



SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

(Session held on September 8, 2022).

MR. PRESIDENT. - There being a quorum, the session is open.

(It is 16:09).

Good afternoon. Thank you for coming today. You know that we have been working in the Special Committee on Futures of Parliament for a couple of years. This year, the area we are focusing on is the Futures of Work, which we have been addressing through five axes. Today we are going to consider the fifth axis, which we call: "The governance of the work of the future: Regulation and labour policy in a change of era."

Now, we are aware that some of those who are appearing today are not strictly linked to this axis, but we ask for their participation anyway because we are finalizing the first stage before the first report that we are going to make on September 26 at a public event, which is the Day of the Future. As we had some communication problems, we thought it was very important that some experts who had not been able to participate did so today.

We are therefore grateful for the presence of Juan Bogliaccini, Gonzalo Zunino, Rafael Sotelo and Alejandra Picco, as well as Sofía Scasserra and Gabriel Burdin, who we have on Zoom. We also greet the advisors who are with us today.

This fifth axis was prepared and will be coordinated by the deputy Lilian Galán. We have distributed the axes among the members of the commission, so without further ado, we thank you for your participation.

Those who have already been there know this, but for those who have not, I inform you that we have one hour and forty-five minutes, which is the time that was allocated, especially for you who have so many activities.

MRS. GALÁN. - We had asked to work on this axis, because we actually know it.

First of all, we would like to thank all the experts who are with us today because they helped us prepare this work. On the other hand, we would like to invite some people who we believe might be interested in this topic and who are advisors in my office.

We believe this axis is very important and has some points to discuss in relation to the topic of technology, more specifically how it impacts society, the world of work and countries. The role of the State, at this time, seemed to us to be very relevant.

Before focusing on these points, I want to inform you - I was strongly asked to do so - that the experts have ten minutes to speak and they also asked me to read the questions that trigger this debate of which you will be the transversal axis.

One of the points I wanted to put on the table to begin working on this topic is that of global value chains and how to ensure human rights in this globalized world that began to change in the second half of the 20th century. It is not the first globalization that the world has experienced, but this one has a different technique that brings countries closer together. This technology is transferred to the entire life of society and today we can see value chains that cut across the world in which we live.

I brought up an example that I find extremely graphic and that has to do with the issue of salmon farms in southern Chile, which although it is not new, the management of that production is because it is not done from that country. That is where the question begins about who has the value in this, whether Chile, a sovereign country that has cold waters, or whoever manages the technology and knows the technological package and is building it, in this case Norway. From that country, an engineer, on a machine, manages how the salmon should be grown, how long they should be vaccinated, etc. In another era in Chile this would have led to the collapse of that production.

So, I thought it was very graphic to present how this technology changes power relations, global value chains and presents a very important challenge. In this we see how countries are competing with each other, precisely, to be able to attract investment.

Foreign direct investment, which is very necessary for countries, even for ours, which is very small and is part of Mercosur and is fundamental in Latin America. Countries often compete to attract this capital, this foreign investment, to the detriment of concessions in labor conditions, in the new generation international treaties, where the issue of property and value is very important.

I thought that this should be put on the table and today the approval of a binding treaty on transnational corporations and human rights is being discussed. I have given some of them the book that we have been working on for a long time at the School of Government of the House of Representatives. This treaty is being discussed and there was a process that began in the Human Rights Council of the United Nations based on Resolution No. 20/9 of 2014, which creates a working group and is now in its third draft in which Uruguay, through its mission in Geneva, has participated intensely. It has done so because a working group on this topic has been created in the National Institution of Human Rights and Ombudsman's Office for several years now, in which not only the Parliament but also the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the ministries that have to do with this topic participate. In addition, there is an inter-institutional dialogue with social organizations that are also participating.

I am not going to expand further on this topic because it is not exactly the This is an issue that we have to consider today, but we think that this regulation and the institutionality that allows us to address the future, obviously with greater social welfare – which is ultimately the role of the States – and to balance the norms at an international level, is still a pending matter.

The other aspect I wanted to discuss is labor relations mediated by technology and the impacts, especially the gender one, which is very well studied. In this future group, I remember that in the last session we said that it was very important to project the changes in the future considering the gender mainstreaming. When the IDB representative was there, he developed this topic. We know that there are very important academic studies in our country from different institutions. In this sense, I am thinking about the Iecon of the Faculty of Economic Sciences and Administration.

We know that in recent years, and even more so since the pandemic, there has been an increase in the use of technologies mediating labor relations. Perhaps the changes that are most obvious are the preeminence of teleworking, precisely because of the pandemic that the world has gone through, and the emergence of platforms that have

enriched in this world transversalized by COVID, such as Uber platforms, deliveries, etc.

We are going to have a speaker who is a specialist in this subject, but I want to say that although the use of these technologies can represent some opportunities for inclusion and greater development for social groups that are often vulnerable, whether due to their territories, their academic training, sometimes because they are a minority or, also, in the case of women, because they have a greater gap, when technology is included in labor relations, in public policies, it can lead to the loss of labor rights, depending on the use made of them. We know that technology a priori is neither good nor bad - Sofía Scaserra is going to work on this aspect much more - but the way in which it is incorporated into the world of work will depend on whether these labor relations are developed without loss of rights and without precarious labor conditions. I say this thinking, precisely, of the boom in these technologies that has led to workers doing their work by bicycle, distributing goods for many hours of work, with precarious salaries. I have two points left to problematize and I'll finish.

I will now refer to the role of States and technological progress as the result of public investment. We know that public investment is fundamental, that States have a very important role, not only in public investment in these technologies, which are sometimes carried out a priori by the States, but also as a guarantee of respect for human rights and current legislation. Therefore, it seems to us that the role of the States has a lot to do with this technological advance and with the legislation that they carry out. Public funds for financing these issues determine how these technologies are developed in our societies.

The last point I want to mention - which is also an aspect for what is problematized is the basic income as an element of balance between work and capital. Who appropriates the income generated by the introduction of these technologies? We say that many times these technologies are financed by public funds and, therefore, the whole society contributes to their development, but these workers are precarious and have working conditions that sometimes force them to start their studies again because they lose their jobs and have to resume their career path.

So the point is how the State guarantees their survival in those periods when they are starving or have an income that we can call rent.

basic, precisely to be able to recycle, study and prepare for this world of the future. The idea is that they can survive and not have very precarious jobs.

I have much more to say, but I do not want to monopolize the use of the word, so let's move on to reading the questions and then to the presentation of the experts, because I believe that is the part that will enrich this axis the most.

The questions are grouped into institutionality and are as follows.

What institutional and regulatory mechanisms might be necessary to facilitate and enable work transformation processes?

Which ones would accompany these processes, protecting labor rights?

How do we imagine the construction of this institutionality?

Where are the main difficulties or inhibitors of change and what could be the enhancers or enablers of this change?

If the labour market is globalised, how can labour relations be globalised?

Is it necessary to have a minimum agreement on working conditions to be respected?

What are possible institutional arrangements at the global level?

The other umbrella of questions has to do with work reasons and redistribution. There the questions are: What role or roles will employers' and employees' organizations – unions – occupy in the creation of alternative futures for work?

What will be the organizational forms of workers who no longer share a common workplace? Teleworking, uberized jobs, etc.

Finally, what are the mechanisms for income distribution at national and global levels in a scenario of automation, substitution and loss of certain jobs?

That is the approach. Now we give way to the speakers. The first is Gonzalo Zunino, who has a PhD in Economics from the Autonomous University of Madrid. He has a Master's degree in Economic Analysis from the Carlos III University of Madrid and a degree in Economics from the Faculty of Economic Sciences and Administration of the Udelar. He is a partner and researcher at Cinve - Centro de Investigaciones Económicas -, where he has dedicated his recent research to microeconomic analysis, human capital dynamics, labor markets and social security analysis.

Thank you so much.

MR. ZUNINO.- Thank you very much for the invitation. Unfortunately, I will have to leave early because I have a class at the faculty. I should clarify that it is macroeconomics, not microeconomics. As I have already excused myself on other occasions, I did not want to excuse myself again. I know that several of my colleagues have many more interesting things to contribute on this subject.

If we talk about institutions and governance, I think there is a first theme I fully agree with what was being proposed, in that in a world that is moving towards more globalised work, it is also necessary to globalise or to have minimum agreements at an international level regarding labour rights and regulation of the labour market. To be specific, the ILO has a relatively simple proposal, which is to generate frameworks that are similar to what is common in maritime work; regardless of which sea they are in or the flag of the ship or the port in which the workers are, there is a common framework of labour rights and human rights that are respected. I think that the ILO proposal goes in that direction. It is about reaching international agreements, global agreements, and it seems to me that it is a very reasonable proposal in a framework where the physical thread of the labour relationship can be increasingly lost, because employer and employee do not have to be in the same physical place. I think that in that direction it is reasonable to move forward. In addition, it is very important to move forward beyond the fact that, as in other issues, countries may think that they are losing some degree of sovereignty. I think it is impossible or highly inadvisable for countries to try to compete for the attraction of transnational companies or for investments in general based on the reduction of labor rights. This is similar to what happened in the

minimum global tax rate. There comes a time when the competitive scheme creates a situation in which everyone loses, and in a globalized economy it is necessary to generate global agreements. I know that Uruguay can contribute in this area, but unfortunately the weight of global agreements on the agenda is sometimes not desirable, but it is the one that must be pursued.

Another issue that I find relevant in institutional terms is that of the Conflict resolution. I think it is an issue that is happening through the facts, and I don't know if the current institutions are sufficiently prepared. What do I mean by this? For example, platform workers are dependent or independent. What is the global experience? Who ends up making the decision if they are one type of worker or another? In general, justice ends up making the decision. The Uruguayan justice system does not necessarily make the same decision as the justice system in Brazil or in some European country. I have serious doubts – perhaps not – that justice is prepared to make these types of decisions and resolve the problems that may arise. I think it is perfect that justice is the final instance of conflict resolution, but the institutions for these types of problems should be strengthened, and I think that legislation should be passed beforehand. That is, trying to avoid creating many legal loopholes, where at the end of the day the person who resolves is someone who probably does not have all the elements on the table to be able to make a reasonable decision.

As regards non-standard employment relationships – which were also mentioned here – I think there are two issues that are beginning to be poorly defined in legislation or in the normal working world: the workplace and the length of the working day. I know that work is being done to regulate these two points. In this sense, I think that legislation also has to move forward and quickly to resolve these problems. Normal legislation is rather designed for a workplace and a work schedule that takes place within that framework. I think that these two institutional figures are becoming a little more diffuse and it is necessary that the law on teleworking and non-standard employment in general try to adequately define these frameworks so that later, at the end of the day, they do not return to the courts and there is a judicial resolution of these issues.

From a more global point of view on institutional issues, Specifically, regarding the so-called labour institutions, I would say that there are many in the labour market. A first global view that I want to raise is that, in my opinion, labour regulation is fundamental and there are no conditions for it to lose ground in the framework of labour market regulation. Why do we regulate the labour market? This is a topic that in economic literature, perhaps two, three or four decades ago, it was thought that all labour regulation was bad. There are many people who still think that any type of regulation or regulation is bad.

institution that is installed hinders the free market or the functioning of the labor market, which ends up generating unemployment and problems.

As in any other market, the economic literature suggests that when there are market failures, regulation is necessary so that the solution that is ultimately given is close to the socially optimal. The labor market has many problems, some of which are called market failures. There are problems of competition failures because companies have monopsony power when hiring. There are information asymmetries that are bilateral: there are employers who have information that workers do not know, as well as workers who have information that employers do not know. Information asymmetries are typical market failures. Above all, I believe that there are very important externalities that cause private benefit when establishing a labor relationship to generate a deviation from what is socially optimal. These externalities have to do with the creation or accumulation of human capital, especially in the future. Any deviation and labor instability generates specific problems for the worker who faces that situation or who loses his job, but it also generates problems in the accumulation of human capital for his family and his children. It also generates externalities in terms of health and social security costs. If there is too much job instability, we have a lower density of contributions from workers, and that takes away funding from social security. Probably, at the end of the day or of the working career, retirements and pensions will have a higher degree of subsidy or workers will end up having non-contributory retirements or pensions. So, there is an externality in terms of health and pensions, but also in terms of education. The new work modalities or the changes that are occurring in the labor market do not change or eliminate these externalities.

So, I think it is important that the starting point is not to think of the arrival of new forms of work as a scenario in which it is necessary to move towards a more deregulated labour market. I understand that the regulatory scheme must be changed so that everyone is included within the systems of social protection, collective bargaining, regulation of labour rights, but we cannot move towards a more deregulated system.

There was also talk of basic income and so on. I think that another of the labour institutions that most needs to be strengthened is the one related to active labour market policies, continuous training and job retraining. Why? Precisely because of what we were talking about today. In any case, I am a little sceptical in believing that we are facing a scenario in which the labour market will undergo rapid and highly relevant transformations. Unfortunately, the adoption of new technologies in Uruguay and

In all of Latin America, it is a bit slow, and the transformations that occur in the labor market are not at the speed that one might imagine when reading literature generated for other types of developed countries. However, we expect a pattern of movement and transformation in the labor market, in which one type of employment will lose participation and be replaced by another. There is a need for reconversion policies. In this sense, I believe that Uruguay has institutions dedicated to this, although perhaps the policies are not sufficiently focused. There is a whole idea of going towards what are the jobs of the future or that everyone goes towards software and programming. Really, these types of policies end up failing and we have to be more realistic in terms of the design and focus of labor reconversion programs. I believe that in this sense a general review should be made and that there should be more participation from the public sector. Why? Because one of the changes that is projected is that workers will probably have more instability in companies. This means that companies lose some of the incentive to invest in ongoing training and retraining of workers, because they simply have difficulty reaping the benefits afterwards.

That is to say, again, there are externalities. We, as a society, are It is useful for workers to reinvent themselves, retrain and generate new human capital. This is socially optimal, but companies, for fear that in two or three years the workers will leave and that accumulation of human capital ends up being exploited by another institution, lose the private incentive. This deviation of private and public incentives generates what happens with many public services or goods: they are socially optimal, but the financing scheme begins to move away from the private solution. There is a problem of clearly defining ownership and, therefore, private parties have less incentive to invest there.

With this I will close. I will try to listen to some of my colleagues, but then I will leave in silence because I have to teach.

MRS. GALÁN. - Thank you very much.

Gabriel Burdin, a graduate in Economics from Udelar, has the floor; doctor in Economics from the University of Siena, Italy; associate professor at the University of Leeds, England, and member of the National System of Researchers.

(Dr. Gabriel Burdin connects via Zoom).

MR. BURDIN. - Thank you very much.

First of all, greetings to everyone.

(Dialogues).

It is a pleasure to be able to participate in this new instance of the session of the commission. I hope to be able to do it in person when I go to Uruguay next week. I was very interested in the framing of this particular activity; it is a topic I have been thinking and writing about for some time.

To begin with, I would like to link this discussion with those that took place in the previous roundtables so as not to lose sight of the global context. Today we are going to discuss labour regulations and institutions and how these can be functional or represent an obstacle to technological change, increased productivity and the dynamics of inequality. In previous roundtables, it was discussed, firstly, that technological change – at least, that is what I tried to suggest – is essential for an ageing country like Uruguay, because it is essential to increase the productivity of employed people in order to sustain a universal social welfare system. Secondly, to take advantage of the opportunities of the new technological scenario, we need companies capable of implementing technologies competently, and in countries like Uruguay – developing Latin American countries – we have a long line of low-productivity companies with poorly developed management practices, which puts them in a difficult position when it comes to implementing new technologies. Lastly, we need workers with the necessary skills to operate new technologies. That is where all the challenges linked to the educational system and the professional training of workers appear. All these topics were discussed in previous panels.

What to do from the perspective of labor regulation and from the labour market institutions? In this regard, I have many points in common with what Gonzalo Zunino raised in the previous intervention.

First, the idea of "the less regulation, the better," which has some validity dissemination in some intellectual and political circles, is a very bad guide for

We need to think about the issues of technological change and the future of work. It is important to understand that a deregulated labour market is not competitive or purely competitive as we thought thirty years ago in economics. In reality, it is a market regulated by employers. For example, in the prototype of a deregulated labour market, which is the labour market in the United States, contractual clauses proliferate in employment contracts that prevent workers from switching to competing companies. It seems paradoxical, but these levels of rigidity can occur in a market that is not, in reality, deregulated, but regulated by employers, who are the most powerful party in the employment relationship.

Does that mean we can regulate in any way? No, we need to Smart regulation that does not hinder the ability of companies to combine labor and capital productively, but labor regulation is necessary, and even more so in this new technological scenario.

A super interesting element in the research – which is very recent, – on the effects of new robotics technologies on the labor market and their consequences on employment is that we are seeing the introduction of technology with job losses in the United States and the introduction of the same type of technology with relative job stability in European countries. These are two worlds with very different labor regulation schemes. The United States typically has a more liberal approach, where there is basically no strong regulation of the labor market, and Europe continues with its classic mechanisms of collective bargaining, employment protection, etc. Therefore, the same technological shock can affect societies in very different ways depending on the characteristics of their labor regulation. This is an element that emerges from contemporary research and that countries like Uruguay must take into account.

I want to review some traditional chapters of labor regulation and in Each of them must understand the implications and possible areas of reform, challenges that countries like Uruguay have in this new scenario where we must think about how to take advantage of the new technological dynamics.

A traditional area of labor regulation is the protection of those who are employees, for example, through protection against dismissals. In general, in most countries - Uruguay is the case - employers face certain costs when dismissing workers. Uruguay is in a reasonable position in terms of these dismissal costs and I do not think that it is an area in which too many innovations are required. The idea is that there must be a fine tuning of the levels of protection

Employment. One would not want layoffs to be free for employers, because when an employer is laid off there are a number of externalities, as Gonzalo Zunino suggested. There are social costs, there are costs in terms of the worker's health, there are costs in terms of social security – because the income of that worker must be sustained and society as a whole does so – and there are costs for families, for children.

So as a society we want that when an employer fires an employee, We do not want the cost of dismissal to be excessively high, because that could discourage employers from hiring new workers. Obviously, if as an employer I know that I have to pay a very high dismissal fee, I will think twice before hiring a new worker. So, we do not want the deregulation ideal where the cost of dismissing workers is zero, nor an excessive cost in terms of dismissals. Uruguay is in an intermediate position, with reasonable levels in relation to comparable countries. I do not think that this is an area where major innovations need to be made, but neither does Uruguay need to reduce the levels of protection against dismissals.

Another important area of labor regulation is the one that has to do with the Wage setting. There are two mechanisms that Uruguay has in place here: one is the minimum wage, the idea that there is a minimum wage that any employment contract must respect, and the other is collective bargaining, a mechanism by which, at the sectoral level, minimum wages are also defined by job categories and other types of working conditions. In this regard, Uruguay has a sense of high coverage, which has been consolidated in the last fifteen or twenty years, after successive and intermittent situations in relation to it in previous periods. In this case, I identify some elements in which the system could be improved. One is to move towards much more protocolized schemes to enable decoupling or exit clauses by companies. Another is the sequential negotiation mechanisms, by which the sectors that are most exposed to international competition, the sectors with export insertion, negotiate first, and then these sectors set a parameter that is taken into account by the sectors less exposed to international competition. A third element - which is very important to me - is the incorporation of mechanisms for employee participation in companies in non-salary aspects. There is extensive experience here in European countries. We can mention the European directive of 2002 on information and consultation of employees, which standardized the rules in this matter for all European countries, and the regulations introduced by Finland in 1991 and in 2008, which establish the participation of workers in works councils to discuss, inform themselves of and, in many cases, to influence aspects related to the organization of work and employment within the companies.

companies, and also participation at the board level. This is an area where there are examples of recent legislation, and I believe that Uruguay could clearly move in this direction.

Recently, in research we have done for Europe, we have shown that, for example, these mechanisms are positively associated with the adoption of new technologies, largely because these mechanisms facilitate the development, within companies, of activities and practices that are complementary to the use of new technologies. Information is shared between unions or workers' representatives and companies; worker training activities are carried out more intensively, as well as various practices that are necessary to use technology productively. All this is facilitated by these cooperation mechanisms within companies, which are articulated and coordinated with more traditional sectoral wage negotiations.

So, changes are required at the level of wage-setting and collective bargaining mechanisms. I know that Parliament is discussing a project. As I am not familiar with it in depth, I am not going to comment on the matter, but I know that these aspects are not contemplated and for me they are key elements of what should be an incremental improvement of the collective bargaining system in Uruguay.

Another important area of labor regulation concerns employment contracts, Non-traditional contractual forms. This is where the issue of self-employed workers and emerging platform work schemes comes into play. Self-employment is extremely heterogeneous in any country and in Uruguay in particular. We have very low-income self-employed workers, with irregular activities, with formal and informal activity, permanent transitions between the informal and formal sectors, as well as high-income self-employed workers in professional activities. So, it is an extremely heterogeneous universe.

To give you an idea, in 1985 in Uruguay there was 18% of employed people. In 2019, the number of people in the labour market increased to around 24%. The map has not changed much or has changed very slowly. We are likely to move towards a situation where transitions between different contractual arrangements are more common. Salaried work remains absolutely predominant, but we are likely to move towards a scheme where people have changing insertions throughout their lives and alternate salaried work with self-employment.

Regulation must therefore be prepared, first of all, to be neutral with regard to employment contracts. Employment regulation should, in principle, not create incentives in one direction or the other. It is therefore necessary to look at the taxation schemes for employees and self-employment and to ensure that there is no possibility of arbitration between the two systems. This is particularly important in high-income self-employment, where opportunities sometimes arise to use the self-employment tax base in order to pay less tax.

It is also necessary to provide self-employed workers with a set of benefits enjoyed by salaried workers. We must universalize the matrix of labor rights to cover these workers in these matters. I am referring to health insurance, maternity insurance, etc.

What specific elements arise in relation to platform work?

It is an emerging form of work, particularly for low-skilled workers, but it is also a job opportunity with an international dimension in some professional services.

In the low-skilled workers sector, in the Latin American context and in Uruguay, I believe that platform work represents opportunities that have to do with their inclusion in social security. In general, these are workers who alternate job insertions in informal work. There are also many situations of migrant workers in this sector, which we have to look at carefully, but in which there is traceability of payments, digital payments. So, it is a sector where the opportunities for the formalization of labor of workers who did not have them before are potentially important and must be taken full advantage of. For example, it is proposed that there should be automatic information exchange schemes between platforms and social security and tax agencies - our DGI and the BPS, for example - to make perfect traceability of payments and ensure that these workers make the corresponding contributions to social security and have access to certain social security services and benefits. It seems to me that this is an area to think about in particular.

Then there is the discussion of whether workers are providing a service or are in a traditional employment relationship. It seems to me that there are elements of regulation related to occupational health that must reach these workers. Regulation should also not stifle certain opportunities for flexibility that they provide.

These jobs are attractive for some workers, but we must also bear in mind that working conditions in these sectors should not become precarious. This is an element that labour regulations designed from this perspective of the future of work must take into account. This is an incipient, emerging phenomenon, but if the idea of this commission is to think of elements to anticipate processes, it is important.

One last point I want to refer to – and with this I finish – is that of the regulations on occupational health and working conditions, another traditional area of labour regulation.

What elements are raised in relation to the new technological scenario?

I am going to raise an element that interests me particularly and that is This is still a matter of discussion, especially in European countries. It has to do with the possibilities that new technology offers employers to monitor the activities of their employees, to check whether workers are carrying out their tasks properly and, on that basis, to establish sanctions and make decisions that penalize workers. This is a complicated scenario, because new technologies offer practically unlimited possibilities to invade the private lives of workers, not only at the level of those who work remotely and who, therefore, via their computers, can be monitored in real time by their companies, but also of workers who do face-to-face work. This is an area where labor regulation, thinking about this perspective of the future of work, should also consider elements, because there are values that are at stake. On the one hand, employers want to develop the production process and need to organize it efficiently, but on the other hand there are elements that have to do with the privacy and dignity of workers that can be violated by an intrusive use of new technologies. This is an area where regulators in the developed world are beginning to think cautiously and I believe our country should act in the same way.

MRS. GALÁN. - Thank you very much.

I don't want to be unfriendly, but it is important to keep track of the times, because Everyone has to go and we will be left without anyone in order to finish today's session.

We are going to make a slight change in the order, because Dr. Juan Ariel Bogliaccini has to leave in a few minutes. He is a dedicated professor in the Department of Social Sciences, holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of North Carolina and a Master's degree in Educational Policies from the Alberto Hurtado University in Chile. His areas of research are comparative politics and research methods in social sciences. He is also a member of the National System of Researchers.

MR. BOGLIACCINI. - Thank you all very much.

First of all, I want to apologize because I have to leave at 5:30 p.m. I have to go and get my son; I can't leave him behind. I'll talk about that for a minute later.

Therefore, I leave you the presentation I had prepared, entitled: "Relationships future. Let's not throw the baby out with the bathwater." That's kind of the idea of what I want to put forward.

Basically I'm going to talk about four aspects: coordination, cooperation, modernisation of regulation and, finally, the role of the State.

As a contextualization - I agree in many aspects with Gabriel Burdin and With Gonzalo Zunino, it is worth mentioning that throughout the 20th century Uruguay structured its political practice - that is, how we relate politically - around social dialogue. This is very rare in Latin America and, in that sense, we have a matrix very similar to the European one. However, it is a social dialogue without regulation. If we look at the regulatory structure of social dialogue in European countries and compare it with ours, we see that we are much more dependent on our good will, and it has always been that way. We have the tradition of sitting down to talk when we have a problem; possibly the size of our country has an influence.

It is important to keep in mind - I am a political scientist - that labour relations structure social relations in a much broader sense than just work regulations; they affect social peace and the capacity for dialogue in a society. It is very important to keep this in mind when we think about how we are going to move into the future.

Linking this to what has been pointed out in previous sessions and taking into account this idea of technological change, it seems very important to me to remember that we have a country divided in terms of job opportunities, the result of a very unequal educational achievement. We have two Uruguays: that of those who finish secondary school and that of those who do not. The capacity for technological incorporation, the capacity for work in the formal world and many other capacities are very limited in this last group. What can we do? Change it. We have already talked about the part of the educational system, but we have to manage it within the framework of labour relations, because it is an inheritance that we will have for two or three more generations. Until we manage to change this situation, more generations may be affected.

I have the intuition that the doors of the knowledge society do not open to everyone in the same way. Alternative forms of social integration are growing, associated, for example, with criminal aspects. So, I think it is very important to think about this in terms of borders.

In labour relations - without naturally denying the existence of different, often conflicting, interests between the two main social actors: labour and capital
- It is essential to deepen strategic coordination by seeking complementarities. Our labour relations are more confrontational than cooperative. Why? Because, due to the very structure of our labour market, there are few opportunities for cooperation, and now I will go into that subject a little more.

What would be ideal? Thinking about future strategies in which we can incorporate the idea that labor and capital are partners. In Portugal, both are called *parceiros sociais*, that is, social partners; the expression in Spanish does not fit well. This is very important because in Uruguay we have few instances of dialogue and cooperation, and they are strictly associated with when the wage councils meet. We have to think of other different structures to sit down and discuss in a more structured way. For example, in some European countries there are what are called "social agreements," which are much more macro than simply labor agreements, but which structure. They are generated once a year or every two years. In Uruguay we have some sectors, such as construction, metallurgy, and chemistry, which are especially cooperative and coordinating among themselves.

I will refer briefly to the construction sector, in which the State played a fundamental collaborative role in the training of construction workers financed, tripartitely, by the State, workers and employers. This then led to a set of tremendous aspects in which these two partners collaborate.

many ways. Why was it necessary to facilitate it? Because - as Gabriel Burdin and Gonzalo Zunino pointed out - in Uruguay our labour market does not require specific training, but rather general or specific training in the sector. So we have a set of aspects that they mentioned - and I am not going to expand on this - associated with the fact that no one is interested in training anyone, because "I train you and the other person hires you for a little more money."

The facilitation of the State in these markets, which are of general or specific capacities at the sector level, is key to lowering costs and also to promoting higher levels of coordination and cooperation. So, how can we increase cooperation between social actors? It is key that the political system - thinking about future social relations - gives the idea that this is the only game in town. We are not thinking of reforms to change everything, of regularizations, of re-regulations. Cooperation and coordination are based on everyone understanding that this is the game we are playing. If there is the possibility of leaving through the back door to another game, there will always be someone interested in doing so.

Gabriel Burdin mentioned another aspect to improve cooperation. In Holland, only disengagements are processed based on clear criteria of needs with shared information and that facilitates cooperation a lot. In several countries, incentives are generated for regular negotiation, such as the possibility of special agreements in hard times. In a way, this was done in Uruguay during the pandemic. A set of elements for the labor market emerged - such as insurance - that were limited to a certain moment in which we had a problem and the State was able to find ways to promote or facilitate this associativity based on, for example, tripartite financing of skills. There is something I said last time and now I repeat it: in this area, as in education, we must generate much more information, guarantee access, both for companies and workers, and also for technical spaces that can collaborate in thinking of future solutions.

How to improve coordination? The future work context is dynamic. There are There is a greater separation between work and personal time. That is not so clear; for example, I now have to go and pick up my children. More time is needed for care, education and training. There are new forms of work - which have already been mentioned - individual, associated with working at home. Holland and Portugal, for example, have a very interesting system that we can think about, although there are others. There is a mechanism for personalizing conditions at the company level within the sectors. That is, negotiations are always carried out at that level and the negotiation of sectors is not lowered to other areas, but there are certain aspects of personalization that are negotiated at the sector level and then work as a la carte. Companies

With the workers they select: narrow bands for wages and working conditions according to the possibilities of the companies and workers; minimum increases with agreements based on productivity on these increases; a trade-off between wages and working conditions à la carte. A company that cannot offer more wages can perhaps offer some working conditions, something previously guaranteed by the sectors. I am not saying that these things have to be done, but I am putting on the table some elements that are important and that can help us think about the future.

Another important point is to modernize labor regulation. Coincidentally with what Burdin and Zunino have expressed, there is an extensive literature on the idea that attracting foreign direct investment does not necessarily imply lowering labor standards and labor regulations. Naturally, the type of foreign investment that I am going to have is in accordance with what I have as regulations. If I want more attractive foreign investment with good labor standards, I have to improve my skills in the population. We cannot expect foreign investment of excellent quality in terms of labor and have a completely uneducated population, only above Guatemala in the percentage of completion of education. So, we have to move to achieve convergence.

For various reasons, Uruguay is not competitive in a racing context. towards the bottom in terms of labour regulation. That is very clear, we have to keep it in mind and I do not see it as a possible scenario.

The regulation of working hours needs to be adapted a little. Some of Our standards are about a hundred years old, so we have to adapt them to new phenomena. Then, we must always keep in mind the problem of informality. For Europeans, the main problem is unemployment, and for Latin Americans, it is informality; it is the proportion of people who work outside a formal employment relationship. Everything we do and all the technologies we incorporate have to be oriented towards improving these aspects.

Another point is that the State must play a very important role in the labour relations of the future. Today we have a State that functions more as a decision-maker – in tripartite relations within the wage councils – than as a facilitator. An example of a facilitating State is one that collaborates in the financing of, for example, the construction sector and from that generates a whole set of cooperation and coordination between the two actors, which is key. Therefore, we must tend to improve as a State the bipartite cooperation in the training of specific skills.

of the sector. This is an area in which it is key to be able to intervene to trigger new processes.

We need to create broader tripartite spaces to achieve agreements and social pacts. In Uruguay we do not have this idea of a social pact that many European countries have, which are much more macro and key.

I certainly believe that advice should not be emptied of content. wages, but somehow the State must always maintain a vocation for bipartisanship, that is, to encourage cooperation between labor and capital. Why? Because in our current scheme, I can be as confrontational as I want because in the end the State will intervene, make a decision and that will help. So that is fine, I think we should not dismantle it, but we must think clearly about how, as a State, we can encourage autonomous bipartisanship. There are sectors that have it based on very deep conflicts that they experienced at other times and from which they managed to cooperate because they realized that if they continued like that they would mutually exterminate each other.

Finally, I believe that more and better information must be generated and made available to social actors and the technical world in order to facilitate evaluations and the generation of a corpus of experience.

Thank you so much.

MRS. GALÁN. - We give the floor to Alejandra Picco, who is an economist from the University of the Republic and currently a member of the Cuesta Duarte Institute of the PIT-CNT.

MRS. PICCO. - Thank you very much for the invitation and for the opportunity to think a little about these things. Often, in our daily work, we find it difficult to raise our heads and take a medium-term view.

I'm going to try not to repeat myself, because many of the things I was going to say have already been said. In that sense, I'm going to try not to be too disorganized and answer some of the questions.

Both Gonzalo Zunino and Gabriel Burdin have paved the way. I want to clarify where I was going to stand with respect to what I was going to say. Without a doubt, all the changes that are being experienced and that are coming in the world of work as a result of the technological emergence and the mediation of technology in labor relations must be addressed with regulation. I believe that regulations and institutions have to be adjusted to these changes, but we must also leave behind the discussion or the arguments that make it seem that regulation is not designed for a world with more technology in work or even in labor relations. That is a fallacy of those who consider that labor regulation is an impediment to economic activity. That is something that has no empirical support but that is still being raised, so I think it is good to stop there.

I am going to make some comments, in particular, about some institutions of the labour market, of all the institutions that have been created. There has been a lot of progress in collective bargaining, which is basically what I work on.

I think Uruguay has great strengths. I will point them out first and then I will talk about some weaknesses or issues that we have to work on, because they are a must today in terms of collective bargaining and even more so if we think about all these changes that are taking place in the world of work.

As was said, today in Uruguay, approximately 70% of the employed have a salaried employment relationship. This is something quite particular in the region and different from what happens in Latin America. As Gabriel Burdin said today, I think there is an important difference between the protection that workers have in a salaried relationship and that maintained by independent or self-employed workers. This great predominance of salaried work means that the collective bargaining system has a very broad coverage, because it covers 100% of salaried workers. However, there is a disparity between the regulation and the rights that protect salaried and non-salaried workers. This means that the mediation of technology in work relationships is used as a way of trying to avoid or disguise a salaried relationship to the detriment of the rights that workers may have. I am referring, for example, to platform workers. In this case, it seems to me that self-employed workers, independent workers, are a very broad category. I am more concerned about workers with less objective or weaker conditions. In this sense, it seems to me that technology is often used as a way of covering up or disguising a wage relationship, in order to leave jobs unprotected and precarious.

With regard to the advantages of collective bargaining, first of all, it seems to me that the wage setting that is done in this framework has a very important coverage. This is due to the great weight that there is of salaried workers and, in addition, to the fact that collective bargaining has a very broad effective coverage and not only in the norm. It is very easy to predict what will happen with the evolution of wages if one only imputes the adjustments of the resolutions of the wage councils to the different sectors of activity. That is to say, that has a real, very important impact, not only in the norm or in the regulation. It seems to me that this makes the coverage and is a great strength that we must work on.

Secondly, I consider it a very important strength - perhaps I have some differences with certain aspects that Mr. Bogliaccini has just raised - how this collective bargaining should take place and how we should think about the future. I think it is a strength that we have collective bargaining where the predominant level is that of the branch of activity. That does not mean that at the sectoral level we can think of other coordinations, whether through value chains or the incorporation of supranational agreements, but given the conditions that Uruguay has, it is not going to be tripartite.

MR. BOGLIACCINI. - What I said was that this is the Dutch situation, not ours.

MRS. PICCO. - As regards tripartite negotiations, I believe that this should be the predominant form of negotiation.

That the branch level is the predominant level is not only good in terms of, for example, mitigating wage disparity and protecting the weakest workers or those with fewer conditions in that negotiation, but it also gives a very important power to the wage policy deployed by the Government. I believe that this has an impact not only on what happens with wages, but also on other dimensions such as income distribution and poverty levels. I believe, then, that the branch level should be the predominant one, but that does not mean that there may not be others that accompany that.

I also think that tripartite should be the form of collective bargaining for the same reasons. I think that the State has to be involved in the negotiation, particularly in the setting of wages, but also in the setting of working conditions, because today

In collective bargaining, the law may have to determine minimum wages by category and also salary adjustments. However, it goes much further than that, since working conditions are set and, ultimately, the resolutions of the wage councils are those that establish the working conditions that, in general, are above the general regulations for workers in the different sectors of activity. It seems to me that the State should be there because of all the implications that this has in terms of working conditions and salary policy and how it is linked to other variables that affect people's lives. That is why I believe that the State should not disappear.

There was some triggering question there regarding how we We imagine that it should be those particular workers' organizations or those representations with workers who are perhaps working separately or not with their peers on a daily basis. Obviously, that creates new challenges, but it is something that collective bargaining has often already resolved, even for workers who are in more precarious conditions or with much lower starting levels. That has been resolved, for example, in the case of paid domestic work, where not everyone works together or in the home work of clothing workshop workers. It seems to me, then, that there is a challenge there, but not the impossibility for the representatives of collective bargaining, ultimately, to be the workers' organizations, the most representative business organizations and the State.

A point was mentioned that, it seems to me, is a great weakness that we have. Today, in the collective bargaining system, in the labour institutions, the State has a very important role to play in terms of the availability of information. It is an issue that I find quite difficult to address because, on the one hand, the State should be a promoter and lead these processes, but in reality there is a culture of not showing information that is very strong and that should be broken. I think that we have to think about this in the future if we want issues such as changes in the organisation of work, training, the incorporation of new technologies to be discussed - I think it should be like this - tripartitely and in the area of collective bargaining. For that to happen, information is required. Today, that is already an obstacle. From my point of view - perhaps, we have some differences, even with the people I work with - it is unthinkable to set salary adjustments in the medium term without these salary adjustments having any reference in the sectorial trajectories, beyond the intuitions that there may be about sectorial trajectories. This requires indicators that must obviously be endorsed by the parties, but which must be on the table.

There is often fear in showing information; that also happens with I think that in Uruguay there is a lot of fear and reluctance on the part of companies to put information on the table. Although the State should promote it, we already have a fairly smooth path because there are business chambers in most sectors that manage this information and it does not have to be personalized by company.

Another thing that was mentioned quite a bit is the issue of flexibility or flexibility in some labour regulations that would appear to be an impediment or an obstacle in the introduction of these new technologies. There was a lot of talk there, for example, about flexible working hours. I think that these issues have to be addressed sectorally. I am very concerned about thinking about some general regulation that could make the daily working day more flexible at a general level. Suddenly, this may not make much noise or may not be very unusual in some sectors, but nobody would like - for example, drivers - to have a totally unregulated daily work day or a weekly work day. It would be quite dangerous. I think that all these things have to be thought about sectorally and within the framework of negotiation. In addition, it seems to me that discussing the flexibility of the regulations creates an obstacle, for example, for the union movement, because when we talk about this issue we are always thinking about adapting people to the needs of the production process and we do not put people and their needs at the centre. So, that is one of the problems.

Another issue that does not contribute much to this debate is that, in general, when we talk about this flexibility, for example, of the working day or teleworking, we use as examples the most dynamic sectors or the most qualified or highest-income workers, and that is not exactly where the problem lies. Therefore, I do not think that these examples contribute to the discussion.

However, I do believe that there are a number of issues that can be made more flexible at the sectoral level of the general regulations, but, obviously, this has to be done with information in a discussion at that level.

I think I have nothing left to say. I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

MRS. GALÁN. - We now give the floor to Rafael Sotelo, electrical engineer, telecommunications option, from Udelar, master's degree in Management of

Companies by IEEM, PhD in Telematics Engineering from the University of Vigo, director of the Research Area of the Faculty of Engineering of the University of Montevideo and a leader in quantum computing.

MR. SOTELO. - Thank you very much for the presentation and the invitation. I feel honored to be with you and to be able to share my perception of this issue.

I would like to tell you that after the initial kick-off of this group to participate in this topic, I had no further communication until these past few days when I was invited to this particular session, which I find extremely relevant.

As mentioned, my experience comes from engineering. I am also a member of the National System of Researchers in the field of engineering. I am also a professor at the University of the Republic – I joined in 1989 – and I have been an advisor to companies in different cases.

Today, the people I am most in contact with are those Alejandra Picco mentioned: those with the greatest training and possibilities, especially in exports. When I was called to attend this Special Commission on Futures and on the subject of the future of work, I imagined that this is where Uruguay has the greatest opportunities to develop. For Uruguay, the emergence of artificial intelligence and globalization can be - depending on how we look at it - a great opportunity to bypass the great geographical difficulties we have. The pandemic proved it: we have a good structure in telecommunications and good training of people. We were able to continue working immediately and many were given the possibility of continuing to work as equals with organizations in central countries. This brought opportunities for the sectors mentioned and, probably, for the others as well.

My only contact with regulation was during my engineering studies - for six months - with Héctor Barbagelata, PhD in Law and Social Sciences, where we saw everything; I was one of the few students who went because I am very interested in the subject. I have never had a closer contact with that. For a long time I have developed technology being close to Uruguayan and international exponents.

Another area where I volunteer is at the IEEE, an organization, a kind of association of technology engineers, which has 400,000 members and generates

standards, gives lectures. I take part in different activities there, which has given me the opportunity to expose myself to many people. It is something that I consider very good, in general, for Uruguay.

Based on what I have interpreted from the questions, I will read my brief response – which I have put in writing – and make some further reflections based on what has been said.

As I said, based on my experience - which is what I recounted - the process of transformation of the world of work, with the emergence of technology and, in particular, artificial intelligence, added to the process of globalization, has been beneficial for workers, businessmen and entrepreneurs. I would also say that it has also been beneficial for Uruguayan users. Based on that, I have an optimistic view of the impact of technology on people, particularly on their work and on different aspects of society. A strongly positive aspect is that in some areas this transformation has made it possible to temper the disadvantage that Uruguay's geographical situation represents for the world of work. This has happened, in part, spontaneously and stimulated by a certain regulatory flexibility. It should be noted that today we can see the use of certain technology and foresee other uses. For example, platform employees were just mentioned; I think that is already present. Although it could increase, I do not see it as something in the future.

On the other hand, one of the new things about the uses of technology is regulation, if it can be interpreted as something that already exists. That is, there is certain regulation on how it works, in what way; we will have to see if it changes substantially or not if it comes through platforms. In short, today there is certain technology, which we know and about which we foresee that there may be other uses, but there will also be technologies or modes of use that we cannot even imagine.

Therefore, with respect to what was proposed in the call about building anticipatory institutionality, I do not think it is good, since it could inhibit the development of these things that we do not even imagine or the development and virtuous use of the use that technology provides.

One thing that I think is important is to generalize agreements with other countries to avoid double taxation and allow Uruguayan workers to work abroad – they already do a lot of this, but we do not have these agreements with other countries and allow Uruguayan employers and entrepreneurs to hire workers abroad.

The call referred to the concern about the scenarios of automation, substitution and loss of certain jobs, as well as the impact of globalization. I think that a very important focus is that of education, both for the people who suffer this impact directly and, especially, for the younger generations. There has been talk of problems that afflict us, of the workers who are suffering these things now, but I think that we should think - and, if we talk about the future, much more - about education - I don't know if the subject has already been discussed in this area; I suppose it has, especially for young people.

In this sense, I believe that some of the main themes to be conveyed in this concern for education should be, especially, the love for abstract thought and the English language - fundamental in this globalized world - in order to be able to integrate properly in all areas, both from Uruguay outwards, and with the people who visit us. In the central countries, and not English-speaking, everyone speaks English. In addition, in meetings between corporations or people who are from different countries, or in other words with different original languages, English is spoken. So, it seems fundamental to me that Uruguayans have a good education in the language.

Another important aspect of education is the proximity to technology, because that is where the world of the future is going, as we all recognize. It is interesting to be exposed to international experiences with central countries, mainly, to take an example. Sometimes we see virtuous children or adolescents who go to compete at NASA or some other institution that is so prominent worldwide. Let us try to make this more common, so that our children can have contact or exchange with schools in other countries to gain experience, to know where the world is going and how other children see it.

Another fundamental issue is openness to change and that we know from our education that the world changes and that we are going to change. I hope that we all have the pleasure of learning permanently, as at least those of us who are in this area see it. I graduated many years ago and for better or worse I have had to study permanently, and the same thing happened to those who preceded me and those I teach. There is always the need for permanent training and personal improvement.

I would also like to comment that there are reports from references such as the European Union or The World Economic Forum, in which many creators are working abroad.

Another trend concerns the difficulties of measuring eight hours of remote work. A trend that the European Union itself mentions in its own documents is the issue of evaluation by tasks. Going down that path may be much more than going to an evaluation for completing eight hours of work. Beyond work flexibility, this is proposed as something more appropriate for this world to come.

On the other hand, the issue of public investment was mentioned. In the central countries we see that in cutting-edge technologies they build the future with public investment; then comes private investment. In these few years I have witnessed what public investment is like in certain countries in a particular area, which was mentioned as a reference, and I am grateful for it; I am referring to quantum computing. In this area, countries have a huge investment and private investment only took off last year. I can provide more information if it is of interest. This is not new, it comes from before and this practice of public support is not only national but also regional – as happens in the European Union – and provincial in countries like Spain, Canada, etc. In these cases, the provinces support academia, industry, and the interaction between academia and industry with public investment. This is how innovation and the construction of this technological future occur in many cases.

Finally, I would like to mention a couple of very important issues, such as artificial intelligence, which not only has an impact on work, but also on everyone's life. There is a fundamental ethical issue that we must be concerned about. For example, interference in the worker to control him was mentioned. We must be very attentive to what that is like, to what things one may be willing to accept and how they are controlled or what we can allow to be controlled and to what extent.

In that sense, it seems to me that there are things that are already regulated for life. everyday, and this is another manifestation. I mean, there are colleagues who are listening online and it is as if they were here. So, nobody has the right to spy on another person; that is a crime anywhere, and there is no need to interpret or regulate anything else.

I thank you and remain at your disposal.

MRS. GALÁN. - Lastly, we give the floor to Sofía Scaserra, economist, associate researcher at the Transnational Institute, member of the Institute of the World of Work, director of the Observatory of Social Impacts of Artificial Intelligence, member of the Alliance for Inclusive Algorithms.

MRS. SCASERRA. - Thank you very much for inviting me.

It is difficult to close the presentations after those made previously. The colleagues who spoke before me presented very accurate and detailed views on the challenges facing us in the world of work in the present, in light of the transformations we are experiencing.

I'll start by saying that technology is not neutral. Technology is not given in a neutral way, but is thought up by someone who has intentions and objectives, which are not necessarily bad, but perhaps not the ones we pursue as a society. An example that I like to give on this subject is the history of the bicycle. The first bicycles were Penny Farthings, which have a large wheel at the front and a small wheel at the back, which we now use as vintage decorative objects in our homes. These bicycles could only be ridden by men; they were considered elite bicycles for strong, agile and powerful men. The bicycles we know today were initially made in secret because the big manufacturers did not want the brand to be associated with power, with skill, with the most beautiful, powerful, strong and skillful people. So, women and the elderly, who found Penny Farthing bicycles very complex to assemble, secretly began to ask craftsmen to make them the bicycle so they could go to market. This very silly story about an old technology - because bicycles have been with us for quite a few decades now - has left us with a powerful lesson: that the technologies we consume from the mainstream, that are sold to us and that brands produce, are not the ones that suit us as a society, they are not the technologies that serve us all and that empower us. So, it is often necessary to begin regulating technologies by asking ourselves what objectives we want as a society.

I have heard people say here that technology has a lot of potential, that it can insert Uruguay into the world, into value chains, and that is true, it can do that, but it will not do so automatically and it does not have to do so. Technology is designed with an objective, with a purpose, which may be to make workers precarious or automated or to monitor them, but not to empower them. So, the first thing we have to ask ourselves is:

It is whether the technology that we are inserting into the Uruguayan productive matrix, that is being inserted into the jobs, empowers Uruguayan workers or is a technology that makes them precarious, automates them or replaces them.

In this sense, I find it interesting to understand the importance of the State and of regulation. Obviously, regulating the future is impossible, we cannot do it, but we can regulate the present, and when we do so, I think we must always keep in mind that the best solution to all of society's problems is more democracy, much more social dialogue. Therefore, we must develop a new agenda of labor rights, no longer conceived with an industrial revolution or a Fordist productive paradigm, because evidently technological intermediation enables other forms of production and other ways of forming global value chains, as was very well described here. Fordist factories with an assembly line and one worker next to another no longer exist. Today the factory is the Internet, the computer, the assembly line, we are all connected to the network, so we must begin to think about the agenda of labor rights with the mind of the digital capitalism that we are experiencing and not with the mind of the Industrial Revolution of a century ago. In this sense, it is necessary to introduce a new agenda of labor rights in line with this technological intermediation, which, while it brought many benefits, also caused many problems.

We believe that a fundamental labor right that we have to regulate in Throughout Latin America and the world – in some legislations they already have it timidly, but it has to be stronger – is the right to digital disconnection, because workers really work twenty-four hours a day, on weekends, have Internet connections and receive messages from work all the time.

The right to disconnect is not the right of workers to throw away their cell phones or to mark their boss as seen, but rather to not be disturbed outside of their working hours, to have clear guidelines regarding the hours in which they can receive messages, perhaps at a time other than during the working day that can be implemented through a system of guards and so on, but that once established must be respected. We have lost the sovereignty of free and quality time, which is a right not only of workers in this new industrial revolution, but also a feminist right, because when responding outside of working hours is a new labor skill, women have much less chance of doing so, given that most of us devote a lot of time to the care economy. In addition, receiving messages outside of working hours does not allow for the organization of care tasks within the home, because even when the family wants to organize and divide them, if work calls get in the way,

It is very difficult to achieve this. Therefore, it is not only a right of workers, but also a feminist right.

Surveillance was mentioned here. Obviously, the protection of data from users is key. The protection of workers is key. We need to start having an agenda for the protection of workers' data. Both Argentina and Uruguay have a data protection law and, at this moment, in Argentina we are discussing a new data protection law that would be important to update with an agenda of labor rights and so that workers can know what data is being collected from them, as well as being able to delete it or take it with them when the employment relationship ends.

In addition, unions should conduct audits to determine what data is being collected from workers and how it is being used. Is it being sold to third parties? Is it being used for espionage or blackmail or to affect workers' careers? Obviously, the union must be aware of these issues because it is essential that it is so.

We should also think about data co-governance, which workers are part of that table and are told what data will be collected, under what circumstances and for what purpose, and those data that are not related to the productive function should not be kept.

Now, there are other new rights. Here it was mentioned that technology increases worker productivity. So, if this is the case, has there been any thought given to negotiating better wages for workers or a reduction in working hours? It is important that parliaments take this into account, because it cannot be that, if there is an increase in productivity as a result of technological integration, this benefit remains with the employer and the worker, who has a multiplicity of tasks and can do more in less time, receives nothing.

Finally, a new labor right that arises with intermediation. The problem that the working class has to start to fight for is that choosing working hours is not synonymous with autonomy. There is a relative sovereignty of working time that we workers gain, as a result of technological intermediation, which must be a new labor right. In Argentina, the teleworking law established that those people who have children in their care or adults with special care can choose their work schedules, and although they have to work the number of hours stipulated by contract, they have the right to cut work hours to carry out the work.

The question is, is whether to take a child to the doctor or to take him or her to and from school? This is very important. We must begin to fight for the sovereignty of working time, because it is a demand not only of the working class, but fundamentally of young workers, who increasingly find autonomy desirable simply because they feel they can control their own work schedules. This is outrageous. Sovereignty of working time - the relative sovereignty of working time - should be a new labour right and not a synonym for autonomy. This has nothing to do with autonomy. There is a relationship of dependency, but we workers have gained sovereignty of working time thanks to technological intermediation, and we must use it to our advantage in this sense, to gain more rights and better working conditions.

Finally, I think it is very important to point out that every time you When technology is introduced into a workplace, it should be done in a consensual and gradual manner. There are many examples around the world of unions, states and companies that have negotiated gradual ways of reintegrating workers into the workplace when a new technology is introduced that will replace or change their working conditions. Obviously, training is needed, and this does not have to be the responsibility of the worker or merely the state, but can be carried out jointly by all actors in society.

That's why I say it's important to respond with more democracy, with more collective bargaining, with more tripartism, with more actors sitting at the negotiating table. We understand that if we are going to have a technological change that modifies the productive matrix of our economies, the way workers work and the way companies do business, it is essential and necessary that this be done with social dialogue, with consensus in society and with a new agenda of rights so that technology is not designed, assembled and used to make workers precarious, subjugate and automate and replace them, because we do not want economies that are increasingly weaker, with lower wages and higher unemployment rates. What we want is to leap towards development like Latin America and have better working conditions for our workers. Therefore, it seems to me that we must respond with social dialogue, with democracy, with a consensual insertion in terms of training, audits, time space - that is, taking into account how long it will take to make this new technological insertion -, of impact on the lives of workers, of understanding whether this technology was designed locally and respects the cultural and social patterns that we have within our region or if it does not respect them and does not take them into account. Only the workers represented through their union can say that because they are the ones who have the capacity to say whether this technology is affecting their lives in a negative way. I often hear businessmen say "We understand, we understand"

"We understand," but then, when it comes to carrying out the audit, an outside company is hired to see what is happening within the business space where the technology was applied. If we want to know if a technology really affects the lives of workers, we have to ask them, represented through the union, and not a multinational company that comes to do a consultancy.

So, I think it is very important to begin to understand that this negotiation has to be broad, we have to negotiate a productivity bonus, but also time slots, training, forms of technological insertion, audits and a lot of other agendas that have to do with understanding that this technology is going to affect the life and productivity of these workers. Therefore, regulation is necessarily required, both at the national level issued through Congress, and at the level of collective bargaining through an agreement or a collective work agreement.

I won't go into much more detail because we have to close the session, but it is the contribution that I wanted to leave in some way, with an agenda of rights that I think is important to begin to understand in terms of regulation, not in light of what is coming, not of the future, but of the present, of what we are experiencing today, which is a brutal change in the form of production because we have abandoned the Fordist industrial revolution and we are facing a new digital or technological capitalism that has evidently changed the form of production through technological intermediation and that needs a new agenda for dialogue and collective bargaining.

Thank you so much.

MRS. GALÁN. - We ran out of time. We had two more guests who were going to speak about basic income and the binding treaty, a topic they have been working on for a long time. We would like to propose, Mr. President - because there is no more time - that they make their contributions in writing so that they can be incorporated into the verbatim version.

Contribution Prof. Christian Adel Mirza

Contribution by Alberto Villarreal

MR. MIRZA. - I am a professor and also a substitute member of parliament; several of those here know me.

I would like to propose to the president of the commission that he include the option of a universal basic income as a topic for discussion on his agenda, because it is being debated at a global level. From ECLAC to the ILO, including the World Bank and the IDB, there are discussions about a universal basic income. The concrete proposal is that they put the topic on the agenda and, eventually, if they deem it necessary, they call us to make a presentation.

Thank you so much.

Mr. President. - Today we ran out of time, but I want to point out that we set this timetable because we all have limited time. This is a process that continues. We always say that our Finnish model took four years in the first stage to deal with this issue. I am referring to the conference "The Future of Work, the Work of the Future, a view from Uruguay." On September 26, we are going to make a first advance of a first annual report that will be finished next year. The issue of universal basic income is on the table and we are going to continue discussing it, among other aspects.

You are all invited to the 26th of September at 6:00 p.m. in the events room of the Legislative Palace where, I repeat, a first progress report will be presented, because there were many contributions and we do not want to be confined to a report where, among other things, we have requests from many of the experts to participate in the review of that report and also to have enough space to make corrections and even discuss them. That is why I inform you that on the 26th of this month, basically, a progress report will be presented where the participation of the experts will be discussed and some of the headlines of the contributions will be announced.

Lydia Garrido, the expert who is accompanying us, is present, as is Bruno Gili, who is connected via Zoom, and unfortunately Inés Fynn could not attend because her father passed away today. Therefore, we have a work team and we will continue this process. As you know, the work regime is one session per month, and there are many sessions left to complete even this first report.

We are going through this process and there are many topics to explore in depth. We apologize to Engineer Sotelo because this was not the specific topic, but his contributions were still very good.

On behalf of the Special Committee on Futures, we would also like to thank the legislators and those who have accompanied us for their presence. We look forward to seeing you all on September 26 at 6:00 p.m. in the events hall of the Legislative Palace.

The meeting is adjourned.

(It is 18:05).

Montevideo, Uruguay. Legislative Branch.