly facilitated by a preliminary consultation with experts in this field. For this reason, the Committee unanimously proposed that the Governing Body examine the possibility of convening a meeting of experts on occupational diseases, whose conclusions would be very useful for the second discussion of this question.

84. The Workers' members expressed the wish that the experts should establish an exhaustive list of all occupational diseases at present known, some of which might only exist in certain countries. Members could then be required to include a certain number of these diseases in their national legislations, but with the freedom to choose those which they considered most appropriate in relation to the industries, processes and risks involved. This method would provide one answer to the virtual impossibility of including in a Convention a list of occupational diseases which would be binding on all, and at the same time meet the needs of each. This view was shared by some Government members.

Adoption of Two Resolutions

85. A Government member submitted a draft resolution emphasising the importance of the prevention of occupational hazards and requesting the Governing Body to examine the possibility of apprising the Conference of this question. After an exchange of views on the form that the resolution should take, it was adopted.

86. The Committee adopted unanimously a resolution concerning the inclusion in the agenda of the next Ordinary Session of the Conference of the question of benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases.

Adoption of the Report

87. The report was adopted unanimously by the Committee and is submitted to the Conference for adoption.


(Signed) I. TORRES CERECEDA, Chairman.

P. JUHL-CHRISTENSEN, Reporter.

(3) Text of the Proposed Conclusions 1 with a View to the Adoption of a Convention and a Supplementary Recommendation, Submitted by the Committee on Social Security. 2

I. FORM OF THE INSTRUMENTS

1. The instruments should be a Convention, supplemented by a Recommendation.

II. CONVENTION

2. (1) Members whose economic and medical facilities are insufficiently developed should be authorised to avail themselves by a declaration, with reasons, appended to the ratification, of the temporary exemptions provided for in specified Points of these conclusions.

---

1 See p. 628.

for doing so subsist.

3. The Convention should provide that Members who have made a declaration provided for in Point 2 may subsequently notify the Director-General of the International Labour Office that they renounce the right to avail themselves of exceptions previously applicable.

A. Persons to Be Protected

4. The Convention should specify that the employment injury benefit provisions of a Member shall protect all employees (including apprentices) and, in respect of death of the breadwinner, beneficiaries prescribed by national laws or regulations.

5. For the purposes of the Convention the term “employees” shall include persons employed in both the public and private sectors including co-operatives.

6. The Convention should provide further that these provisions shall also apply to such categories of self-employed persons as the Member ratifying the Convention may specify in a declaration appended to its ratification or submitted subsequent to ratification.

7. Exceptions or special provisions should be allowed in respect of—
   (a) persons whose employment is of a casual nature, employed otherwise than for the purpose of the employer’s trade or business;
   (b) out-workers;
   (c) members of the employer’s family living in his house, in respect of their work for him;
   (d) such other categories of employees as may be prescribed by national legislation: Provided that the total number of employees in respect of whom exceptions or special provisions are allowed under subparagraphs (a) to (d) of this Point shall not exceed 10 per cent. of all employees.

8. Where a declaration provided for in Point 2 is in force a Member may temporarily exclude one or more categories of employees specified in its instrument of ratification: Provided that no category of employee engaged in an industrial undertaking shall be excluded.

B. Contingencies to Be Covered

9. The Convention should cover the following contingencies where due to an employment injury:
   (a) any morbid condition;
   (b) incapacity for work resulting from such a condition and involving suspension of earnings, as defined by national laws or regulations;
   (c) total loss of earning capacity or partial loss thereof in excess of a prescribed degree, likely to be permanent, or corresponding loss of faculty; and
   (d) the loss of support suffered as a result of the death of the breadwinner, by beneficiaries prescribed by national laws and regulations.

10. The Convention should require that national laws or regulations shall define “industrial accident” and that each Member which ratifies it shall specify the terms of such definition, and summarise pertinent case law, in its annual reports made to the International Labour Office under article 22 of the Constitution.

11. Each Member should establish by national laws or regulations either a list of diseases which, when they are contracted under prescribed conditions by workers who have been exposed to a relevant risk, shall be regarded as occupational diseases, or a general definition of occupational diseases. Any such list should comprise at least the diseases enumerated in the Appendix to the Convention and any general definition shall be broad enough to cover all these diseases.

12. Where a declaration provided for in Point 2 is in force, coverage in respect of occupational diseases may be restricted to employees in industrial undertakings.

13. The Convention should provide that the Conference may, at any session at which the matter is put on its agenda, make changes in the Appendix thereto. These changes shall become binding in respect of Members already parties to the Convention when such Members notify the Director-General that they have accepted them. Unless expressly made optional by the Conference decision, the changes shall be binding on any Member which ratifies the Convention subsequently to the decision.

C. Benefits to Be Provided

14. The Convention should provide for the following benefits to be granted throughout the contingency:
   (a) medical and allied care in respect of a morbid condition;
   (b) cash benefits in respect of temporary or initial incapacity for work, continuing total loss of earning capacity or partial loss thereof in excess of a prescribed degree, likely to be permanent, or corresponding loss of faculty, or the death of the breadwinner.

15. The Convention should also require Members under prescribed conditions—
   (a) to take measures to prevent industrial accidents and occupational diseases;
   (b) to provide rehabilitation services which, wherever possible, should prepare a disabled person for the resumption of his previous activity, or, if this is not possible, the most nearly equivalent gainful activity;
   (c) to take measures to promote the re-employment of disabled persons.
16. Medical and allied care should comprise—
(a) general practitioner and specialist in-patient and out-patient care, including domiciliary visiting;
(b) dental care;
(c) nursing care at home or in hospital or other medical institutions;
(d) maintenance in hospitals, convalescent homes, sanatoria or other medical institutions;
(e) dental, pharmaceutical and other medical or surgical supplies, including prosthetic appliances kept in repair and renewed as necessary, and eyeglasses;
(f) the care furnished by members of such other professions as may at any time be legally recognised as allied to the medical profession, under the supervision of a medical or dental practitioner; and,
(g) wherever possible, emergency treatment at the place of work of injured persons sustaining a serious accident, and follow-up treatment of those whose injury is slight and does not entail discontinuance of work.

17. Where a declaration provided for in Point 2 is in force, medical and allied care should include at least—
(a) general practitioner care, including domiciliary visiting;
(b) specialist care at hospitals for in-patients and out-patients, and such specialist care as may be available outside hospitals;
(c) the essential pharmaceutical supplies as prescribed by a medical or other qualified practitioner; and
(d) hospitalisation under prescribed conditions.

18. The Convention should specify that medical care shall be afforded, using all suitable means, with a view to maintaining, restoring, or, where this is not possible, improving the health of the injured person and his ability to work and to attend to his personal needs.

19. The Convention should permit Members which provide medical and allied care by means of a general health scheme or a medical care scheme for employed persons to decide that such care be made available to persons who have sustained injuries resulting from employment on the same conditions as to other persons entitled thereto, on condition that the rules are so designed to avoid hardship.

20. Subject to the provisions of Point 18, Members which provide medical and allied care by reimbursing expenses incurred by an employee may prescribe special rules in respect of cases where the extent, duration or cost of such care exceeds reasonable limits, on condition that the rules are so designed as to avoid hardship.

21. Cash benefits should be payable in respect of continuing loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty in all cases where a total or significant partial loss remains at the expiration of the period during which benefits are payable by reason of temporary or initial incapacity for work.

22. Where the loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty is substantial, the cash benefit should take the form of a periodical payment for the duration of the loss.

23. In other cases of significant loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty, the cash benefits may, with the agreement of the injured person, take the form of a lump sum corresponding to the actuarial equivalent of the periodical payment.

24. National laws or regulations should prescribe the percentages of loss which are to be considered as “significant” and as “substantial” for the purpose of the application of Points 21, 22 and 23, subject to the rules being so designed as to avoid hardship.

25. The periodical payment provided for in Point 22 may be converted into a lump sum corresponding to its actuarial equivalent, under conditions prescribed by national laws or regulations, in the following instances:
(a) in exceptional circumstances, with the agreement of the injured person, when the competent authority has reason to believe that the lump sum paid in conversion of all or part of the periodical payment will be utilised in a way which is particularly advantageous for the beneficiary;
(b) where a declaration provided for in Point 2 is in force and the country concerned considers that it lacks the necessary administrative facilities for periodical payments.

26. In respect of disabled persons requiring the constant help or attendance of another person, increments in the rate or amount of periodical payments, or other supplementary or special benefits, as prescribed by national laws or regulations, should be provided.

27. National laws and regulations should prescribe the conditions in which there shall be reassessment, suspension or cancellation of periodical payments due in respect of partial loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty by reference to a change in degree of the loss.

28. The following cash benefits should be payable in respect of death of the breadwinner:
(a) a funeral benefit at a rate prescribed by national laws and regulations which shall not be less than the normal cost of a funeral;
(b) a periodical payment to a dependent widow;
(c) a periodical payment to a widower who is disabled for any gainful activity and who was dependent on his deceased wife for support;
(d) a periodical payment to children of the deceased who are—
(i) below school-leaving age or age 15, whichever is the higher; or
(ii) below a prescribed age and who are apprentices or students or have a
chronic illness or infirmity disabling them for any gainful activity; and

(e) where national laws and regulations so provide, a periodical payment to other dependants.

29. A Member which provides survivors with periodical payments significantly more favourable than those prescribed by the Convention may make the right to the funeral benefit subject to special conditions prescribed by national laws and regulations.

30. Lump sums may be paid in lieu of any of the periodical payments provided for in Point 28 where a declaration has been made under Point 2 and the country concerned considers that it lacks the necessary administrative facilities for periodical payments. The lump sum shall approximate, as far as possible, the actuarial equivalent of the periodical payment which would have been due.

31. The rates of the periodical payments in respect of—

(a) temporary or initial incapacity for work;
(b) continuing total loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty;
(c) death of the breadwinner;

shall be calculated in such a manner as to comply with the requirements of either Point 32 or Point 33: Provided that no benefit shall be less than such minimum amount as may be prescribed by national laws or regulations.

32. Where benefits are determined with reference to the injured person's previous earnings, the periodical payments provided for should comply with the following standards:

(a) the rate of the benefit, increased by the amount of any family allowances payable during the contingency, shall be such as to attain, in respect of the contingency in question, for the standard beneficiary indicated in the schedule appearing at the end of Point 33, at least the percentage indicated therein of the total of the previous earnings of the beneficiary or his breadwinner and of the amount of any family allowances payable to a person protected with the same family responsibilities as the standard beneficiary;

(b) the previous earnings of the beneficiary or his breadwinner shall be calculated according to prescribed rules, and, where the persons protected or their breadwinner are arranged in classes according to their earnings, their previous earnings may be calculated from the basic earnings of the classes to which they belonged;

(c) a maximum limit may be prescribed for the rate of the benefit or for the earnings taken into account for the calculation of the benefit, provided that the maximum limit is fixed in such a way that the provisions under subparagraph (a) of this Point are complied with where the previous earnings of the beneficiary or his breadwinner are equal to or lower than the wage of a skilled manual male employee;

(d) the previous earnings of the beneficiary or his breadwinner, the wage of the skilled manual male employee, the benefit and any family allowances shall be calculated on the same time basis;

(e) for the other beneficiaries, the benefit shall bear a reasonable relation to the benefit for the standard beneficiary;

(f) for the purpose of this provision, a skilled manual male employee shall be—

(i) a fitter or turner in the manufacture of machinery other than electrical machinery;

(ii) a person deemed typical of skilled labour selected in accordance with the provisions of the following paragraph;

(iii) a person whose earnings are such as to be equal to or greater than the earnings of 75 per cent. of all the persons protected, such earnings to be determined on the basis of annual or shorter periods as may be prescribed;

(iv) a person whose earnings are equal to 125 per cent. of the average earnings of all the persons protected;

(g) the person deemed typical of skilled labour for the purposes of subparagraph (f) (ii) of this Point shall be a person employed in the major group of economic activities with the largest number of economically active male persons protected in the contingency in question, or of the breadwinners of the persons protected, as the case may be, in the division comprising the largest number of such persons or breadwinners; for this purpose, the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities, adopted by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations at its Seventh Session on 27 August 1948, or such Classification as at any time amended, shall be used;

(h) where the rate of benefit varies by region, the skilled manual male employee may be determined for each region in accordance with subparagraphs (f) and (g) of this Point;

(i) the wage of the skilled manual male employee shall be determined on the basis of the rates of wages for normal hours of work fixed by collective agreements, by or in pursuance of national laws or regulations, where applicable, or by custom, including cost-of-living allowances if any; where such rates differ by region but the provision under subparagraph (h) of this Point is not applied, the median rate shall be taken.

33. Where benefits are determined without reference to the injured person's previous earnings, the periodical payments provided for shall comply with the following standards:

(a) the rate of the benefit, increased by the amount of any family allowances payable during the contingency, shall be such as to attain, in respect of the contingency in
question for the standard beneficiary indicated in the schedule appended, at least the percentage indicated therein of the total of the wage of an ordinary adult male labourer and of the amount of any family allowances payable to a person protected with the same family responsibilities as the standard beneficiary;

(b) the wage of the ordinary adult male labourer, the benefit and any family allowances shall be calculated on the same time basis;

(c) for the other beneficiaries, the benefit shall bear a reasonable relation to the benefit for the standard beneficiary;

(d) for the purpose of this provision, the ordinary adult male labourer shall be—

(i) a person deemed typical of unskilled labour in the manufacture of machinery other than electrical machinery; or

(ii) a person deemed typical of unskilled labour selected in accordance with the provisions of the following subparagraph;

(e) the person deemed typical of unskilled labour for the purpose of clause (ii) of the preceding subparagraph shall be a person employed in the major group of economic activities with the largest number of economically active male persons protected in the contingency in question, or of the breadwinners of the persons protected, as the case may be, in the division comprising the largest number of such persons or breadwinners; for this purpose the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities, adopted by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations at its Seventh Session on 27 August 1948, or such Classification as at any time amended, shall be used;

(f) where the rate of benefit varies by region, the ordinary adult male labourer may be determined for each region in accordance with subparagraphs (d) and (e) of this Point;

(g) the wage of the ordinary adult male labourer shall be determined on the basis of the rates of wages for normal hours of work fixed by collective agreements, by or in pursuance of national laws or regulations, where applicable, or by custom, including cost-of-living allowances if any; where such rates differ by region but the provision under subparagraph (f) of this Point is not applied, the median rate shall be taken.

SCHEDULE : PERIODICAL PAYMENTS TO STANDARD BENEFICIARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Standard beneficiary</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Temporary or initial incapacity for work</td>
<td>Man with wife and two children</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Continuing total loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty</td>
<td>Man with wife and two children</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Death of breadwinner</td>
<td>Widow with two children</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. The rates of cash benefits should be adjusted to any substantial changes in the cost of living or in the general level of earnings either by tying rates of benefit in a prescribed manner to some automatic indicator or by a periodical review of benefit rates.

35. The Convention should provide that a benefit to which a person protected would otherwise be entitled may be suspended to such extent as may be prescribed—

(a) as long as the person concerned is maintained at public expense, or at the expense of a social security institution or service;

(b) where the person concerned, without good cause, neglects to make use of the medical and allied care or vocational rehabilitation services placed at his disposal or fails to comply with the rules prescribed for verifying the occurrence or continuance of the contingency or for the conduct of recipients;

(c) where the employment injury was caused by a criminal offence of the injured person;

(d) where the employment injury was caused by voluntary intoxication or by some other serious and wilful misconduct of the person concerned; and

(e) where a fraudulent claim was submitted by the person concerned.

Provided that, under prescribed conditions, part of the cash benefit otherwise due shall be paid to the dependants of the person concerned.

D. Miscellaneous

36. The Convention should specify that—

(a) every claimant shall have a right of appeal in case of refusal of the benefit or complaint as to its quality or quantity;

(b) where in the application of the instrument a government department responsible to a legislature is entrusted with the administration of medical care, the right of appeal may be replaced by a right to have a complaint concerning the refusal of medical care or the quality of the care received investigated by the appropriate authority;

(c) where a claim is settled by a special tribunal established to deal with employment injury questions and on which the persons protected are represented, no right of appeal shall be required, except on questions of law.

37. The Convention should require that each Member shall accept general responsibility for the proper administration of the institutions and services concerned in the application of the instrument.

38. The Convention should specify that where the administration is not entrusted to an institution regulated by the public authorities or to a government department responsible to a legislature—

(a) representatives of the persons protected shall participate in the management, or be associated therewith in a consultative capacity, under prescribed conditions;
(b) national laws or regulations may decide as to the participation of representatives of employers and of the public authorities.

39. The Convention should require each Member to accept general responsibility for the due provision of the benefits provided in accordance therewith, and to take all measures required for this purpose.

40. The Convention should be regarded as revising the Workmen's Compensation (Agriculture) Convention, 1921, the Workmen's Compensation (Accidents) Convention, 1925, the Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention, 1925, and the Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention (Revised), 1934.

41. The Convention should provide for the possibility that particular provisions thereof may be revised by any instrument adopted subsequently which concerns any subject dealt with therein.

III. RECOMMENDATION

42. The employment injury benefit provisions of Members should be extended, if necessary by stages, to—

(a) persons whose employment is of a casual nature and who are employed otherwise than for the purpose of the employer's trade or business;
(b) out-workers;
(c) members of the employer's family who work exclusively on his behalf and who live in his house, whether paid or unpaid;
(d) certain categories of persons working without pay, which should include—

(i) persons in training or otherwise preparing for their future occupation, pupils and students;
(ii) members of volunteer bodies charged with combating natural disasters, with saving lives and property or with maintaining law and order;
(iii) other categories of persons not otherwise covered who are active in the public interest or engaged in civic or benevolent pursuits, such as persons volunteering their services for public office, social service or hospitals;
(iv) prisoners and other detained persons doing work which has been required or approved by the competent authorities.

43. The employment injury benefit provisions of Members should be extended to prescribed categories of self-employed persons, notably persons owning and actively engaged in the operation of small-scale businesses or farms; where necessary, such persons may be protected on a voluntary basis.

44. The following should be treated as industrial accidents, on conditions to be laid down in national laws and regulations:

(a) accidents, regardless of their cause, sustained during working hours at or near the place of work or at any place where the worker would not have been present except for his employment;
(b) accidents sustained within reasonable periods before and after working hours in connection with transporting, cleaning, preparing, securing, conserving, storing and packing work tools or clothes;
(c) accidents sustained while on the way to and from the place of work and—

(i) the employee's principal or secondary residence;
(ii) the place where the employee takes his meals.

45. Diseases known to arise out of the exposure to substances or dangerous conditions in certain industrial processes, trades or occupations should be recognised, under prescribed conditions, as occupational diseases.

46. There should be an irrebuttable presumption of the occupational origin of such diseases where the employee—

(a) was exposed for at least a specified period and
(b) has developed symptoms of the disease within a specified period following termination of the last employment involving exposure.

47. Where national laws or regulations contain a schedule establishing a presumption of occupational origin in respect of certain diseases, proof of the occupational origin of other diseases, or of the diseases listed in the schedule when they manifest themselves under conditions different from those establishing a presumption of their occupational origin, should be permitted.

48. Cash benefits in respect of temporary or initial incapacity for work resulting from an employment injury should be paid from the first day in each case of suspension of earnings.

49. Benefits payable by reason of a continuing loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty should take the form of a periodical payment for the duration of such loss in all cases in which the degree of loss equals at least 25 per cent.

50. In case of continuing loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty of a degree of less than 25 per cent. but at least 5 per cent., a lump sum may be paid in lieu of a periodical payment. Such lump sum should bear an equitable relationship to the rates of periodical payments and should not be less than the periodical payments which would be due in respect of a period of three years.

51. The rates of cash benefit in respect of temporary or initial incapacity for work or continuing total loss of earning capacity or corresponding loss of faculty should be not less than two-thirds of the injured person's earnings.

52. Provision should be made to defray the reasonable cost of the constant help or attendance of another person in cases in which the injured person requires such services; alternatively, the amount of the periodical payment should be increased by not less than 50 per cent.
53. Where an employment injury entails unemployability or disfigurement and this is not taken fully into account in the evaluation of the loss sustained by the injured person, supplementary or special benefits should be provided.

54. In case of death of the breadwinner due to an employment injury, a periodical payment should be made without restriction to a widow until her remarriage, to a dependent widower, and to children who are engaged in occupational training or studying for a profession up to an age at which they can normally be expected to have completed their training or studies.

55. Where the periodical payments due to a widow or a dependent widower and to children are less than the maximum amount provided in national laws or regulations, a periodical payment should be made to the following categories of persons if they were dependent on the deceased for support:

(a) parents;
(b) brothers and sisters;
(c) grandchildren.

56. The amount payable to all dependants eligible at one time should not be less than two-thirds of the earnings of the deceased.

### APPENDIX

#### List of Occupational Diseases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Disease Description</th>
<th>Persons Eligible for Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Silicosis with or without pulmonary tuberculosis, provided that silicosis is an essential factor in causing the resultant incapacity or death.</td>
<td>All work involving exposure to the risk concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Asbestosis with or without pulmonary tuberculosis, provided that asbestos is an essential factor in causing the resultant incapacity or death.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by lead, its alloys or compounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by mercury, its amalgams or compounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by manganese, its alloys or compounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by arsenic or its compounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by phosphorus or its compounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by carbon bisulphide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by the halogen derivatives of hydrocarbons of the aliphatic series.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by benzene or its homologues and their nitro- and amido-derivatives.</td>
<td>All work involving exposure to the action of ionising radia-tions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by ionising radiations.</td>
<td>Work in connection with animals infected with anthrax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Anthrax infection.</td>
<td>Handling of animal carcasses or parts of such carcasses including hides, hoofs and horns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Diseases caused by chrome or chromates.</td>
<td>Loading and unloading or transport of merchandise which may have been contaminated by animals or animal carcasses infected with anthrax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Primary epitheliomatous cancer of the skin caused by tar, pitch, bitumen, mineral oil, paraffin, anthracene, or the compounds, products or residues of these substances.</td>
<td>All work involving exposure to the risks concerned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[List referred to in Point 11 of the Proposed Conclusions.]
The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,
Considering the primary importance of prevention against industrial accidents and occupational diseases, as envisaged in Point 15, subparagraph (a), of the Proposed Conclusions with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a supplementary Recommendation concerning the benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases, and
Taking into account the complexity and technical nature of the problems involved;
Decides to consider further action in the field of the prevention of industrial accidents and occupational diseases; and
Requests the Governing Body to examine the possibility of putting this question on the agenda of a future session of the International Labour Conference.

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,
Having adopted the report of the Committee appointed to consider the seventh item on the agenda;
Decides that the question of benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases shall be placed on the agenda of its next Ordinary Session for a second discussion with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a supplementary Recommendation.

1. In conformity with the decision taken by the Committee at its ninth sitting, a Subcommittee was set up to examine the list of occupational diseases annexed to the proposals in Report VII (8) and to propose to the Committee any amendments. This Subcommittee was composed of Government members of Cameroon, Chile, France, Italy, Turkey and the United Arab Republic, four Employers' members, and four Workers' members. Mrs. Netter (Government member, France) was elected Chairman and Reporter of the Subcommittee.

2. During the general discussion, several members of the Subcommittee expressed the view that, in order to take account of the progress made in the technical and medical fields, the establishment of a list of occupational diseases would require the assistance of a Committee of Experts to advise on every aspect of the question, juridical, medical and technical. This Committee could be entrusted with the task of preparing (a) a basic list of occupational diseases for which coverage by the national compensation legislations would be compulsory and (b) an additional list, to be as comprehensive as possible, of known occupational diseases from which each member State could select the ones which correspond most closely to the risks encountered in that particular country, for inclusion in its national laws and regulations. Nevertheless, the Subcommittee en-
The Subcommittee realised that this point covered a very large number of chemical substances, only some of which were now generally regarded as being toxic. It seemed impossible to establish a restrictive list of the latter and it was emphasised that the proposed text only concerned derivatives which were likely to cause pathological manifestations. However, the Subcommittee felt that it might be advisable to leave to governments the task of defining closely the chemical substances or categories of this group which they considered likely to cause occupational diseases.

Point 10 of the List (Benzene).

13. During a long discussion, several members expressed the wish that all aromatic toxic amines should be clearly mentioned in the wording of this point. Certain members would also like to see other derivatives of aromatic hydrocarbons taken into consideration, as well as amido- and nitro-derivatives. However, the Subcommittee did not feel qualified to formulate proposals which would be sufficiently substantiated from the medical and chemical points of view and recalled the view already expressed during the general discussion that the proposed list should be re-examined by experts of all the branches concerned, who would take account of the views or suggestions formulated by the Committee.

Point 11 of the List (Radiations).

14. The Subcommittee decided to amend the wording of this item so as to cover all hazards affecting health, whatever the nature or source of the radiations. According to the official terminology used by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the expression "ionising radiations" adequately covered all the radiations considered, i.e. electrons, protons, alpha particles, neutrons, photons, etc.

Point 12 of the List (Anthrax Infection).

15. The members of the Subcommittee agreed that this one item alone on a disease which can be transmitted to man by animals was quite inadequate. There appeared to be no proof that anthrax infection was at present the most serious or the most frequent of transmissible diseases and there were many others which present a serious occupational hazard in certain occupations and certain regions. However, the Subcommittee finally rejected the idea of adopting for this point a general formula to cover all diseases which can be transmitted to man by animals, in recognition of the serious difficulties which might be experienced in applying such a broad standard, and also of the fact that in certain countries compensation for occupational diseases may be granted as for an industrial accident. The Subcommittee did not think it possible to make a choice from among these diseases in the absence of adequate data upon which to base an assessment as to which were the most widespread or the most serious. Once again it urged the need for expert advice on this matter, so that this type of disease would be given the importance it deserved.

Point 13 of the List (Occupational Diseases of the Skin).

16. The Subcommittee considered it essential to include in the list of occupational diseases annexed to the Convention an item on skin diseases, since these were the occupational diseases to occur most frequently in the world and they could often have serious repercussions on the future of the workers, both from the occupational and the social points of view. However, the members had to face the fact that they did not have sufficient data at their disposal either to adopt a general formula capable of acceptance and application by the majority of countries, or to establish a limited list of substances liable to cause occupational skin diseases. This question brought out very clearly the difficult problem to be solved in the field of legal medicine with regard to contact dermatites and allergic dermatoses. Moreover, it was very risky to make a choice from a very large number of substances of mineral, vegetable or animal origin which might be involved, when some of these might be very widely used in certain countries and practically unknown in others. The Subcommittee decided, therefore, not to include this item in the draft list, but emphasised that it was essential to obtain the advice of a committee of experts on the best method of including it at a later stage.

Point 14 of the List (Chrome).

17. The Subcommittee thought the wording of the proposed text should be amended so as to include chromates, since these were just as liable to cause ulceration as chrome. It also decided to extend the scope of the item by replacing the restrictive concept of "ulcera­tion" by the wider one of "diseases", so as to take account of other risks already covered by a certain number of legislations.

Point 15 of the List (Arsenic Compounds).

18. This point was deleted, having already been covered by the new wording of point 6.

Point 16 of the List (Epitheliomatous Cancer).

19. The wording was amended to bring it into line with that of the other items, the only change being the addition of anthracene to the list of products liable to cause occupational skin cancer, owing to its notoriously carcinogenic nature, whether in isolation or in combination with others.

20. Having established the draft list of diseases annexed to the present report, the Subcommittee also considered it necessary to examine the list of trades, industries and processes shown in the right-hand column. By modifying in a uniform way the text of each of the items on diseases caused by chemical substances, the Subcommittee evinced its desire to make no restriction in the trades, industries or processes indicated, in so far as they presented a risk of exposure to the substance concerned—thereby following a tendency already largely apparent in a number of legislations. With regard to the item on anthrax infection which requires a restricted list of occupations or processes, the Subcommittee made only a slight addition to the text, in order to define more closely the category of workers in question.

21. In concluding its work, the Subcommittee stressed certain general considerations on the conditions which were necessary to ensure that any list of occupational diseases would have a practical value. It emphasised that the fact of including such a list in national laws or regulations was by no means sufficient in itself to ensure the compensation of the occupational disease concerned. It would be necessary for the national legislation concerned to prescribe additional provisions to ensure—
   (a) the detection and diagnosis of occupational diseases;
   (b) notification of these diseases to the competent authorities;
   (c) recognition of the causal connection between the disease and the harmful substance concerned (presumption of origin).

All these measures were directly related to compensation. It depended on each one whether the victim of an occupational disease would receive a benefit or not. They presupposed, of course, an adequate medical and administrative infrastructure, but this again was one of the most effective means of ensuring prevention, always the prime objective.


(Signed) JEANNE NETTEY,
Chairman and Reporter.
APPENDIX X

Election of the Members of the Governing Body

(1) Information Prepared by the International Labour Office to Facilitate the Working of the Electoral Colleges.

COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

The composition of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office is determined by the provisions of article 7 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation which, as amended by the Instrument for the Amendment of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, 1962, which came into force on 22 May 1963, is in the following terms:

Article 7

1. The Governing Body shall consist of forty-eight persons:
   Twenty-four representing governments,
   Twelve representing the employers, and
   Twelve representing the workers.

2. Of the twenty-four persons representing governments, ten shall be appointed by the Members of chief industrial importance, and fourteen shall be appointed by the Members selected for that purpose by the Government delegates to the Conference, excluding the delegates of the ten Members mentioned above.

3. The persons representing the employers and the persons representing the workers shall be elected respectively by the Employers' delegates and the Workers' delegates to the Conference.

4. The period of office of the Governing Body shall be three years...

In addition, the Standing Orders of the Conference and of the Governing Body include provisions for the appointment of deputy members.

METHOD OF ELECTION

The method of electing members and deputy members of the Governing Body is laid down in the Standing Orders of the Conference. The formal changes required in the Standing Orders following the entry into force of the Amendment to article 7 of the Constitution have not yet been made. The relevant articles are therefore reproduced below as they appeared prior to entry into force of the Amendment, the new figures being inserted in brackets.

The method of electing Government members and deputy members is laid down in article 49 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, which is as follows:

Article 49

Government Electoral College

1. Subject to the provisions of article 13, paragraph 4, of the Constitution and of Section D of the Standing Orders of the Conference, the Government electoral college shall consist of the Government delegates of all Members of the Organisation excepting those of the ten Members of chief industrial importance.

2. Each member of the electoral college shall be entitled to cast one vote.

3. The Government electoral college shall select ten Members of the Organisation, the governments of which shall be entitled to appoint Government members of the Governing Body.

4. The Government electoral college shall also select ten other Members of the Organisation, the governments of which shall be entitled to appoint deputy Government members of the Governing Body.

The method of electing Employers' and Workers' members and deputy members of the Governing Body is laid down in article 50 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, which is as follows:

Article 50

Employers' and Workers' Electoral Colleges

1. The Employers' and Workers' electoral colleges shall consist of the Employers' and Workers' delegates to the Conference respectively, excluding the Employers' and Workers' delegates of States disqualified from voting in pursuance of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 4, of the Constitution and of Section D of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

2. The Employers' and Workers' electoral colleges shall each elect by name ten persons as regular members of the Governing Body and ten persons as deputy members of the Governing Body.

The last elections for the Governing Body were held on the occasion of the 44th Session of the Conference (1960).

Information designed to facilitate the procedure of the electoral colleges in connection with the election of the members and deputy members of the Governing Body is given below.

PROCEDURE OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGES

The voting procedure in the electoral colleges is laid down in article 52 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, which is as follows:

Article 52

Procedure of Voting

1. Each electoral college shall vote by secret ballot.

2. The Chairman of each electoral college shall ask the representative of the President of the Conference to read the list of delegates who have the right to vote. Each delegate shall come forward as his name is called and place his voting paper in the ballot box.

3. The counting of the votes shall be carried out under the direction of the representative of the President of the Conference assisted by two returning officers appointed by the electoral college from among its members.

4. No State or person shall be considered to be elected unless it or he has obtained more than half of the votes cast by the members of the electoral college present at the...
meeting. If after the first vote one or more seats remain to be filled, one or more further votes shall be taken as may be necessary, each member of the electoral college being entitled to vote for a number of candidates equal to the number of seats which still remain to be filled.

5. On the conclusion of the voting the Chairman of the electoral college shall announce the result of the meeting and a report shall be drawn up for communication to the Conference and deposited in the archives of the International Labour Office. This report shall be signed by the Chairman of the electoral college and countersigned by the representative of the President of the Conference.

**INFORMATION CONCERNING THE GOVERNMENT MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY**

**Regular Members.**

The regular members of the Governing Body representing governments are divided into two categories:

(a) Representatives of the ten States of chief industrial importance. The Government electoral college at the Conference has no decision to take in regard to the allocation of these seats.

It may be recalled that the ten States of chief industrial importance are: Canada, China, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(b) Representatives of the fourteen elected member States. These fourteen States are elected by the Government delegates other than those representing the ten States of chief industrial importance and those States which under the terms of article 13, paragraph 4, of the Constitution cannot take part in the vote. Each of the delegates of the States entitled to take part in the proceedings of the Government electoral college has a vote.

**Deputy Members.**

The election of Government deputy members of the Governing Body by the Government electoral college must be carried out separately from the election of the regular members. The electoral college is exactly the same for both elections.

The attention of the Government electoral college is drawn to the desirability, which the Conference has recognised, of taking the geographical factor into account in electing the ten deputy members.

**INFORMATION CONCERNING THE EMPLOYERS' MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY**

**Regular Members.**

The twelve Employers' regular members are elected by name by the Employers' delegates at the Conference.

**Deputy Members.**

The ten Employers' deputy members are also elected by name by the Employers' delegates at the Conference.

**INFORMATION CONCERNING THE WORKERS' MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY**

**Regular Members.**

The twelve Workers' regular members are elected by name by the Workers' delegates at the Conference.

**Deputy Members.**

The ten Workers' deputy members are also elected by name by the Workers' delegates at the Conference.

(2) Results of the Elections to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

(The results of the elections to the Governing Body were communicated orally to the Conference at its 11th Sitting, on 14 June 1963. See Second Part, p. 142.)
APPENDIX XI

Communications to the Conference

(1) Statement on Behalf of the Appeals Board concerning the Procedure to Be Followed by the Board.

The Appeals Board has requested that the following statement be issued on its behalf.

By a letter dated 7 June 1963, the President of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference forwarded to the Board the requests concerning the composition of committees submitted to him by the Employers' delegates of Albania, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Yugoslavia, which were transmitted to the Board by the International Labour Conference on 7 June 1963.\(^1\)

The Board has decided to follow the same procedure as did the Boards in 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962 in discharging the responsibility entrusted to it by the Conference. There are two considerations to which it must attach decisive importance.

The first consideration is that the delegate lodging an appeal and the group against which an appeal is made should be treated on a footing of complete equality in the procedure of the Board and should have an opportunity of making the grounds for the appeal or the decision appealed against, as the case may be, known to the Board.

The second consideration is that the proceedings should be sufficiently expeditious to permit of the decision of the Board becoming effective at as early a stage of the Conference as possible.

In the light of these considerations the Board has decided that it will, in reaching its decision, take into account any statement which may be submitted to it in writing by 10.30 a.m. on Saturday, 8 June 1963 by any of the appellants or by either of the groups of the Conference concerned.

The Board will announce its decision at the earliest possible date following the expiry of the deadline of 10.30 a.m. on Saturday, 8 June 1963, which it has fixed for the receipt of any statements which may be submitted to it.


(2) Report of the Appeals Board.\(^1\)

The Appeals Board appointed by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office at its 154th Session (March 1963) from the panel of independent persons appointed by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation at its 46th Session on 7 June 1962, in pursuance of the decision taken by the Conference on 8 June 1959, met at the International Labour Office on 10 June 1963.

The Board elected as Chairman Mr. M. K. Vellodi.

The Board had before it a letter dated 7 June 1963 from the President of the 47th Session of the International Labour Conference enclosing the requests concerning the composition of committees submitted to him by the Employers' delegates of Albania, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Yugoslavia, which were transmitted to the Board by the International Labour Conference on 7 June 1963.

The Board last year decided to consult the other members of the Panel with a view to having the statement as to the procedure to be followed by the Board issued on its behalf prior to its first meeting, thus avoiding the necessity of holding a preliminary meeting of the Board for this purpose and enabling the Board to draw up its report at a meeting held at an earlier date after the opening of the Conference than in previous years. The other members of the Panel having consented to this course, the Board has applied this procedure this year.


\(^1\) See Second Part, p. 78.
In all other respects the Board decided to follow the same procedure as did the Boards in 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962 in discharging the responsibility entrusted to it by the Conference. There are two considerations to which it must attach decisive importance.

The first consideration is that the delegate lodging an appeal and the group against which an appeal is made should be treated on a footing of complete equality in the procedure of the Board and should have an opportunity of making known to the Board the grounds for the appeal or the decision appealed against, as the case may be.

The second consideration is that the proceedings should be sufficiently expeditious to permit of the decision of the Board becoming effective at as early a stage of the Conference as possible.

In the light of these considerations the Board decided that, in reaching its decisions, it would take into account any statement which might be addressed to it in writing by 10.30 a.m. on Saturday, 8 June 1963, by any of the appellants or by the group of the Conference concerned.

Such statements were received from the following appellants: Mr. Sallabanda, Employers' delegate, Albania; Mr. Klecan, Employers' delegate, Czechoslovakia; Mr. Vuño, Employers' delegate, Yugoslavia. The Chairman of the Board has also received a statement on the matter addressed by the Chairman of the Employers' group to the President of the Conference.

In addition to these statements the Board has studied the text of the decision taken by the Conference on 8 June 1959, together with the report of the Committee to Consider the Improvement of the Practical Methods of Working of the International Labour Conference, the relevant majority and minority reports of the Credentials Committee of the 37th to 46th Sessions of the International Labour Conference, the report of the Committee on the Freedom and Independence of Employers' and Workers' Organisations, the debates in the plenary sittings of the 37th to 46th Sessions of the International Labour Conference concerning these reports and concerning the composition of committees, and the report of the Secretary-General's representative on the official meeting of the Employers' group held on 6 June 1963. It has not considered any other documentation or evidence.

With respect to the appeals submitted to it, the Board has before it the statement addressed to the President of the Conference on 8 June 1963 by the Chairman of the Employers' group.

The Chairman of the Employers' group declares in his statement that the large majority of the Employers' delegates continue not to recognise the constitutionality of the decision adopted, temporarily, by the International Labour Conference on 8 June 1959. They consider, in fact, that the procedure of asking a Board consisting of persons external to the Conference to give a decision, instead of the Conference giving it, on a fundamental question relating to the functioning of the Conference, is in contradiction with the right of every delegate to vote individually on all matters which are taken into consideration by the Conference (article 4 of the Constitution). In their view, moreover, the Conference, by adopting this procedure, has dealt a serious blow to the principle of trilateralism which is the basis of the International Labour Organisation. Nevertheless, he observes, the Appeals Board has taken the view in previous years that it is not called upon, under its mandate, to pronounce as to the validity of the decision of the Conference which established it and that its sole function is to ensure respect for the principle that the Conference has the duty to ensure equality of treatment for all members attending the Conference, this principle applying specifically to the question of full participation in the work of the committees of the Conference.

The Chairman of the Employers' group maintains that, with regard to the Employers' group, this equality of treatment has been fully and entirely ensured. With regard to participation in the work of committees, he declares, this equality of treatment is ensured by the provisions of paragraph 2 of Part II of the decision referred to above, which provides that:

Every delegate making application to his group for membership of a committee shall be placed on the list of members of that committee.

It is not denied, he points out, that all the delegates who have asked to participate in a committee have been placed on the list of members of that committee by the secretariat of the group, and this on a footing of complete equality.

The Chairman of the Employers' group observes that, by virtue of article 56, paragraph 5, of the Standing Orders of the Conference, all the members of a committee have the same rights and the same possibility of participating in the work of the committee, with the exception of the right to vote. This right, he maintains, unlike the right of merely having membership in a committee, does not belong automatically to every delegate as such, as the authors of the appeals would appear to think, but is only the exercise of a function conferred by the group to which he belongs. Paragraph 3 of Part II provides, indeed, that the Conference, on the recommendations of the Conference groups, will decide in respect of each committee how many and which members of each group in the committee shall have the right to vote, which implies, a contrario, that certain members may not have this right. In reality, states the Chairman of the Employers' group, the attribution of the right to vote to certain members of committees by the Conference, on the recommendation of their group, must be regarded as a delegation of powers on the part of the group in question, as a whole, to a limited number of persons authorised to represent it in respect to a particular question in the event of a vote; the members of the voting section of a committee do not vote in the committee by exercising a right which is their own but by virtue of the mandate conferred upon them by their group.

The Chairman of the Employers' group asks how the principle of equality of treatment applies in such circumstances. He argues that
it certainly does not give any particular delegate a right to be appointed *ipso facto* a voting member the moment that he shows a desire to have this right accorded to him; on the other hand, he declines; it makes it obligatory to place all candidates on the same footing before the group and to make the final choice by means of a democratic procedure which makes it possible to ensure that the Employers' members in a committee may act validly on behalf of their group. Moreover, he adds, the democratic character of the procedure followed is not brought into question and is confirmed by the report of the representative of the Secretary-General on the official meeting of the group on 6 June. He points out that the Appeals Board, however, has taken the view in previous years that regularity of procedure alone does not guarantee in fact substantive equality of treatment, but that the Employers' group could not support this thesis, which would deprive the very principle of elections of all meaning if it were applied so as to permit every candidate who has not been elected to regard himself as being the victim of inequality of treatment.

The Chairman of the Employers' group goes on to state that the large majority of the Employers' delegates have taken the view that they should not accord the mandate of representing them as a whole to persons appointed as Employers' delegates by certain governments; they have taken this decision pursuant to the rights conferred upon them in this connection by the Constitution of the I.L.O. and the Standing Orders of the Conference, not because of any personal or political animosity but because they are convinced that the particular character of the social system in these countries does not permit of the nomination of independent non-governmental delegates, as is provided for in paragraphs 1 and 5 of article 3 of the Constitution, and as was envisaged by those who conceived the tripartite form of the International Labour Conference.

The Chairman of the Employers' group considers that the experience of the last few years, at sessions of the International Labour Conference, of the behaviour of the Employer delegates of these countries has, in the view of the Employers' group, entirely confirmed their attitude, and that, in particular, it has shown that these delegates have nothing in common with their employer colleagues with regard to the responsibility and the conception of the social role of employers which have justified the tripartite structure of the I.L.O.

The Chairman of the Employers' group expresses the view that, while it is true that, in the last two years, the Board has not considered itself competent to define the term "employer" in the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, it cannot, however, refrain from taking account of the reasons which are fundamental to the decision of the group and to the basic principles of the Organisation.

In conclusion, the Chairman of the Employers' group adds that, if the Board should accord places with voting rights to the appellants, the latter would be quite unjustifiably favoured by comparison with those of their colleagues who, also having offered themselves as candidates and not having been appointed, have accepted the democratic decision of the group to which they belong. In that case, and only in that case, he declares, would there be a violation of the principle of equality of treatment.

The Chairman of the Employers' group raises no consideration of principle which has not been dealt with by the Board in one or other of the reports to the Conference in preceding years. His statement is in effect a request that the Board should specifically define the meaning of the term "employer" in the Constitution of the I.L.O., and reach its decision on the present appeals in the light of such a definition.

Previous Boards have taken the view that they were not called on to undertake this task or to pronounce upon the validity of the credentials of delegates to the Conference. The present Board has, however, again given careful consideration to the request of the Chairman of the Employers' group, but it finds itself in agreement with its predecessors that this question does not fall within its competence. By direction of the Conference the function of the Board is to consider appeals relating to participation in committees and to deal with the individual cases referred to it without prejudice to any other issue.

The Conference has defined the principle on the basis of which the Board is to consider appeals in the following terms:

The Conference has the duty to ensure equality of treatment for all members attending the Conference. Specifically, this principle applies to the question of full participation in the work of the committees of the Conference.

The appellants contend that the failure of the Employers' group to give them places on committees is a violation of this principle.

The principle which the Board is called upon to apply by the decision taken by the Conference is that of equality of treatment for all members of the Conference in respect of full participation in the work of the committees of the Conference. In the view of the Board the decisive factor is that the appellants have not, in fact, been accorded such equality of treatment. Regularity of procedure alone does not guarantee, and has not in fact secured, substantive equality of treatment.

The Board has accordingly, in pursuance of the responsibility placed upon it by the Conference, determined as follows:

1. Mr. Gacio Fuerte, Employers' delegate, Cuba, and Mr. Klecan, Employers' delegate, Czechoslovakia, shall be added to the voting section of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.
2. Mr. Gheorghiu, Employers' delegate, Romania, and Mr. Vuço, Employers' delegate, Yugoslavia, shall be added to the voting section of the Committee on Guarding of Machinery.
3. Mr. Koloshin, Employers' delegate, Byelorussian S.S.R., and Mr. Sallabanda, Employers' delegate, Albania, shall be added to the voting section of the Committee on Termination of Employment.
4. Mr. Olszewski, Employers' delegate, Poland, and Mr. Prikhodko, Employers' delegate,
The decision taken by the Conference provides that the decisions of the Board shall be final and shall be put into effect by the Conference without debate.

Under the system of voting in force in Committees of the Conference the number of votes of each member of the committee depends on the number of members of his group in the voting section of the committee.

While it is for the Conference to make the necessary arrangements to preserve equality of voting strength among the three groups in each committee, the Board has noted that such equality can be maintained by the application of the normal practice of the Conference of adjusting the voting power of the members of each group on the basis of the number of members of the group.

For the convenience of the Conference the Board has requested and included in its report the figures for each committee of the Conference as resulting from its decisions. These figures are as follows:

The Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations now consists of 40 Government voting members, 17 Employers' voting members and 30 Workers' voting members. In order to preserve equality of voting strength, it will be necessary to multiply each Government member's vote by 240, each Employers' member's vote by 495 and each Workers' member's vote by 352, the entire voting strength of each group thus amounting to 15,840.

The Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations now consists of 72 Government voting members, 47 Employers' voting members and 45 Workers' voting members. In order to preserve equality of voting strength, it will be necessary to multiply each Governament member's vote by 240, each Employers' member's vote by 495 and each Workers' member's vote by 352, the entire voting strength of each group thus amounting to 15,840.

The Committee on Guarding of Machinery now consists of 60 Government voting members, 11 Employers' voting members and 30 Workers' voting members. In order to preserve equality of voting strength, it will be necessary to multiply each Government member's vote by 11, each Employers' member's vote by 60 and each Workers' member's vote by 22, the entire voting strength of each group thus amounting to 660.

The Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations now consists of 40 Government voting members, 17 Employers' voting members and 15 Workers' voting members. In order to preserve equality of voting strength, it will be necessary to multiply each Government member's vote by 51, each Employers' member's vote by 120 and each Workers' member's vote by 136, the entire voting strength of each group thus amounting to 2,040.

The Committee on Termination of Employment now consists of 72 Government voting members, 47 Employers' voting members and 60 Workers' voting members. In order to preserve equality of voting strength, it will be necessary to multiply each Government member's vote by 235, each Employers' member's vote by 360, and each Workers' member's vote by 282, the entire voting strength of each group thus amounting to 16,920.

The Committee on Social Security now consists of 66 Government voting members, 32 Employers' voting members and 45 Workers' voting members. In order to preserve equality of voting strength, it will be necessary to multiply each Government member's vote by 240, each Employers' member's vote by 495 and each Workers' member's vote by 352, the entire voting strength of each group thus amounting to 15,840.

Geneva, 10 June 1963.

(Signed) M. K. VELLODNI, Chairman.

HECTOR HETHERINGTON.  
C. PARRA PéREZ.

(3) Election of the Members of the Asian Advisory Committee: Information Submitted to the Conference by the International Labour Office.

I

1. The Composition and terms of reference of the Asian Advisory Committee are governed by decisions taken by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office at its 112th Session (June 1950).

2. The area with which the Committee is concerned is the same as that covered by the Asian Regional Conference (hereinafter referred to as "the Area").

3. The terms of reference of the Committee are very general: to advise the Governing Body on Asian problems and on Asian aspects of general problems.

4. The Committee consists of 16 members—eight Government members, four Employers' and four Workers' members. Of these 16, 12 members (six Government, three Employers' and three Workers') must be drawn from States Members of the Organisation within the Area. Subject to this, members are appointed as follows:

(a) automatic or ex officio members: regular Government, Employers' and Workers' members of the Governing Body who are nationals of one of the member States falling within the Area;

(b) elected members to complete, with the ex officio members, the total of 12, namely six Government, three Employers' and three Workers' members. Those eligible for election are the States Members of the Organisation entitled to attend the Asian Regional Conference, or in the case of Employers and Workers, nationals of those States. The electoral colleges consist of the member States entitled to attend the Asian Regional Conference, or, in the case of Employers and Workers' colleges, the full electoral colleges, it being understood that nominations will be confined to nationals of those States;

(c) four members (two Government, one Employers' and one Workers') to be nominated by the Governing Body from countries entitled to attend the Asian Regional Conference. If the total number of members drawn from States Members of the Organisation within the Area under (a) and (b) falls short of 12, the number
required to complete 12 will be nominated from among such members under this clause.

5. The period of office of members of the Committee is three years and the Committee is reconstituted at the time of the elections to the Governing Body. The meetings of the Committee are normally held once a year, either in conjunction with an Asian Regional Conference in Asia, or with some convenient meeting of the Organisation at Geneva.

II

6. Following on the elections to the Governing Body held on 13 June 1963, the ex officio members referred to in paragraph 4 (a) above are:

Government members:
- Australia.
- China.
- India.
- Japan.
- Pakistan.
- U.S.S.R.

Employers' members:
- Mr. Tata (Indian).
- Mr. Wajid Ali (Pakistani).

Workers' members:
- Mr. Ahmad (Pakistani).
- Mr. Ambekar (Indian).
- Mr. Monk (Australian).

III

7. The electoral colleges mentioned in paragraph 4 (b) above are required to elect the number of members necessary to complete with the ex officio members a total of 12, namely six Government, three Employers' and three Workers' members. On this occasion neither the Government electoral college nor the Workers' electoral college will be required to hold an election. The Employers' electoral college will require to elect one member of the Asian Advisory Committee.

8. The States Members of the Organisation which the Governing Body has decided are entitled to attend the Asian Regional Conference are: Afghanistan, Australia, Burma, Ceylon, China, France, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Portugal, Thailand, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the United States and Viet-Nam.

9. The Employers' electoral college will comprise the Employers' delegates present at the Conference, each delegate having one vote, it being understood that only nationals of States Members of the Organisation entitled to attend the Asian Regional Conference, the list of which is given in paragraph 8 above, will be eligible for election.

10. As stated in paragraph 7 above, no meeting of the Government or of the Workers' electoral college will be necessary on this occasion.

(4) Results of the Election of the Members of the Asian Advisory Committee.

(The results of the election of the members of the Asian Advisory Committee were communicated orally to the Conference at its 24th Sitting, on 25 June 1963. See Second Part, p. 393.)
APPENDIX XII

Miscellaneous Decisions of the Conference

(1) Amendments to the Standing Orders of the Conference.

The Conference adopted on 24 June 1963 the report of its Standing Orders Committee which contained recommendations to amend articles 17, 55, 62 and 64 of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

The amended texts are given below.

ARTICLE 17

Resolutions relating to Matters not Included in an Item on the Agenda

1. (1) No resolution relating to a matter not included in an item on the agenda of the Conference shall be moved at any sitting of the Conference, until a copy of the resolution has been deposited with the Director-General of the International Labour Office at least 15 days before the opening of the session of the Conference, by a delegate to the Conference.

5. The Resolutions Committee shall determine the order in which resolutions which have been declared receivable shall be examined, as follows:

(a) After having given the author, or one of the authors, of each resolution the possibility of moving it in a speech which shall not exceed 10 minutes, the Committee shall, without discussion, determine by ballot the first five resolutions to be considered in the following manner:

(i) each member of the Committee shall receive a ballot paper on which the titles of all the resolutions to be considered appear, and shall indicate therein the five resolutions which he wishes to be discussed first, his first preference being marked "1" ; his second "2" ; and so forth; a ballot paper which does not indicate preferences for five resolutions shall be void;

(ii) whenever a resolution is indicated as a first preference, it shall be allotted five points, whenever it is indicated as a second preference, four points, and so forth; resolutions for which no preference has been indicated will receive no points;

(iii) where the Government, Employers' or Workers' members of the Committee are entitled to cast more than one vote, to take account of the unequal representation of the group on the Committee, the total number of points secured by each resolution shall be calculated separately for each group and multiplied by the multiplier applicable to the votes of members of the group;

(iv) the resolution obtaining the largest number of points, as determined in accordance with clauses (ii) and (iii), shall be discussed first, the resolution obtaining the second largest number of points shall be discussed second, and so forth for five resolutions; if the voting result is in an equal number of points for each of two or more of the first five resolutions, priority shall be decided by lot in one or more castings, as appropriate.

(b) The Committee shall, at the beginning of its proceedings, set up a Working Party composed of three Government members, three Employers' members and three Workers' members to make recommendations as to the order in which the resolutions which were not included in the first five as a result of the procedure set forth in subparagraph (a) should be examined.

6. The Resolutions Committee shall begin its work as soon as possible after the opening of the session of the Conference, in order to enable it to complete its agenda, and shall terminate its work not later than the Saturday preceding the closing of the session. If, nevertheless, any resolution has not been considered by the Committee by the date on which it terminates its work, the Conference shall not discuss or act upon that resolution.

ARTICLE 55

Scope

4. These Standing Orders apply to the Resolutions Committee, subject to the special provisions contained in articles 62, paragraph 4, and 64, paragraph 4.

ARTICLE 62

Right to Address the Committee

4. In the case of the Resolutions Committee only the sponsor of the motion, resolution or amendment under discussion, or one of the sponsors if there were several, shall have the right to speak on the question under discussion after the closure has been voted.

The Conference also adopted on 25 June 1963 the tenth report of its Selection Committee which contained recommendations to amend articles 4 and 25 of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

The amended texts are given below.

ARTICLE 4

Selection Committee

1. The Conference shall appoint a Selection Committee consisting of twenty-four members nominated by the Government group, twelve members nominated by the Employers' group and twelve members nominated by the Workers' group. In none of these categories shall a country have more than one member.

ARTICLE 25

In accordance with article 4, paragraph 1, of the Standing Orders, the Government group shall nominate twenty-four members for the Selection Committee and the Employers' and Workers' groups shall each nominate twelve members. In none of those groups shall any Member of the Organisation have more than one member.

1 See Second Part, p. 349.
2 See Appendix III, p. 479.
3 The new texts are given in italic type.
APPENDIX XIII

Resolutions Adopted by the Conference

(1) Resolution concerning the Placing on the Agenda of the Next Ordinary Session of the Conference of the Question of Hygiene in Commerce and Offices, Submitted by the Committee on Hygiene in Shops and Offices. (Adopted on 25 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,
Having adopted the report of the Committee appointed to consider the sixth item on the agenda, and
Having in particular approved as general conclusions, with a view to the consultation of governments, proposals for a Convention and a Recommendation relating to hygiene in commerce and offices;
Decides that the item entitled "Hygiene in Commerce and Offices" shall be included in the agenda of its next Ordinary Session for second discussion with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a Recommendation.

(2) Resolution concerning Prevention of Industrial Accidents and Occupational Diseases, Submitted by the Committee on Social Security. (Adopted on 25 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,
Considering the primary importance of preventive measures against industrial accidents and occupational diseases, as envisaged in Point 15, subparagraph (a), of the Proposed Conclusions with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a supplementary Recommendation concerning the benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases 3, and
Taking into account the complexity and technical nature of the problems involved;
Decides to consider further action in the field of the prevention of industrial accidents and occupational diseases; and
Requests the Governing Body to examine the possibility of putting this question on the agenda of a future session of the International Labour Conference.

(3) Resolution concerning the Placing on the Agenda of the Next Ordinary Session of the Conference of the Question of Benefits in the Case of Industrial Accidents and Occupational Diseases, Submitted by the Committee on Social Security. (Adopted on 25 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,
Having adopted the report of the Committee appointed to consider the seventh item on the agenda;
Decides that the question of benefits in the case of industrial accidents and occupational diseases shall be placed on the agenda of its next Ordinary Session for a second discussion with a view to the adoption of a Convention and a supplementary Recommendation.

1 At the 46th Session of the Conference, the Secretary-General appealed to delegates for one year not to present resolutions on specific issues so that all the important issues be raised in the discussion on his Report to the Conference. This appeal was heeded unanimously. Hence the resolutions adopted by the Conference at its 47th Session relate solely to the placing of items on the agenda of a future session, and to financial or administrative questions.


(4) Resolution concerning the Adoption of the Budget for the 46th Financial Period (1964) and the Allocation of Expenses among Member States for 1964, Submitted by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.2

(Adopted on 20 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

In virtue of the Financial Regulations, passes for the 46th financial period, ending 31 December 1964, the net budget of expenditure of the International Labour Organisation amounting to $16,388,799 and the net budget of income amounting to $16,388,799 and resolves that the budget of income from member States shall be allocated among them in accordance with the scale of contributions recommended by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

(5) Resolution concerning the Contributions Payable to the International Labour Office Staff Pensions Fund in 1964, Submitted by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.2

(Adopted on 20 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

Decides that the contribution of the International Labour Organisation to the Pensions Fund for 1964 under article 7, paragraph (a), of the Staff Pensions Regulations shall be 14 per cent. of the pensionable emoluments of the members of the Fund;

Decides that, for the year 1964, the officials mentioned in article 4, paragraph (a) (i), of the International Labour Office Staff Pensions Regulations shall continue to pay an additional 1 per cent. of their pensionable emoluments (making a total of 7½ per cent.) and those mentioned in article 4, paragraph (a) (ii), an additional ½ per cent. (making a total of 5½ per cent.) if their pensionable emoluments exceed the equivalent of Swiss francs 6,500 per annum, and an additional 3¼ per cent. (making a total of 5¼ per cent.) if their emoluments are the equivalent of Swiss francs 6,500 or less;

Resolves that, in continuation of the arrangement approved in previous years, the whole budgetary vote for 1964 in respect of the contributions of the Organisation to the International Labour Office Staff Pensions Fund should be paid to the Fund.

(6) Resolution concerning Appointment to the Administrative Board of the International Labour Office Staff Pensions Fund and the International Labour Office Staff Pension Committee (United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund), Submitted by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.2

(Adopted on 20 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

Appoints to the Administrative Board of the International Labour Office Staff Pensions Fund for the period until 8 October 1965, and to the International Labour Office Staff Pension Committee (United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund) for the period until 10 July 1965, as a substitute member of these bodies, Mr. A. C. M. van de Ven (Netherlands), Director-General for Social Provisions and Industrial Relations in the Netherlands Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health.

(7) Resolution concerning Appointment to the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organisation, Submitted by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.2

(Adopted on 20 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—

In accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal, Extends the term of office of Lord Forster of Harraby, K.B.E., Q.C. (United Kingdom), and of Mr. André Grisel (Switzerland) as judges of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organisation for a further period of three years.

1 See Second Part, p. 248, and Appendix IV, p. 507.

(Adopted on 20 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—
Decides to amend article 29, paragraph 2, of the Financial Regulations to read as follows:

"2. Whenever a single purchase of goods or services is likely to exceed U.S. $2,500 or the equivalent, tenders from at least three suppliers shall be sought by invitations to bid or by newspaper advertisement, except where the Director-General decides in the interest of the Organisation to waive this requirement."

(9) Resolution concerning the Amendment of Article 18, Paragraph 3, of the Financial Regulations, Submitted by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives 1.

(Adopted on 20 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—
Decides to amend article 18, paragraph 3, of the Financial Regulations by deleting the following sentence:

"All payments under the above provisions of this paragraph shall be reported by the Director-General to the Governing Body."

(10) Resolution concerning the Assessment of the Contribution of Algeria to the Budget of the International Labour Organisation, Submitted by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives 2.

(Adopted on 20 June 1963)

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation—
Decides that the financial contribution of Algeria to the budget of expenses of the International Labour Organisation for the financial years 1962, 1963 and 1964 respectively shall be assessed at the same percentage as that which will be determined at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly for the contribution of Algeria to the budget of the United Nations, except that if the United Nations assessment should be lower than 0.12 per cent. (the minimum rate in the I.L.O. scale of contributions), the contribution of Algeria shall be assessed at the minimum rate of 0.12 per cent. of the budget of the International Labour Organisation.

---

AUTHENTIC TEXTS
Convention 119

(1) Convention concerning the Guarding of Machinery.

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,
Having been convened at Geneva by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Forty-seventh Session on 5 June 1963, and
Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the session, and
Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an international Convention,
adopts this twenty-fifth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three and sixty-three the following Convention, which may be cited as the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963:

PART I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1

1. All power-driven machinery, new or second-hand, shall be considered as machinery for the purpose of the application of this Convention.

2. The competent authority in each country shall determine whether and how far machinery, new or second-hand, operated by manual power presents a risk of injury to the worker and shall be considered as machinery for the purpose of the application of this Convention. Such decisions shall be taken after consultation with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned. The initiative for such consultation can be taken by any such organisation.

3. The provisions of this Convention—
   (a) apply to road and rail vehicles during locomotion only in relation to the safety of the operator or operators;
   (b) apply to mobile agricultural machinery only in relation to the safety of workers employed in connection with such machinery.

PART II. SALE, HIRE, TRANSFER IN ANY OTHER MANNER AND EXHIBITION

Article 2

1. The sale and hire of machinery of which the dangerous parts specified in paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Article are without appropriate guards shall be prohibited by national laws or regulations or prevented by other equally effective measures.
1) **Convention concernant la protection des machines.**

La Conférence générale de l'Organisation internationale du Travail,
Convocée à Genève par le Conseil d'administration du Bureau interna
tional du Travail, et s'y étant réunie le 5 juin 1963, en sa quarante-
septième session ;
Après avoir décidé d'adopter diverses propositions relatives à l'inter-
diction de la vente, de la location et de l'utilisation des machines
dépourvues de dispositifs de protection appropriés, question qui
constitue le quatrième point à l'ordre du jour de la session ;
Après avoir décidé que ces propositions prendraient la forme d'une
convention internationale,
adopte, ce vingt-cinquième jour de juin mil neuf cent soixante-trois, la
convention ci-après, qui sera dénommée Convention sur la protection des
machines, 1963 :

**PARTIE I. DISPOSITIONS GÉNÉRALES**

*Article 1*

1. Toutes les machines, neuves ou d'occasion, mues par une force autre
que la force humaine sont considérées comme des machines aux fins de
l'application de la présente convention.

2. L'autorité compétente dans chaque pays déterminera si et dans quelle
mesure des machines, neuves ou d'occasion, mues par la force humaine
présentent des dangers pour l'intégrité physique des travailleurs et doivent
être considérées comme des machines aux fins d'application de la présente
convention. Ces décisions seront prises après consultation des organisations
les plus représentatives d'employeurs et de travailleurs intéressées. L'ini-
tiative de la consultation peut être prise par l'une quelconque de ces organi-
sations.

3. Les dispositions de la présente convention :

a) ne s'appliquent aux véhicules routiers ou se déplaçant sur rails, lorsqu'ils
sont en mouvement, que dans la mesure où la sécurité du personnel de
conduite est en cause ;

b) ne s'appliquent aux machines agricoles mobiles que dans la mesure où
la sécurité des travailleurs dont l'emploi est en rapport avec ces machines
est en cause.

**PARTIE II. VENTE, LOCATION, CESSION À TOUT AUTRE TITRE
ET EXPOSITION**

*Article 2*

1. La vente et la location de machines dont les éléments dangereux,
spécifiés aux paragraphes 3 et 4 du présent article, sont dépourvus de dispo-
sitifs de protection appropriés, doivent être interdites par la législation
nationale ou empêchées par d'autres mesures tout aussi efficaces.
2. The transfer in any other manner and exhibition of machinery of which the dangerous parts specified in paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Article are without appropriate guards shall, to such extent as the competent authority may determine, be prohibited by national laws or regulations or prevented by other equally effective measures: Provided that during the exhibition of machinery the temporary removal of the guards in order to demonstrate the machinery shall not be deemed to be an infringement of this provision as long as appropriate precautions to prevent danger to persons are taken.

3. All set-screws, bolts and keys, and, to the extent prescribed by the competent authority, other projecting parts of any moving part of machinery also liable to present danger to any person coming into contact with them when they are in motion, shall be so designed, sunk or protected as to prevent such danger.

4. All flywheels, gearing, cone and cylinder friction drives, cams, pulleys, belts, chains, pinions, worm gears, crank arms and slide blocks, and, to the extent prescribed by the competent authority, shafting (including the journal ends) and other transmission machinery also liable to present danger to any person coming into contact with them when they are in motion, shall be so designed or protected as to prevent such danger. Controls also shall be so designed or protected as to prevent danger.

**Article 3**

1. The provisions of Article 2 do not apply to machinery or dangerous parts thereof specified in that Article which—
   (a) are, by virtue of their construction, as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices; or
   (b) are intended to be so installed or placed that, by virtue of their installation or position, they are as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices.

2. The prohibition of the sale, hire, transfer in any other manner or exhibition of machinery provided for in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 2 does not apply to machinery by reason only of the machinery being so designed that the requirements of paragraphs 3 and 4 of that Article are not fully complied with during maintenance, lubrication, setting-up and adjustment, if such operations can be carried out in conformity with accepted standards of safety.

3. The provisions of Article 2 do not prohibit the sale or transfer in any other manner of machinery for storage, scrapping or reconditioning, but such machinery shall not be sold, hired, transferred in any other manner or exhibited after storage or reconditioning unless protected in conformity with the said provisions.

**Article 4**

The obligation to ensure compliance with the provisions of Article 2 shall rest on the vendor, the person letting out on hire or transferring the machinery in any other manner, or the exhibitor and, where appropriate under national laws or regulations, on their respective agents. This obligation shall rest on the manufacturer when he sells machinery, lets it out on hire, transfers it in any other manner or exhibits it.

**Article 5**

1. Any Member may provide for a temporary exemption from the provisions of Article 2.

2. The duration of such temporary exemption, which shall in no case exceed three years from the coming into force of the Convention for the Member concerned, and any other conditions relating thereto, shall be prescribed by national laws or regulations or determined by other equally effective measures.

3. In the application of this Article the competent authority shall consult the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned and, as appropriate, manufacturers' organisations.
2. La cession à tout autre titre et l’exposition de machines dont les éléments dangereux, spécifiés aux paragraphes 3 et 4 du présent article, sont dépourvus de dispositifs de protection appropriés, doivent, dans la mesure déterminée par l’autorité compétente, être interdites par la législation nationale ou empêchées par d’autres mesures tout aussi efficaces. Toutefois, l’enlèvement provisoire, pendant l’exposition d’une machine, des dispositifs de protection, aux fins de démonstration, ne sera pas considéré comme une infraction à la présente disposition, à condition que les précautions appropriées soient prises pour protéger les personnes contre tout risque.

3. Tous les boulons, vis d’arrêt et clavettes, ainsi que telles autres pièces, formant saillie sur les parties mobiles des machines, qui seraient susceptibles également de présenter des dangers pour les personnes entrant en contact avec ces pièces — lorsque celles-ci sont en mouvement — et qui seraient désignées par l’autorité compétente, doivent être conçus, noyés ou protégés de façon à prévenir ces dangers.

4. Tous les volants, engrenages, cônes ou cylindres de friction, cannes, poulies, courroies, chaînes, pignons, vis sans fin, bielles et coulisseaux, ainsi que les arbres (y compris leurs extrémités) et autres organes de transmission qui seraient susceptibles également de présenter des dangers pour les personnes entrant en contact avec ces éléments — lorsque ceux-ci sont en mouvement — et qui seraient désignés par l’autorité compétente, doivent être conçus ou protégés de façon à prévenir ces dangers. Les commandes des machines doivent être conçues ou protégées de façon à prévenir tout danger.

**Article 3**

1. Les dispositions de l’article 2 ne s’appliquent pas aux machines ou à leurs éléments dangereux spécifiés audit article qui :
   a) offrent, du fait de leur construction, une sécurité identique à celle que présenteraient des dispositifs de protection appropriés ;
   b) sont destinés à être installés ou placés de manière que, du fait de leur installation ou de leur emplacement, ils offrent une sécurité identique à celle que présenteraient des dispositifs de protection appropriés.

2. Des machines construites de telle façon que les conditions prévues aux paragraphes 3 et 4 de l’article 2 ne seraient pas pleinement remplies pendant les opérations d’entretien, de graissage, de changement des parties travaillantes et de réglage — à condition toutefois que ces opérations puissent être effectuées conformément aux normes usuelles de sécurité — ne seront pas, de ce simple fait, visées par l’interdiction de vente, de location, de cession à tout autre titre ou d’exposition, prévue aux paragraphes 1 et 2 dudit article.

3. Les dispositions de l’article 2 ne font pas obstacle à la vente ni à la cession à tout autre titre de machines pour les entreposer, les mettre au rebut ou les remettre en état. Toutefois, ces machines ne doivent pas être vendues, louées, cédées à tout autre titre ou exposées, après leur entreposage ou leur remise en état, à moins qu’elles ne remplissent les conditions prévues à l’article 2.

**Article 4**

L’obligation d’appliquer les dispositions de l’article 2 doit incomber au vendeur, au loueur, à la personne qui cède la machine à tout autre titre ou à l’exposant, ainsi que, dans les cas appropriés, conformément à la législation nationale, à leurs mandataires respectifs. Le fabricant qui vend, loue, cède à tout autre titre ou expose des machines aura la même obligation.

**Article 5**

1. Tout Membre peut prévoir une dérogation temporaire aux dispositions de l’article 2.

2. Les conditions et la durée de cette dérogation temporaire, qui ne peut dépasser trois ans à partir de l’entrée en vigueur de la présente convention pour le Membre intéressé, doivent être déterminées par la législation nationale ou par d’autres mesures tout aussi efficaces.

3. Aux fins de l’application du présent article, l’autorité compétente doit consulter les organisations les plus représentatives d’employeurs et de travailleurs intéressées, ainsi que, le cas échéant, les organisations de fabricants.
PART III. USE

Article 6

1. The use of machinery any dangerous part of which, including the point of operation, is without appropriate guards shall be prohibited by national laws or regulations or prevented by other equally effective measures: Provided that where this prohibition cannot fully apply without preventing the use of the machinery it shall apply to the extent that the use of the machinery permits.

2. Machinery shall be so guarded as to ensure that national regulations and standards of occupational safety and hygiene are not infringed.

Article 7

The obligation to ensure compliance with the provisions of Article 6 shall rest on the employer.

Article 8

1. The provisions of Article 6 do not apply to machinery or parts thereof which, by virtue of their construction, installation or position, are as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices.

2. The provisions of Article 6 and Article 11 do not prevent the maintenance, lubrication, setting-up or adjustment of machinery or parts thereof carried out in conformity with accepted standards of safety.

Article 9

1. Any Member may provide for a temporary exemption from the provisions of Article 6.

2. The duration of such temporary exemption, which shall in no case exceed three years from the coming into force of the Convention for the Member concerned, and any other conditions relating thereto, shall be prescribed by national laws or regulations or determined by other equally effective measures.

3. In the application of this Article the competent authority shall consult the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned.

Article 10

1. The employer shall take steps to bring national laws or regulations relating to the guarding of machinery to the notice of workers and shall instruct them, as and where appropriate, regarding the dangers arising and the precautions to be observed in the use of machinery.

2. The employer shall establish and maintain such environmental conditions as not to endanger workers employed on machinery covered by this Convention.

Article 11

1. No worker shall use any machinery without the guards provided being in position, nor shall any worker be required to use any machinery without the guards provided being in position.

2. No worker using machinery shall make inoperative the guards provided, nor shall such guards be made inoperative on any machinery to be used by any worker.

Article 12

The ratification of this Convention shall not affect the rights of workers under national social security or social insurance legislation.
PARTIE III. UTILISATION

Article 6

1. L'utilisation de machines dont l'un quelconque des éléments dangereux, y compris les parties travaillantes (zone d'opération), est dépourvu de dispositifs de protection appropriés, doit être interdite par la législation nationale ou empêchée par d'autres mesures tout aussi efficaces. Toutefois, lorsque cette interdiction ne peut être pleinement respectée sans empêcher l'utilisation de la machine, elle doit néanmoins s'appliquer dans toute la mesure où cette utilisation le permet.

2. Les machines doivent être protégées de façon que la réglementation et les normes nationales de sécurité et d'hygiène du travail soient respectées.

Article 7

L'obligation d'appliquer les dispositions de l'article 6 doit incomber à l'employeur.

Article 8

1. Les dispositions de l'article 6 ne s'appliquent pas aux machines ou aux éléments de machines qui, du fait de leur construction, de leur installation ou de leur emplacement, offrent une sécurité identique à celle que présenteraient des dispositifs de protection appropriés.

2. Les dispositions de l'article 6 et de l'article 11 ne font pas obstacle aux opérations d'entretien, de graissage, de changement des parties travaillantes ou de réglage des machines ou éléments de machines, effectuées conformément aux normes usuelles de sécurité.

Article 9

1. Tout Membre peut prévoir une dérogation temporaire aux dispositions de l'article 6.

2. Les conditions et la durée de cette dérogation temporaire, qui ne peut dépasser trois ans à partir de l'entrée en vigueur de la présente convention pour le Membre intéressé, doivent être déterminées par la législation nationale ou par d'autres mesures tout aussi efficaces.

3. Aux fins de l'application du présent article, l'autorité compétente doit consulter les organisations les plus représentatives d'employeurs et de travailleurs intéressées.

Article 10

1. L'employeur doit prendre des mesures pour mettre les travailleurs au courant de la législation nationale concernant la protection des machines et doit les informer, de manière appropriée, des dangers résultant de l'utilisation des machines, ainsi que des précautions à prendre.

2. L'employeur doit établir et maintenir des conditions d'ambiance telles que les travailleurs affectés aux machines visées par la présente convention ne courent aucun danger.

Article 11

1. Aucun travailleur ne doit utiliser une machine sans que les dispositifs de protection dont elle est pourvue soient en place. Il ne pourra être demandé à aucun travailleur d'utiliser une machine sans que les dispositifs de protection dont elle est pourvue soient en place.

2. Aucun travailleur ne doit rendre inopérants les dispositifs de protection dont est pourvue la machine qu'il utilise. Les dispositifs de protection dont est pourvue une machine destinée à être utilisée par un travailleur ne doivent pas être rendus inopérants.

Article 12

La ratification de la présente convention n'affectera pas les droits qui découlent pour les travailleurs des législations nationales de sécurité sociale ou d'assurances sociales.
Article 13

The provisions of this Part of this Convention relating to the obligations of employers and workers shall, if and in so far as the competent authority so determines, apply to self-employed workers.

Article 14

The term "employer" for the purpose of this Part of this Convention includes, where appropriate under national laws or regulations, a prescribed agent of the employer.

PART IV. MEASURES OF APPLICATION

Article 15

1. All necessary measures, including the provision of appropriate penalties, shall be taken to ensure the effective enforcement of the provisions of this Convention.

2. Each Member which ratifies this Convention undertakes to provide appropriate inspection services for the purpose of supervising the application of the provisions of the Convention, or to satisfy itself that appropriate inspection is carried out.

Article 16

Any national laws or regulations giving effect to the provisions of this Convention shall be made by the competent authority after consultation with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned and, as appropriate, manufacturers' organisations.

PART V. SCOPE

Article 17

1. The provisions of this Convention apply to all branches of economic activity unless the Member ratifying the Convention specifies a more limited application by a declaration appended to its ratification.

2. In cases where a declaration specifying a more limited application is made—

(a) the provisions of the Convention shall be applicable as a minimum to undertakings or branches of economic activity in respect of which the competent authority, after consultation with the labour inspection services and with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned, determines that machinery is extensively used; the initiative for such consultation can be taken by any such organisation;

(b) the Member shall indicate in its reports under article 22 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation any progress which may have been made with a view towards wider application of the provisions of this Convention.

3. Any Member which has made a declaration in pursuance of paragraph 1 of this Article may at any time cancel that declaration in whole or in part by a subsequent declaration.

PART VI. FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 18

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director-General of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 19

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director-General.
Article 13

Les dispositions de la présente partie de la convention qui ont trait aux obligations des employeurs et des travailleurs s'appliquent, si l'autorité compétente en décide ainsi et dans la mesure fixée par elle, aux travailleurs indépendants.

Article 14

Aux fins de l'application de la présente partie de la convention, le terme « employeur » désigne également, le cas échéant, le mandataire de l'employeur au sens où l'entend la législation nationale.

PARTIE IV. MESURES D'APPLICATION

Article 15

1. Toutes mesures nécessaires, y compris des mesures prévoyant des sanctions appropriées, doivent être prises en vue d'assurer l'application effective des dispositions de la présente convention.

2. Tout Membre qui ratifie la présente convention s'engage à charger des services d'inspection appropriés du contrôle de l'application de ses dispositions, ou à vérifier qu'une inspection adéquate est assurée.

Article 16

Toute législation nationale donnant effet aux dispositions de la présente convention doit être élaborée par l'autorité compétente après consultation des organisations les plus représentatives d'employeurs et de travailleurs intéressées, ainsi que, le cas échéant, des organisations de fabricants.

PARTIE V. CHAMP D'APPLICATION

Article 17

1. Les dispositions de la présente convention s'appliquent à tous les secteurs d'activité économique, à moins que le Membre ratifiant la convention n'en restreigne l'application par une déclaration annexée à sa ratification.

2. Dans le cas d'une déclaration restreignant ainsi l'application des dispositions de la présente convention :

a) les dispositions de la convention doivent s'appliquer au moins aux entreprises ou aux secteurs d'activité économique que l'autorité compétente, après consultation des services de l'inspection du travail et des organisations les plus représentatives d'employeurs et de travailleurs intéressées, considère comme utilisant des machines dans une mesure importante ; l'initiative de la consultation peut être prise par l'une quelconque desdites organisations ;

b) le Membre doit indiquer, dans ses rapports à soumettre en vertu de l'article 22 de la Constitution de l'Organisation internationale du Travail, quels ont été les progrès réalisés en vue d'une plus large application des dispositions de la convention.

3. Tout Membre qui a fait une déclaration conformément au paragraphe 1 ci-dessus peut, en tout temps, l'annuler totalement ou partiellement, par une déclaration ultérieure.

PARTIE VI. DISPOSITIONS FINALES

Article 18

Les ratifications formelles de la présente convention seront communiquées au Directeur général du Bureau international du Travail et par lui enregistrées.

Article 19

1. La présente convention ne liera que les Membres de l'Organisation internationale du Travail dont la ratification aura été enregistrée par le Directeur général.
2. It shall come into force twelve months after the date on which the ratifications of two Members have been registered with the Director-General.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member twelve months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

**Article 20**

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention first comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director-General of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this Article.

**Article 21**

1. The Director-General of the International Labour Office shall notify all Members of the International Labour Organisation of the registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the second ratification communicated to him, the Director-General shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

**Article 22**

The Director-General of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding Articles.

**Article 23**

At such times as it may consider necessary the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall examine the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

**Article 24**

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides—

   (a) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall ipso jure involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 20 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

   (b) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

**Article 25**

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.
2. Elle entrera en vigueur douze mois après que les ratifications de deux Membres auront été enregistrées par le Directeur général.

3. Par la suite, cette convention entrera en vigueur pour chaque Membre douze mois après la date où sa ratification aura été enregistrée.

**Article 20**

1. Tout Membre ayant ratifié la présente convention peut la dénoncer à l’expiration d’une période de dix années après la date de la mise en vigueur initiale de la convention, par un acte communiqué au Directeur général du Bureau international du Travail et par lui enregistré. La dénonciation ne prendra effet qu’une année après avoir été enregistrée.

2. Tout Membre ayant ratifié la présente convention qui, dans le délai d’une année après l’expiration de la période de dix années mentionnée au paragraphe précédent, ne fera pas usage de la faculté de dénonciation prévue par le présent article sera lié pour une nouvelle période de dix années et, par la suite, pourra dénoncer la présente convention à l’expiration de chaque période de dix années dans les conditions prévues au présent article.

**Article 21**

1. Le Directeur général du Bureau international du Travail notifiera à tous les Membres de l’Organisation internationale du Travail l’enregistrement de toutes les ratifications et dénonciations qui lui seront communiquées par les Membres de l’Organisation.

2. En notifiant aux Membres de l’Organisation l’enregistrement de la deuxième ratification qui lui aura été communiquée, le Directeur général appellera l’attention des Membres de l’Organisation sur la date à laquelle la présente convention entrera en vigueur.

**Article 22**


**Article 23**

Chaque fois qu’il le jugera nécessaire, le Conseil d’administration du Bureau international du Travail présentera à la Conférence générale un rapport sur l’application de la présente convention et examinera s’il y a lieu d’inscrire à l’ordre du jour de la Conférence la question de sa révision totale ou partielle.

**Article 24**

1. Au cas où la Conférence adopterait une nouvelle convention portant révision totale ou partielle de la présente convention, et à moins que la nouvelle convention ne dispose autrement :

   a) la ratification par un Membre de la nouvelle convention portant révision entrainerait de plein droit, nonobstant l’article 20 ci-dessus, dénonciation immédiate de la présente convention, sous réserve que la nouvelle convention portant révision soit entrée en vigueur ;

   b) à partir de la date de l’entrée en vigueur de la nouvelle convention portant révision, la présente convention cesserait d’être ouverte à la ratification des Membres.

2. La présente convention demeurerait en tout cas en vigueur dans sa forme et teneur pour les Membres qui l’auraient ratifiée et qui ne ratifieraient pas la convention portant révision.

**Article 25**

Les versions française et anglaise du texte de la présente convention font également foi.
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(2) Recommendation concerning the Guarding of Machinery.

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,
Having been convened at Geneva by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Forty-seventh Session on 5 June 1963, and
Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the prohibition of the sale, hire and use of inadequately guarded machinery, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the session, and
Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of a Recommendation supplementing the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963,
adopts this twenty-fifth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three the following Recommendation, which may be cited as the Guarding of Machinery Recommendation, 1963:

I. MANUFACTURE, SALE, HIRE, TRANSFER IN ANY OTHER MANNER AND EXHIBITION

1. (1) The manufacture, sale, hire, and, to such extent as the competent authority may determine, the transfer in any other manner and exhibition of specified types of machinery should be prohibited by national laws or regulations or prevented by other equally effective measures when this machinery, as defined in Article 1 of the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963, comprises, in addition to the parts specified in Article 2 thereof, dangerous working parts (at the point of operation) which are without appropriate guards.

(2) The provisions of subparagraph (1) of this Paragraph and of Paragraph 2 should be considered in the design of the machinery in question.

(3) The types of machinery referred to in subparagraph (1) should be specified by national laws or regulations or other equally effective measures.

2. In specifying the types of machinery covered by Paragraph 1 account should also be taken of the following provisions:

(a) all working parts of machinery which, while in operation, may produce flying particles should be adequately guarded in such a manner as to ensure the safety of the operators;

(b) all parts of machinery which are under dangerous electrical pressure should be protected in such a manner as to give complete protection to the workers;

(c) wherever possible, automatic safeguards should protect persons when machinery is being started, is in operation or is being stopped;

(d) machinery should be so constructed as to exclude as far as possible any dangers other than those specified in this Paragraph to which a person working on the machines may be exposed, taking account of the nature of the materials or the type of danger.

3. (1) The provisions of Paragraph 1 do not apply to machinery or working parts thereof specified in that Paragraph which:

(a) are, by virtue of their construction, as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices; or

(b) are intended to be so installed or placed that, by virtue of their installation or position, they are as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices.
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2) Recommandation concernant la protection des machines.

La Conférence générale de l'Organisation internationale du Travail,
Convoquée à Genève par le Conseil d'administration du Bureau international du Travail, et s'y étant réunie le 5 juin 1963, en sa quarante-septième session ;
Après avoir décidé d'adopter diverses propositions relatives à l'interdiction de la vente, de la location et de l'utilisation des machines dépourvues de dispositifs de protection appropriés, question qui constitue le quatrième point à l'ordre du jour de la session ;
Après avoir décidé que ces propositions prendraient la forme d'une recommandation complétant la convention sur la protection des machines, 1963,

I. FABRICATION, VENTE, LOCATION, CESSION A TOUT AUTRE TITRE ET EXPOSITION

1. (1) La fabrication, la vente, la location et, dans la mesure déterminée par l'autorité compétente, la cession à tout autre titre, ainsi que l'exposition de types déterminés de machines, telles que définies à l'article 1 de la convention sur la protection des machines, 1963, devraient être interdites par la législation nationale ou être empêchées par d'autres mesures tout aussi efficaces lorsque ces machines comportent, outre les éléments spécifiés à l'article 2 de ladite convention, des parties travaillantes (zone d'opération) dangereuses dépourvues de dispositifs de protection appropriés.
(2) Il devrait être tenu compte des dispositions du sous-paragraphe précédent et du paragraphe 2 lors de la création des machines.
(3) Les types de machines visés au sous-paragraphe (1) devraient être déterminés par la législation nationale ou par d'autres mesures tout aussi efficaces.

2. Aux fins de la détermination des types de machines visés au paragraphe 1, il devrait en outre être tenu compte des dispositions suivantes :
   a) toutes les parties travaillantes de machines qui peuvent produire en cours de fonctionnement des éclats ou des copeaux devraient être convenablement protégées de façon à garantir la sécurité des préposés aux machines ;
   b) tous les éléments de machines qui se trouvent sous tension électrique dangereuse devraient être protégés de façon à assurer la protection complète des travailleurs ;
   c) chaque fois que cela est possible, des dispositifs automatiques devraient protéger les personnes lors de la mise en marche de la machine, pendant son utilisation et lorsqu'elle s'arrête ;
   d) les machines devraient être construites de manière à éviter dans la mesure du possible tout danger, autre que ceux qui sont spécifiés dans le présent paragraphe, auquel peuvent être exposées les personnes qui sont affectées à ces machines, compte tenu de la nature des matériaux mis en œuvre ou du genre de danger.

3. (1) Les dispositions du paragraphe 1 ne s'appliquent pas aux machines ou aux parties travaillantes de machines visées audit paragraphe qui :
   a) offrent, du fait de leur construction, une sécurité identique à celle que présenteraient des dispositifs de protection appropriés ;
   b) sont destinées à être installées ou placées de manière que, du fait de leur installation ou de leur emplacement, elles offrent une sécurité identique à celle que présenteraient des dispositifs de protection appropriés.
(2) The prohibition of the manufacture, sale, hire, transfer in any other manner, or exhibition of machinery provided for in Paragraph 1 does not apply to machinery by reason only of the machinery being so designed that the requirements of that Paragraph concerning guarding are not fully complied with during maintenance, lubrication, setting-up and adjustment, if such operations can be carried out in conformity with accepted standards of safety.

(3) The provisions of Paragraph 1 do not prohibit the sale or transfer in any other manner of machinery for storage, scrapping or reconditioning, but such machinery should not be sold, hired, transferred in any other manner or exhibited after storage or reconditioning unless protected in conformity with the said provisions.

4. The obligation to ensure compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 1 should rest on the manufacturer, the vendor, the person letting out on hire or transferring the machinery in any other manner, or the exhibitor, and, where appropriate under national laws or regulations, their respective agents.

5. (1) Any Member may provide for a temporary exemption from the provisions of Paragraph 1.

(2) The duration of such temporary exemption, which should in no case exceed three years, and any other conditions relating thereto, should be prescribed by national laws or regulations or determined by other equally effective measures.

(3) In the application of this Paragraph the competent authority should consult the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned and, as appropriate, manufacturers' organisations.

6. Any operating instructions for machinery should be based on safe methods of operation.

II. USE

7. (1) The use of machinery any dangerous part of which, including the point of operation, is without appropriate guards should be prohibited by national laws or regulations or prevented by other equally effective measures: Provided that where this prohibition cannot fully apply without preventing the use of the machinery it should apply to the extent that the use of the machinery permits.

(2) Machinery should be so guarded as to ensure that national regulations and standards of occupational safety and hygiene are not infringed.

8. The obligation to ensure compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 7 should rest on the employer.

9. (1) The provisions of Paragraph 7 do not apply to machinery or parts thereof which, by virtue of their construction, installation or position, are as safe as if they were guarded by appropriate safety devices.

(2) The provisions of Paragraph 7 and Paragraph 12 do not prevent the maintenance, lubrication, setting-up or adjustment of machinery or parts thereof carried out in conformity with accepted standards of safety.

10. (1) Any Member may provide for a temporary exemption from the provisions of Paragraph 7.

(2) The duration of such temporary exemption, which should in no case exceed three years, and any other conditions relating thereto, should be prescribed by national laws or regulations or determined by other equally effective measures.

(3) In the application of this Paragraph the competent authority should consult the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned.
(2) Des machines construites de telle façon que les conditions prévues au paragraphe 1 ne seraient pas pleinement remplies pendant les opérations d'entretien, de graissage, de changement des parties travaillantes ou de réglage — à condition toutefois que ces opérations puissent être effectuées conformément aux normes usuelles de sécurité — ne seront pas, de ce simple fait, visées par l'interdiction de fabrication, de vente, de location, de cession à tout autre titre ou d'exposition, prévue au dit paragraphe.

(3) Les dispositions du paragraphe 1 ne font pas obstacle à la vente ni à la cession à tout autre titre de machines pour les entreposer, les mettre au rebut ou les remettre en état. Toutefois, ces machines ne devraient pas être vendues, louées, cédées à tout autre titre ou exposées, après leur entreposage ou leur remise en état, à moins qu'elles ne remplissent les conditions prévues au paragraphe 1.

4. L'obligation d'appliquer les dispositions du paragraphe 1 devrait incomber au fabricant, au vendeur, au loueur, à la personne qui cède des machines à tout autre titre, ou à l'exposant ainsi que, dans les cas appropriés, conformément à la législation nationale, à leurs mandataires respectifs.

5. (1) Tout Membre peut prévoir une dérogation temporaire aux dispositions du paragraphe 1.

(2) Les conditions et la durée de cette dérogation temporaire, qui ne pourrait dépasser trois ans, devraient être déterminées par la législation nationale ou par d'autres mesures tout aussi efficaces.

(3) Aux fins de l'application du présent paragraphe, l'autorité compétente devrait consulter les organisations les plus représentatives d'employeurs et de travailleurs intéressées, ainsi que, le cas échéant, les organisations de fabricants.

6. Tout mode d'emploi de la machine devrait être basé sur les méthodes propres à assurer son utilisation en toute sécurité.

II. UTILISATION

7. (1) L'utilisation des machines dont l'un quelconque des éléments dangereux, y compris les parties travaillantes (zone d'opération), est dépourvu de dispositifs de protection appropriés, devrait être interdite par la législation nationale ou empêchée par d'autres mesures tout aussi efficaces. Toutefois, lorsque cette interdiction ne peut être pleinement respectée sans empêcher l'utilisation de la machine, elle devrait néanmoins s'appliquer dans toute la mesure où cette utilisation le permet.

(2) Les machines devraient être protégées de façon que la réglementation et les normes nationales de sécurité et d'hygiène du travail soient respectées.

8. L'obligation d'appliquer les dispositions du paragraphe 7 devrait incomber à l'employeur.

9. (1) Les dispositions du paragraphe 7 ne s'appliquent pas aux machines et aux éléments de machines qui, du fait de leur construction, de leur installation ou de leur emplacement, offrent une sécurité identique à celle que présenteraient des dispositifs de protection appropriés.

(2) Les dispositions du paragraphe 7 et du paragraphe 12 ne font pas obstacle aux opérations d'entretien, de graissage, de changement des parties travaillantes ou de réglage des machines ou éléments de machines, effectuées conformément aux normes usuelles de sécurité.

10. (1) Tout Membre peut prévoir une dérogation temporaire aux dispositions du paragraphe 7.

(2) Les conditions et la durée de cette dérogation temporaire, qui ne peut dépasser trois ans, devraient être déterminées par la législation nationale ou par d'autres mesures tout aussi efficaces.

(3) Aux fins de l'application du présent paragraphe, l'autorité compétente devrait consulter les organisations les plus représentatives d'employeurs et de travailleurs intéressées.
11. (1) The employer should take steps to bring national laws or regulations relating to the guarding of machinery to the notice of workers and should instruct them, as and where appropriate, regarding the dangers arising and the precautions to be observed in the use of machinery.

(2) The employer should establish and maintain such environmental conditions as not to endanger workers employed on machinery covered by this Recommendation.

12. (1) No worker should use any machinery without the guards provided being in position, nor should any worker be required to use any machinery without the guards provided being in position.

(2) No worker using machinery should make inoperative the guards provided, nor should such guards be made inoperative on any machinery to be used by any worker.

13. The rights of workers under national social security or social insurance legislation should not be affected by the application of this Recommendation.

14. The provisions of this part of this Recommendation relating to the obligations of employers and workers should, if and in so far as the competent authority so determines, be applied to self-employed workers.

15. The term “employer” for the purpose of this part of this Recommendation includes, where appropriate under national laws and regulations, a prescribed agent of the employer.

III. SCOPE

16. This Recommendation applies to all branches of economic activity.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

17. (1) All necessary measures should be taken to ensure the effective enforcement of the provisions of this Recommendation. Such measures should include the fullest possible detailed specification of the means by which machinery or certain types thereof may be regarded as appropriately guarded, provision for effective inspection and provision for appropriate penalties.

(2) Each Member should provide appropriate inspection services for the purpose of supervising the application of this Recommendation, or satisfy itself that appropriate inspection is carried out.

18. (1) Members exporting or importing machinery should enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements providing for mutual consultation and co-operation concerning the application of the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963, and this Recommendation in respect of transactions having an international character for the sale or hire of machinery.

(2) Such arrangements should provide, in particular, for uniformity in occupational safety and hygiene standards relating to machinery.

(3) In making such arrangements, Members should have regard to the relevant Model Codes of Safety Regulations and Codes of Practice published from time to time by the International Labour Office, and to the appropriate standards of international organisations for standardisation.

19. National laws or regulations giving effect to the provisions of this Recommendation should be made by the competent authority after consultation with the most representative organisations of employers and workers concerned and, as appropriate, manufacturers' organisations.
11. (1) L'employeur devrait prendre des mesures pour mettre les travailleurs au courant de la législation nationale concernant la protection des machines et devrait les informer, de manière appropriée, des dangers résultant de l'utilisation des machines, ainsi que des précautions à prendre.

(2) L'employeur devrait établir et maintenir des conditions d'ambiance telles que les travailleurs affectés aux machines visées par la présente recommandation ne courent aucun danger.

12. (1) Aucun travailleur ne devrait utiliser une machine sans que les dispositifs de protection dont elle est pourvue soient en place. Il ne devrait être demandé à aucun travailleur d'utiliser une machine sans que les dispositifs de protection dont elle est pourvue soient en place.

(2) Aucun travailleur ne devrait rendre inopérants les dispositifs de protection dont est pourvue la machine qu'il utilise. Les dispositifs de protection dont est pourvue une machine destinée à être utilisée par un travailleur ne devraient pas être rendus inopérants.

13. Les droits qui découlent pour les travailleurs des législations nationales de sécurité sociale ou d'assurances sociales ne devraient pas être affectés par l'application de la présente recommandation.

14. Les dispositions de la présente partie de la recommandation qui ont trait aux obligations des employeurs et des travailleurs devraient être appliquées, si l'autorité compétente en décide ainsi et dans la mesure fixée par elle, aux travailleurs indépendants.

15. Aux fins de l'application de la présente partie de la recommandation, le terme « employeur » désigne également, le cas échéant, le mandataire de l'employeur au sens où l'entend la législation nationale.

III. CHAMP D'APPLICATION

16. La présente recommandation s'applique à tous les secteurs d'activité économique.

IV. DISPOSITIONS DIVERSES

17. (1) Toutes mesures nécessaires devraient être prises en vue d'assurer l'application effective des dispositions de la présente recommandation. Ces mesures devraient prévoir des dispositions détaillées aussi complètes que possible spécifiant par quels moyens les machines ou certains types de machines pourraient être considérés comme protégés d'une façon appropriée, des dispositions pour une inspection efficace ainsi que des sanctions appropriées.

(2) Tout Membre devrait charger des services d'inspection appropriés du contrôle de l'application des dispositions de la présente recommandation ou vérifier qu'une inspection adéquate est assurée.

18. (1) Des arrangements bilatéraux ou multilatéraux de consultation et de coopération mutuelles devraient être prévus, entre Membres exportant ou important des machines, pour appliquer la convention sur la protection des machines, 1963, ainsi que la présente recommandation, aux transactions de caractère international touchant à la vente ou à la location de machines.

(2) Ces arrangements devraient notamment porter sur l'uniformisation des normes de sécurité et d'hygiène du travail relatives aux machines.

(3) Lors de l'élaboration de tels arrangements, les Membres devraient tenir compte des règlements types de sécurité et recueils de directives pratiques pertinents publiés de temps à autre par le Bureau international du Travail, ainsi que des normes appropriées des organisations internationales de normalisation.

19. Toute législation nationale donnant effet aux dispositions de la présente recommandation devrait être élaborée par l'autorité compétente après consultation des organisations les plus représentatives d'employeurs et de travailleurs intéressées, ainsi que, le cas échéant, des organisations de fabricants.
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(3) Recommendation concerning Termination of Employment at the Initiative of the Employer.

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Forty-seventh Session on 5 June 1963, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to termination of employment at the initiative of the employer, which is the fifth item on the agenda of the session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of a Recommendation,

adopts this twenty-sixth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three the following Recommendation, which may be cited as the Termination of Employment Recommendation, 1963:

I. METHODS OF IMPLEMENTATION

1. Effect may be given to this Recommendation through national laws or regulations, collective agreements, works rules, arbitration awards, or court decisions or in such other manner consistent with national practice as may be appropriate under national conditions.

II. STANDARDS OF GENERAL APPLICATION

2. (1) Termination of employment should not take place unless there is a valid reason for such termination connected with the capacity or conduct of the worker or based on the operational requirements of the undertaking, establishment or service.

(2) The definition or interpretation of such valid reason should be left to the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1.

3. The following, inter alia, should not constitute valid reasons for termination of employment:

(a) union membership or participation in union activities outside working hours or, with the consent of the employer, within working hours;

(b) seeking office as, or acting or having acted in the capacity of, a workers' representative;

(c) the filing in good faith of a complaint or the participation in a proceeding against an employer involving alleged violation of laws or regulations; or

(d) race, colour, sex, marital status, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin.

4. A worker who feels that his employment has been unjustifiably terminated should be entitled, unless the matter has been satisfactorily determined through such procedures within the undertaking, establishment or service, as may exist or be established consistent with this Recommendation, to appeal, within a reasonable time, against that termination with the assistance, where the worker so requests, of a person representing him to a body established under a collective agreement or to a neutral body such as a court, an arbitrator, an arbitration committee or a similar body.
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3) Recommandation concernant la cessation de la relation de travail à l'initiative de l'employeur.

La Conférence générale de l'Organisation internationale du Travail, Convoquée à Genève par le Conseil d'administration du Bureau international du Travail, et s'y étant réunie le 5 juin 1963, en sa quarante-septième session ;

Après avoir décidé d'adopter diverses propositions relatives à la cessation de la relation de travail à l'initiative de l'employeur, question qui constitue le cinquième point à l'ordre du jour de la session ;

Après avoir décidé que ces propositions prendraient la forme d'une recommandation,


I. MÉTHODES D'APPLICATION

1. La présente recommandation pourra être appliquée par voie de législation nationale, de conventions collectives, de règlements d'entreprise, de sentences arbitrales ou de décisions judiciaires, ou de toute autre manière qui serait conforme à la pratique nationale et semblerait appropriée, compte tenu des conditions propres à chaque pays.

II. NORMES D'APPLICATION GÉNÉRALE

2. (1) Aucun licenciement ne devrait intervenir sans qu'il existe un motif valable de licenciement lié à l'aptitude ou à la conduite du travailleur ou fondé sur les nécessités du fonctionnement de l'entreprise, de l'établissement ou du service.

(2) La définition ou l'interprétation d'un tel motif valable devrait être laissée aux méthodes d'application prévues au paragraphe 1.

3. Ne devraient pas constituer des motifs valables de licenciement, notamment :

a) l'affiliation syndicale ou la participation à des activités syndicales en dehors des heures de travail ou, avec le consentement de l'employeur, durant les heures de travail ;

b) le fait de solliciter, d'exercer ou d'avoir exercé un mandat de représentation des travailleurs ;

c) le fait d'avoir de bonne foi déposé une plainte ou participé à des procédures engagées contre un employeur en raison de violations alléguées de la législation ;

d) la race, la couleur, le sexe, la situation conjugale, la religion, l'opinion politique, l'ascendance nationale ou l'origine sociale.

4. Le travailleur qui estime avoir fait l'objet d'une mesure de licenciement injustifiée devrait — à moins que la question n'ait été réglée d'une manière satisfaisante selon telles procédures qui pourraient exister ou être établies en conformité de la présente recommandation dans l'entreprise, l'établissement ou le service — avoir le droit de recourir contre cette mesure, dans un délai raisonnable et avec l'assistance, si le travailleur le demande, d'une personne le représentant, devant un organisme institué en vertu d'une convention collective ou devant un organisme impartial tel qu'un tribunal, un arbitre, une commission d'arbitrage ou un organisme similaire.
5. (1) The bodies referred to in Paragraph 4 should be empowered to examine the reasons given for the termination of employment and the other circumstances relating to the case and to render a decision on the justification of the termination.

(2) Subparagraph (1) should not be construed as implying that the neutral body should be empowered to intervene in the determination of the size of the work force of the undertaking, establishment or service.

6. The bodies referred to in Paragraph 4 should be empowered, if they find that the termination of employment was unjustified, to order that the worker concerned, unless reinstated, where appropriate with payment of unpaid wages, should be paid adequate compensation, or afforded such other relief as may be determined under the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1, or granted such compensation and other relief as may be so determined.

7. (1) A worker whose employment is to be terminated should be entitled to a reasonable period of notice or compensation in lieu thereof.

(2) During the period of notice the worker should, as far as practicable, be entitled to a reasonable amount of time off without loss in pay in order to seek other employment.

8. (1) The worker whose employment has been terminated should be entitled to receive, on request, at the time of the termination, a certificate from the employer specifying the dates of his engagement and termination and the type or types of work on which he was employed.

(2) Nothing unfavourable to the worker should be inserted in such certificate.

9. Some form of income protection should be provided for workers whose employment has been terminated; such protection may include unemployment insurance or other forms of social security, or severance allowance or other types of separation benefits paid for by the employer, or a combination of benefits, depending upon national laws or regulations, collective agreements and the personnel policy of the employer.

10. The question whether employers should consult with workers' representatives before a final decision is taken on individual cases of termination of employment should be left to the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1.

11. (1) In case of dismissal for serious misconduct, a period of notice or compensation in lieu thereof need not be required, and the severance allowance or other types of separation benefits paid for by the employer, where applicable, may be withheld.

(2) Dismissal for serious misconduct should take place only in cases where the employer cannot in good faith be expected to take any other course.

(3) An employer should be deemed to have waived his right to dismiss for serious misconduct if such action has not been taken within a reasonable time after he has become aware of the serious misconduct.

(4) A worker should be deemed to have waived his right to appeal against dismissal for serious misconduct if he has not appealed within a reasonable time after he has been notified of the dismissal.

(5) Before a decision to dismiss a worker for serious misconduct becomes finally effective, the worker should be given an opportunity to state his case promptly, with the assistance where appropriate of a person representing him.

(6) In the implementation of this Paragraph the definition or interpretation of "serious misconduct" as well as the determination of "reasonable time" should be left to the methods of implementation set out in Paragraph 1.
5. (1) Les organismes mentionnés au paragraphe 4 devraient être habilités à examiner les motifs invoqués pour justifier le licenciement, ainsi que les autres circonstances pertinentes, et à se prononcer sur la justification du licenciement.

(2) Le sous-paragraphe précédent ne devrait pas être interprété comme signifiant que l'organisme impartial devrait être habilité à intervenir dans la détermination de l'importance numérique du personnel de l'entreprise, de l'établissement ou du service.

6. Les organismes mentionnés au paragraphe 4 devraient être habilités à ordonner — s'ils arrivent à la conclusion que le licenciement était injustifié — que le travailleur intéressé, à moins qu'il n'ait été réintégré, avec, dans les cas appropriés, paiement du salaire non perçu, reçoive, soit une indemnisation adéquate, soit telle autre forme de réparation qui pourrait être déterminée d'après les méthodes d'application prévues au paragraphe 1, soit une combinaison de l'une et l'autre qui serait également ainsi déterminée.

7. (1) Le travailleur qui va faire l'objet d'une mesure de licenciement devrait avoir droit à un préavis d'une durée raisonnable ou à une indemnité compensatoire en tenant lieu.

(2) Pendant la durée du préavis, le travailleur devrait, dans la mesure du possible, avoir droit à des périodes de temps libre raisonnables sans perte de salaire, de façon à pouvoir chercher un autre emploi.

8. (1) Au moment de son licenciement, le travailleur licencié devrait avoir le droit de se faire délivrer, à sa demande, par l'employeur, un certificat indiquant les dates de son entrée en service et de son départ et la nature du travail ou des travaux dont il était chargé.

(2) Aucune mention défavorable au travailleur ne devrait figurer dans ce certificat.

9. Les travailleurs licenciés devraient être assurés d'une certaine protection de leur revenu ; cette protection pourrait comprendre une assurance-chômage ou d'autres formes de protection relevant de la sécurité sociale, ou des indemnités de départ ou d'autres prestations similaires versées par l'employeur, ou encore une combinaison de prestations selon la législation nationale, les conventions collectives ou la politique adoptée par l'employeur en matière de personnel.

10. La question de savoir si les employeurs devraient consulter les représentants des travailleurs avant de prendre une décision définitive dans un cas de licenciement devrait être laissée aux méthodes d'application prévues au paragraphe 1.

11. (1) En cas de licenciement pour faute grave, la période de préavis ou l'indemnité compensatoire en tenant lieu pourraient n'être pas requises et, le cas échéant, l'indemnité de départ ou d'autres prestations similaires versées par l'employeur pourraient n'être pas accordées.

(2) Le licenciement pour faute grave ne devrait intervenir que dans les cas où l'on ne pourrait, selon les règles de la bonne foi, exiger de l'employeur qu'il agisse autrement.

(3) L'employeur devrait être considéré comme ayant renoncé à exercer son droit de licencier pour faute grave si cette mesure n'a pas été prise dans un délai raisonnable à compter de la date à laquelle il a eu connaissance de la faute grave en question.

(4) Le travailleur devrait être considéré comme ayant renoncé à exercer son droit de recourir contre le licenciement pour faute grave s'il ne l'a pas fait dans un délai raisonnable à partir du moment où le licenciement lui a été notifié.

(5) Avant qu'une décision de licencier un travailleur pour faute grave ne prenne effet de façon définitive, le travailleur intéressé devrait avoir la possibilité d'exposer son cas sans délai, avec l'assistance, dans les cas appropriés, d'une personne le représentant.

(6) Pour l'application du présent paragraphe, la définition ou l'interprétation de la « faute grave », ainsi que la détermination du « délai raisonnable », devraient être laissées aux méthodes d'application prévues au paragraphe 1.
III. SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISIONS CONCERNING
REDUCTION OF THE WORK FORCE

12. Positive steps should be taken by all parties concerned to avert or minimise as far as possible reductions of the work force by the adoption of appropriate measures, without prejudice to the efficient operation of the undertaking, establishment or service.

13. (1) When a reduction of the work force is contemplated, consultation with workers' representatives should take place as early as possible on all appropriate questions.

(2) The questions on which consultation should take place might include measures to avoid the reduction of the work force, restriction of overtime, training and retraining, transfers between departments, spreading termination of employment over a certain period, measures for minimising the effects of the reduction on the workers concerned, and the selection of workers to be affected by the reduction.

(3) As and when consultation takes place, both parties should bear in mind that there may be public authorities which might assist the parties in such consultation.

14. If a proposed reduction of the work force is on such a scale as to have a significant bearing on the manpower situation of a given area or branch of economic activity, the employer should notify the competent public authorities in advance of any such reduction.

15. (1) The selection of workers to be affected by a reduction of the work force should be made according to precise criteria, which it is desirable should be established wherever possible in advance, and which give due weight both to the interests of the undertaking, establishment or service and to the interests of the workers.

(2) These criteria may include—
(a) need for the efficient operation of the undertaking, establishment or service;
(b) ability, experience, skill and occupational qualifications of individual workers;
(c) length of service;
(d) age;
(e) family situation; or
(f) such other criteria as may be appropriate under national conditions, the order and relative weight of the above criteria being left to national customs and practice.

16. (1) Workers whose employment has been terminated owing to a reduction of the work force should be given priority of re-engagement, to the extent possible, by the employer when he again engages workers.

(2) Such priority of re-engagement may be limited to a specified period of time; where appropriate, the question of the retention of seniority rights should be determined in accordance with national laws or regulations, collective agreements or other appropriate national practices.

(3) Re-engagement should be effected on the basis of the principles set out in Paragraph 15.

(4) The rate of wages of re-engaged workers should not be adversely affected as a result of the interruption of their employment, regard being had to differences between their previous occupation and the occupation in which they are re-engaged and to any intervening changes in the structure of wages in the undertaking, establishment or service.

17. There should be full utilisation of national employment agencies or other appropriate agencies to ensure, to the extent possible, that workers whose employment has been terminated as a result of a reduction of the work force are placed in alternative employment without delay.
III. DISPOSITIONS ADDITIONNELLES
CONCERNANT LA RÉDUCTION DU PERSONNEL

12. Toutes les parties intéressées devraient, par des mesures appropriées, entreprendre une action positive pour prévenir ou limiter, dans toute la mesure possible, les réductions de personnel, sans préjudice pour le fonctionnement efficace de l'entreprise, de l'établissement ou du service.

13. (1) Lorsqu'une réduction du personnel est envisagée, les représentants des travailleurs devraient être consultés aussi longtemps d'avance que possible sur toutes les questions pertinentes.

(2) Les questions qui devraient faire l'objet de consultations pourraient comprendre les mesures propres à prévenir la réduction du personnel, la diminution du nombre des heures supplémentaires, la formation et la réadaptation des travailleurs, les transferts entre services, l'échelonnement des départs sur une certaine période, les mesures visant à minimiser les effets de la réduction du personnel sur la situation des travailleurs intéressés, ainsi que le choix des travailleurs devant être atteints par une mesure de réduction du personnel.

(3) Lorsqu'elles procèdent auxdites consultations, les deux parties devraient avoir présent à l'esprit qu'il peut exister des autorités publiques qui pourraient les aider dans ces consultations.

14. Si une mesure projetée de réduction du personnel est d'une ampleur telle qu'elle risque d'avoir des répercussions importantes sur la situation de la main-d'œuvre d'une région ou d'une branche d'activité économique déterminée, l'employeur devrait informer les autorités publiques compétentes avant de procéder à une telle réduction.

15. (1) Le choix des travailleurs devant être atteints par une mesure de réduction du personnel devrait s'opérer selon des critères précis qu'il serait désirable d'établir autant que possible d'avance et qui tiendraient dûment compte aussi bien des intérêts de l'entreprise, de l'établissement ou du service que de ceux des travailleurs.

(2) Ces critères pourraient inclure :
   a) la nécessité d'assurer le fonctionnement efficace de l'entreprise, de l'établissement ou du service ;
   b) les capacités, l'expérience, la compétence et les qualifications professionnelles de chaque travailleur ;
   c) son ancienneté ;
   d) son âge ;
   e) sa situation de famille ;
   f) tout autre critère qui paraîtrait indiqué, compte tenu des conditions propres à chaque pays,
   l'ordre et l'importance relative des critères ci-dessus étant déterminés par la coutume et la pratique nationales.

16. (1) Les travailleurs dont l'emploi a cessé à la suite d'une réduction de personnel devraient, dans la mesure du possible, bénéficier d'une priorité de réembauchage par rapport aux autres travailleurs lorsque l'employeur procède de nouveau à des embauchages.

(2) Cette priorité de réembauchage pourrait être limitée à une période déterminée ; dans les cas appropriés, la question du maintien des droits d'ancienneté devrait être tranchée conformément à la législation nationale, aux conventions collectives ou à d'autres pratiques nationales appropriées.

(3) Les réembauchages devraient s'effectuer sur la base des principes exposés au paragraphe 15.

(4) Le montant du salaire des travailleurs réembauchés ne devrait pas être affecté du fait de l'interruption de l'emploi, compte tenu des différences entre leur occupation antérieure et leur nouvelle occupation, ainsi que des changements intervenus quant à la structure des salaires dans l'entreprise, l'établissement ou le service.

17. Les services publics de l'emploi ou d'autres services appropriés devraient être pleinement utilisés pour faire en sorte que, dans la mesure du possible, le travailleur dont l'emploi a cessé à la suite d'une réduction de personnel trouve sans délai un autre emploi.
IV. Scope

18. This Recommendation applies to all branches of economic activity and all categories of workers: Provided that the following may be excluded from its scope:

(a) workers engaged for a specified period of time or a specified task in cases in which, owing to the nature of the work to be effected, the employment relationship cannot be of indeterminate duration;
(b) workers serving a period of probation determined in advance and of reasonable duration;
(c) workers engaged on a casual basis for a short period; and
(d) public servants engaged in the administration of the State to the extent only that constitutional provisions preclude the application to them of one or more provisions of this Recommendation.

19. In accordance with the principle set forth in article 19, paragraph 8, of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, this Recommendation does not affect any provisions more favourable to the workers concerned than those contained herein.

20. This Recommendation should be considered as having been implemented in respect of workers whose conditions of employment are governed by special laws or regulations where those laws or regulations provide for such workers conditions which, in their entirety, are at least as favourable as the totality of those provided in this Recommendation.
IV. CHAMP D'APPLICATION

18. La présente recommandation s'applique à toutes les branches de l'activité économique et à toutes les catégories de travailleurs, étant entendu que pourraient être exclus de son champ d'application :

a) les travailleurs engagés pour une période déterminée ou pour une tâche déterminée, lorsque, en raison de la nature du travail à effectuer, la relation de travail ne peut pas avoir une durée indéterminée ;

b) les travailleurs effectuant une période d'essai, à condition que la durée de celle-ci soit fixée d'avance et soit raisonnable ;

c) les travailleurs engagés à titre occasionnel pour une courte période ;

d) les fonctionnaires publics qui travaillent dans l'administration de l'État, mais seulement dans la mesure où des dispositions constitutionnelles empêchent l'application d'une ou de plusieurs dispositions de la présente recommandation.

19. Conformément au principe énoncé à l'article 19, paragraphe 8, de la Constitution de l'Organisation internationale du Travail, la présente recommandation n'affecte aucune disposition plus favorable aux travailleurs intéressés que celles qui sont prévues ci-dessus.

20. La présente recommandation devrait être réputée appliquée, en ce qui concerne les travailleurs dont l'emploi est régi par un statut spécial, lorsque ce statut comporte des conditions qui, dans leur ensemble, sont au moins aussi favorables que l'ensemble de celles prévues par la recommandation.
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