

vation gap, especially because more than 1 in 4 reported that their family income declined after working for an IO. Not surprisingly, then, that greater than 2 out of 3 report that spousal employment was important to their own employment at an IO.

Prior to joining the IO, more than 2 in 5 of the respondents were not adequately informed about dependents' rights. During recruitment, dependents' rights were not considered in the depth that they should have been, given the many subsequent problems; in hindsight, half of the respondents would reconsider their decision to accept IO employment.

Spouses have their careers interrupted, their prospects for employment in the IO centre are restricted, and, because they have left Canada, they have forfeited their life long participation in such central programs as OAS and CPP/QPP. For example, Health and Welfare has a mechanism which permits Canadians at IO to claim back their years of service for OAS eligibility; having been unemployed, spouses are not eligible.

Spousal employment programs are lacking: more than 70 per cent of IO do not have spousal employment programs, and, of the ones that do, 1 in 4 respondents said that the program in place was not effective. Only 3 per cent actually endorsed their spousal program.

IO, like most employers, focus on three dimensions—job content, salary, and benefits. The major theme which emerged during the Study however, is that a fourth dimension exists: family rights. Employers must begin to consider this fourth dimension on an equal basis to the others. Bear in mind that many respondents either have or will opt for an IO career during which their family interests and needs change significantly.

21. Conversely, 1 in 4 report that the issue is no problem or not applicable. Being married to spouses of the host country or to an EC nationality circumvents the problem through birth or nationality. These fortunate individuals have a right to work status via the freedom of movement of labour.

Employers must become engaged in dealing with the issues involved in the fourth dimension including specifically the right to work for family members of their employees. To do otherwise is to risk changing the basic character of the individuals who present themselves for employment in IO. There will be pressure increasingly from employees with families, particularly those in which the employee is female, for the IO to better support their needs.²² Negotiating with host countries for better deals for work permits would be an important start.

Clearly much can be accomplished. France apparently succeeded with Switzerland to obtain access for 40,000 residents of France to work at IO in Geneva without the usual Swiss government work permit controls. Given the *normal* processing period of three months for a work permit in Switzerland, the time and effort are impediments, and many would-be employers discourage applicants from even trying.

Since Switzerland derives enormous financial benefits from the presence of IO, it is reasonable to assume that in the face of concerted UN efforts they would be amenable to provide a more accommodating process for work permits to family members of IO staff. Within the European Community amongst IO employees, non-EC nationals are discriminated against in that citizens of member countries get *national treatment* accorded to them for all EC social rights including work permits. UNESCO officials, during a visit, advised that in the process of negotiating their Headquarters Agreement, they intended to press for an improved work permit regime from the French government.

Other IO should encourage UNESCO in its negotiations, and could adapt more readily to present family situations by recognizing

22. Professional level women are twice as likely as men to be single: though involved in relationships, women are not as likely to be accompanied by a spouse at the duty station. Women tend to be considerably younger, consequently with less experience, and less inclined to make a career decision for employment at IO.