

therefore, to ensure that that restraint is applied to and by international organizations of which we are members. We must resist the temptation to embark on overly ambitious and costly new programs without correspondingly reducing or eliminating earlier ones. In particular, we must resist the temptation to utilize the resumption of contributions by the United States to the ILO as a justification in itself for program expansion.

I want now to turn to Canada's relations with the ILO and the ILO's relations with Canada. Our federal and provincial governments as well as workers and employers continue to be strong supporters of the organization and its programs. The organization has at its disposition expertise of a high calibre. The Director-General and his associates have demonstrated leadership of a high order. I like to believe, and I think it is widely acknowledged, that a number of Canadians have made substantial contributions to the work of the organization: Joe Morris, as president of the workers group, and Kalmen Kaplansky, formerly of the workers group and now director of the Canadian ILO office, as well as Keith Richan, as president of the International organization of employers; and John Mainwaring, a Government representative of whom a number of you spoke so warmly in the governing body a few days ago.

The declaration of Philadelphia states that the application of the programs and principles of the ILO must be undertaken with due regard by each people.

What this means for Canada is not easily stated; we are a huge country in area, but not a major power. We may be a wealthy industrial power by the usual standards of this organization (which was again recently acknowledged), but we have people who are poor by our own standards. When the ILO works on behalf of those who are disabled, it works on behalf of Canadians. When it expresses concern with respect to the unevenness of development, it addresses a Canadian reality. When it interests itself in undesirable practices of multinational enterprises, it touches upon an issue of concern to Canadians. When it emphasizes the need for training, it focuses on a problem of contemporary significance for Canadians too.

Canada's economy, like that of a great number of member states, is vulnerable to cyclical swings in demand for raw materials and semi-finished products. Inflation has had its impact. Unemployment in some regions is at an unacceptably high level.

There are some paradoxes in this. The number of people employed is at historical high levels, as is the number of women in the work force. But jobs in Canada are unfilled because a significant number of the unemployed members of our work force are not appropriately trained to fill these jobs.

The ILO medium-term plan and the Director-General's report give significant emphasis to training. I do not challenge the concern shown. But I wonder whether centralized co-ordination or direction is the answer to this problem. Surely effort must be made in, and by, each country to train its work force bearing in mind development circumstances and the nature of its institutions. Surely employers and trade unions should take a substantial lead in devising, with government assistance