



Report of the Resolutions Committee

1. The Resolutions Committee, set up by the Conference at its first sitting on 4 June 2002, was originally composed of 166 voting members (81 Government members, 29 Employer members, 56 Worker members). An appropriate weighting system ensured equality of voting strength.
2. The Committee first elected its Officers. On the proposal of Mr. Kamjorn Nakchuen (Government member, Thailand), speaking on behalf of Government members of the Asia-Pacific group, Mr. John Chetwin (Government member, New Zealand), was elected to the Chair. In accordance with the Committee's usual practice, the Chairperson was also elected Reporter. The Committee elected as Vice-Chairpersons Mr. Bokkie Botha (Employer member, South Africa) and Lord Brett (Worker member, United Kingdom). Reservations with regard to the election of the Worker Vice-Chairperson were expressed by Worker members of Egypt and Yemen, speaking on behalf of Arab workers.
3. The Committee had before it 12 draft resolutions submitted in accordance with article 17 of the Standing Orders of the Conference. In keeping with the same article, these were introduced by one of their authors in the following order: (a) resolution concerning the promotion of gender equality; (b) resolution concerning the role of the ILO in addressing the devastating effects of Israeli occupation and hostilities on the working conditions and the workers of Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories; (c) resolution concerning tripartism in the ILO; (d) resolution concerning international employment and skills; (e) resolution concerning strengthening tripartism and social dialogue; (f) resolution concerning sustainable development; (g) resolution concerning pay equity; (h) resolution concerning asbestos; (i) resolution concerning the social responsibilities of business; (j) resolution concerning psychological harassment at work; (k) resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue; (l) resolution concerning the ILO and sustainable development.
4. After the introduction of the resolutions and before the vote held in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 17, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Orders, the following resolutions were combined by their authors:
 - (a) the resolutions concerning the promotion of gender equality and pay equity;

the first of which had been submitted by the Government delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, and the second by the following Worker members: Mr. Aguilar (Costa Rica); Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan); Ms. Anderson (Mexico); Mr. Attigbe (Benin); Lord Brett (United Kingdom); Ms. Brighi (Italy); Mr. Daer (Argentina); Mr. Edström (Sweden); Mr. El Maaytah (Jordan); Ms. Engelen-Kefer (Germany); Mr. Etty (Netherlands); Mr. Ito (Japan); Mr. Jrad (Tunisia); Mr. Kara (Israel); Ms. Lekang (Norway); Mr. Martinez Molina (Chile); Mr. Matheson (Australia);

Mr. Nollet (Belgium); Mr. Norddahl (Iceland); Mr. Parrot (Canada); Mr. Patel (South Africa); Mr. Prince (Switzerland); Mr. Rampak (Malaysia); Mr. Romano (Brazil); Mr. Sidialsaïd (Algeria); Mr. Sidorov (Russian Federation); Mr. Sithole (Swaziland); Mr. Trogrlic (France); Mr. Trotman (Barbados); Ms. Valkonen (Finland); Mr. Wistisen (Denmark); Ms. Yacob (Singapore); and Mr. Zellhoefer (United States).

- (b) the resolutions concerning tripartism in the ILO, strengthening tripartism and social dialogue, and tripartism and social dialogue;

the first of which had been submitted by the following Employer members: Mr. Anand (India); Mr. Barde (Switzerland); Mr. Botha (South Africa); Mr. Funes de Rioja (Argentina); Mr. Hoff (Norway); Mr. Lima Godoy (Brazil); Mr. Noakes (Australia); Mr. Potter (United States) and Mr. Tabani (Pakistan), the second by the following Worker members: Mr. Aguilar (Costa Rica); Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan); Ms. Anderson (Mexico); Mr. Attigbe (Benin); Mr. Basnet (Nepal); Lord Brett (United Kingdom); Ms. Brighi (Italy); Mr. Daer (Argentina); Mr. Edström (Sweden); Mr. El Maaytah (Jordan); Ms. Engelen-Kefer (Germany); Mr. Ety (Netherlands); Mr. Ito (Japan); Mr. Jrad (Tunisia); Mr. Kara (Israel); Ms. Lekang (Norway); Mr. Martinez Molina (Chile); Mr. Matheson (Australia); Mr. Nollet (Belgium); Mr. Norddahl (Iceland); Mr. Parrot (Canada); Mr. Patel (South Africa); Mr. Prince (Switzerland); Mr. Rampak (Malaysia); Mr. Romano (Brazil); Mr. Sidialsaïd (Algeria); Mr. Sidorov (Russian Federation); Mr. Sithole (Swaziland); Mr. Trogrlic (France); Mr. Trotman (Barbados); Ms. Valkonen (Finland); Mr. Wistisen (Denmark); Ms. Yacob (Singapore); and Mr. Zellhoefer (United States), and the third by the following Worker members: Mr. Abreu (Dominican Republic); Mr. Affillal (Morocco); Mr. Cortebeeck (Belgium); Ms. Diallo (Guinea); Mr. Duron (Honduras); Mr. Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso); Mr. Parra (Paraguay); and Mr. Zounnadjala (Togo).

- (c) the resolutions concerning international employment and skills, sustainable development, and the ILO and sustainable development;

the first of which had been submitted by the Government delegations of Canada, Finland, Ireland, Sweden and the United Kingdom, the second by the following Worker members: Mr. Aguilar (Costa Rica); Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan); Ms. Anderson (Mexico); Mr. Attigbe (Benin); Mr. Basnet (Nepal); Lord Brett (United Kingdom); Ms. Brighi (Italy); Mr. Daer (Argentina); Mr. Edström (Sweden); Mr. El Maaytah (Jordan); Ms. Engelen-Kefer (Germany); Mr. Ety (Netherlands); Mr. Ito (Japan); Mr. Jrad (Tunisia); Mr. Kara (Israel); Ms. Lekang (Norway); Mr. Martinez Molina (Chile); Mr. Matheson (Australia); Mr. Nollet (Belgium); Mr. Norddahl (Iceland); Mr. Parrot (Canada); Mr. Patel (South Africa); Mr. Prince (Switzerland); Mr. Rampak (Malaysia); Mr. Romano (Brazil); Mr. Sidialsaïd (Algeria); Mr. Sidorov (Russian Federation); Mr. Sithole (Swaziland); Mr. Trogrlic (France); Ms. Valkonen (Finland); Mr. Wistisen (Denmark); Ms. Yacob (Singapore); and Mr. Zellhoefer (United States), and the third by the following Worker members: Mr. Abreu (Dominican Republic); Mr. Affillal (Morocco); Mr. Cortebeeck (Belgium); Ms. Diallo (Guinea); Mr. Duron (Honduras); Mr. Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso); Mr. Parra (Paraguay); and Mr. Zounnadjala (Togo).

5. In accordance with the procedure laid down in article 17, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Orders of the Conference, and using the traditional system of balloting, the Committee

convened at its third sitting to determine the first five resolutions to be considered among the seven resolutions remaining before the Committee and their order of priority.

6. Owing to a change in the composition of the Committee, there were at the time of voting 205 voting members (97 Government members with 2,867 votes each; 47 Employer members with 5,917 votes each; and 61 Worker members with 4,559 votes each).¹
7. The first five resolutions and the votes cast for them were as follows:
 - (1) Resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue: 2,777,080 weighted votes;
 - (2) Resolution concerning sustainable development: 2,127,916 weighted votes;
 - (3) Resolution concerning the role of the ILO in addressing the devastating effects of Israeli occupation and hostilities on the working conditions and the workers of Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories: 1,918,185 weighted votes;
 - (4) Resolution concerning gender equality: 1,882,961 weighted votes;
 - (5) Resolution concerning the social responsibilities of business: 1,069,035 weighted votes.
8. In accordance with article 17, paragraph 5(b), of the Standing Orders, the Committee, at its fourth sitting, set up a working party to make recommendations as to the order in which the remaining resolutions before the Committee should be examined.
9. The Working Party was composed as follows:

Government members:

Mr. Macphee (Canada)

Ms. Jensen (Denmark)

Mr. Thullen (Ecuador)

Employer members:

Mr. Kabyemera (United Republic of Tanzania)

Ms. Riddervold (Norway)

Mr. Senechal (France)

¹ Subsequently, further changes were made in the composition:

Fourth sitting on 10.6.02, 194 voting members (100 G, 32 E, 62 W);

Fifth sitting on 11.06.02, 193 voting members (102 G, 29 E, 62 W);

Sixth sitting on 12.06.02, 172 voting members (102 G, 25 E, 45 W);

Seventh sitting on 13.06.02, 155 voting member (102 G, 16 E, 37 W);

Eighth sitting on 14.06.02, 151 voting members (102 G, 12 E, 37 W);

Ninth sitting on 15.06.02, 150 voting members (101 G, 12 E, 37 W).

Worker members:

Ms. Brighi (Italy)

Mr. Miranda de Oliveira (Brazil)

Mr. Trabelsi (Tunisia)

10. At the Committee's fifth sitting, the Chairperson announced that the Working Party had met and had favoured the following order of priority:

(6) Resolution concerning psychological harassment at work;

(7) Resolution concerning asbestos.

11. The Committee took note of the information given.

Resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue

General discussion

12. A Worker member from Brazil said he was content with the merged text of this resolution; various members in his group would take the floor to reflect how different regions viewed its relevance. As far as Latin America was concerned, the need to widen democracy so as to involve all partners in decision-making processes was recognized. The need to extend social dialogue could not be decreed, however. The practice of tripartism and social dialogue is important both at the legislative level (with laws that have to be fully implemented) and in the case of implementing agreements reached through collective bargaining. Tripartism, in the ILO and beyond, was important in order to raise awareness of the need for greater participation. A dialogue with NGOs was vital, while respecting different roles and responsibilities, and he was happy to see the way this was developing in his region.

13. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, as one of the sponsors of the merged text, he supported it. He reminded the Committee that his group had long argued in favour of short and meaningful resolutions that were easily understood by constituents. In producing amendments, members of his group would be looking at a number of issues, including the need to recognize local practices and take account of existing structures. The resolution should focus on general principles rather than adopt a prescriptive approach. He stressed that the idea of tripartism should continue to concern the three current social partners, notwithstanding the attention given to the role of NGOs and civil society. The resolution should avoid ambiguity and duplication, and its preamble should be succinct. Importantly, this and other resolutions should reflect due concern for any budgetary implications.

14. A Worker member from Ghana appreciated the attention given to this resolution. The importance of social dialogue and tripartism could not be underestimated while moves towards greater democracy were underway in several African countries. Beyond electoral democracy, tripartism and social dialogue were crucial for giving the social partners a role in the design and implementation of social policy. Calls for a number of pertinent ILO Conventions to be ratified should be backed up by technical cooperation activities, inter alia to strengthen employers' and workers' organizations. He also stressed the need to have tripartism reflected in the work of the Bretton Woods institutions that played a major role in shaping economic and social policies in many developing countries.

-
15. The Government member of France expressed satisfaction at seeing this resolution as the first on the list since tripartism was an essential element at both the national and the international levels. It was an original and effective mechanism for workers to be represented in an independent manner in discussing issues that concerned them. Countries should be inspired by the work of the ILO, as was his country, France, which considered it an honour to work in and with the ILO. Adoption of the resolution would underpin government work on tripartism and social dialogue.
 16. A Worker member from India said that the fact that this resolution was proposed by two of the three social partners underlined its significance. Together with the ILO Director-General, who had referred to tripartism as an underutilized asset, he pleaded for a fuller and more effective use of tripartism to deal with conflicts in society in general and the workplace in particular. The ILO Conventions that were referred to in the draft resolution should be ratified by countries that had not done so, as they provided a firm basis for effective tripartism. That this was often difficult did not mean that it could not be done. The social partners should actively participate in shaping policy decisions instead of being limited to taking part in “post mortem” exercises that merely discussed what had already been decided about issues of concern to workers. A global tendency towards labour flexibility risked bypassing tripartite consultation and this was also speeding up informalization of the economy with all its evils. While it was important to draw inputs from civil society when promoting social dialogue, tripartism should not turn into quadripartism or multipartism; the resolution should be clear in this respect. Also, there should be no reference to the involvement of the Bretton Woods institutions in the resolution.
 17. An Employer member from the United States said that, as one of the authors of the Employers’ resolution on the subject, she was pleased this topic was before the Committee. The long history of the ILO demonstrated the importance of tripartite dialogue and she hoped an agreement would be reached that would strengthen the core values of tripartism within the ILO itself, as well as recognize the significant differences that existed among member States.
 18. A Worker member from Italy stressed the importance of the fact that workers and employers had worked together in merging this important resolution. Tripartism and social dialogue were crucial instruments, especially in situations of economic and political change at the national, regional and international level. She recalled that the resolution invited governments to set up tripartite structures as necessary, and that it asked the ILO Governing Body, among other things, to ensure that tripartism and social dialogue were strengthened within the ILO itself as tools for bringing about policy change. She underlined the difference between social dialogue and civil dialogue and the importance, before dealing with other actors, to strengthen the pillars of the ILO. She emphasized the need for the main ILO Conventions dealing with tripartism and social dialogue to be ratified.
 19. An Employer member from France reminded the Committee that unlike in some other international bodies, including the OECD and the European Union, in the ILO employers and workers were on the same footing as governments.
 20. The Government member of Denmark welcomed the resolution because social dialogue and tripartism had been at the centre of ILO concerns since the Organization’s establishment in 1919. In spite of this, freedom of association, the right to organize and collective bargaining were still not exercised in all member States. Given the global picture, there certainly was a need for social dialogue and tripartism to be actively promoted. There was also a need for a better recognition that good governance in the

labour market would contribute to sustainable development and social stability. Her country had more than 100 years of experience of this, and all parties assumed responsibility both in finding solutions and in implementing agreements reached. The text of the resolution should be directed more towards member States, rather than focusing on the Office itself where tripartism and social dialogue worked reasonably well. The great challenge was to introduce tripartism and social dialogue in countries where they were lacking or non-existent.

- 21.** A Worker member from Sudan urged the adoption of the resolution since it met the ambitions and aspirations of people around the world. In Sudan, recent experiences with a tripartite council which monitored inflation, wage rates and economic indicators had proved valuable for wage negotiations. A tripartite standing committee on labour law and employment law encouraged bridge-building among government, employers and workers with regard to legislation submitted to Parliament. In the past, such committees only rubber-stamped agreements; now they were able to provide inputs for decision-making.
- 22.** An Employer member from the United Republic of Tanzania noted that a national labour law review was being carried out in his country by a tripartite committee. It was important to support capacity building for employers' and workers' organizations in order to strengthen tripartism.
- 23.** A Worker member from Poland stressed the importance of tripartism and social dialogue in Central and Eastern Europe, where three major challenges were being faced: globalization, Europeanization and socio-economic transition. In Poland, tripartite committees operated at both the national and district levels, however, bipartite social dialogue was increasing due to the influence of deregulation. Tripartite social dialogue was indispensable for progress on such critical issues as unemployment and underemployment, which were beyond the capacity of enterprises to address.
- 24.** The Government member of Germany stated that tripartite institutions and mechanisms in his country had long contributed to positive achievements in areas such as collective bargaining, social security, and employment protection. The value of international tripartite social dialogue had been demonstrated in ILO's approach to critical issues such as the social impacts of globalization and child labour. The speaker expressed the hope that other countries which had not yet done so might be inspired to adopt tripartite practices. While his Government supported the resolution, he regretted that no reference was made therein to decent work and suggested that it might be added. The ILO should promote the mainstreaming of social issues, tripartism and social dialogue in other organizations.
- 25.** A Worker member from Iraq accepted the importance of tripartite structures for social stability; tripartite mechanisms were important to achieve improved wages and to fight inflation. However, Third World countries faced particular obstacles and difficulties. Their national economies were being destabilized due to globalization and liberalization. It was difficult for workers to recommend that government implement a resolution on tripartism and social dialogue, when his country was facing an embargo, the suspension of payments for its exports, and the resulting financial disruption. Such aggression should stop in all countries of the world.
- 26.** An Employer member from Zimbabwe noted that historical realities affected the proper practice of tripartism. In his country, sanctions were also in force and apartheid policies had left as a legacy a dualistic economy. Social dialogue was critical, but it was imperative to know with whom one was dialoguing. Employers must truly represent employers' interests and Workers must truly represent workers' interests. If social dialogue merely

entrenched the status quo ante, it was not useful. Issues of equity and empowerment needed to be addressed.

27. A Worker member from Japan observed that the significance of tripartism had become clear during the 1997 Asian financial crisis. The Asian crisis and the pace of globalization had demonstrated government's incapacity, when acting alone, to protect employment and maintain social security in a time of rapid change. There was a need for government, employers and workers to find solutions together. Tripartism that was based on trust and confidence among the three parties could lead to greater consensus on how to respond to the challenges posed by the changing trade and investment patterns in a globalizing economy. The need for trust and cooperation was more recognized at enterprise level, through collective bargaining between management and trade unions.
28. The Government member of Norway supported the view of the Government member of Denmark with regard to focusing the operative part of the resolution on the lack of tripartism and social dialogue in ILO member States. That was where the real challenge lay.
29. A Worker member from France recalled the fundamental reasons for supporting and strengthening tripartism at a time of rapid globalization. Tripartism was an important means to reduce social conflict. Tripartism was essential to ensuring social stability on a sustainable basis. Tripartism ensured the democratic expression of the views of all parties and enabled the search for appropriate solutions which respected the interests of all concerned. Tripartism also offered standardized procedures through which the various parties could work together along common principles. The speaker urged ratification of the core labour standards, in particular [Conventions Nos. 87 and 98](#), to ensure democratic development. The adoption of this resolution with the sponsorship and full support of governments, employers and workers would send a strong message on the need to apply tripartism in all ILO member States, which was indeed its purpose.
30. An Employer member from Argentina noted that tripartism embodied a balanced approach to complex social issues which focused on the common good. There were no simple answers. No party had a monopoly on truth or power. Tripartism relied on strong social partners, and there was a need for capacity building for governments as well as employers' and workers' organizations. ILO technical cooperation was needed in this area. Simply to imagine a better future was not enough; one must take steps to make it happen.

Consideration of amendments

31. Forty-four amendments to the draft text, numbered D.6 to D.49, were submitted for examination.

Title

32. The Employers' group submitted an amendment (D.12) to add the words "in the ILO" after the word "tripartism". In introducing the amendment, the Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his group's concern that the resolution should be easily understandable by ordinary employers and workers. Concepts such as tripartism, social dialogue and social partners were sometimes interpreted differently in different parts of the world. Local, national and regional practices differed. A distinction needed to be drawn between tripartism in the ILO and social dialogue, which took place in wider society.

-
33. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that much of the text in the resolution was not about tripartism in the ILO, but was more general in nature. Social dialogue was carried out by the social partners, whereas civil dialogue might involve other stakeholders in society as well. The effect of the proposed amendment would be restrictive and misleading. The title of the resolution should be left as it was.
 34. The Government members of Argentina, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the Syrian Arab Republic agreed with the Workers' view that it would be limiting to refer only to tripartism within the ILO.
 35. The Government members of Cameroon, Cuba, Indonesia, and Pakistan favoured the amendment. While expressing their full support for the practice of tripartism at the national level, several felt that widening the focus beyond the ILO would only create confusion.
 36. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment but asked that the debate be remembered in subsequent discussion.
 37. The title was adopted.

Preamble

38. Paragraph 1 was adopted without amendment.
39. The Government member of Israel, supported by the Workers' group, presented an amendment (D.33) to add a new paragraph following paragraph 1 which specifically mentioned [Conventions Nos. 87, 98, 144, 150, 151 and 154](#) and their accompanying Recommendations, as well as [Recommendation No. 113](#). Such references were common practice in preambles.
40. The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment, reiterating his group's preference for a resolution which was meaningful, short, concise and easy to understand.
41. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reaffirmed his support for the amendment that was quite valuable for explaining the focus of the resolution.
42. The amendment was adopted.
43. Paragraph 2 was adopted without amendment.
44. The Employers' group submitted an amendment (D.13) to delete paragraph 3. It was desirable to avoid repetition and the ideas in paragraph 3 were already reflected in the two preceding paragraphs.
45. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled the Director-General's concern that the ILO was not well known outside the circle of its constituents. It was important to retain paragraph 3 since it explained the Organization in plain language and underscored its unique nature.
46. A Worker member from Benin strongly supported the retention of the original text as it was the only paragraph that defined tripartism and provided the needed framework for understanding social dialogue, a view supported by the Government member of Cameroon.
47. The Government member of Argentina, in supporting the amendment, observed that other tripartite bodies existed outside the ILO, one example being the social-labour committee, an auxiliary tripartite committee within MERCOSUR.

-
48. The Government members of Canada, Ecuador and France did not support the amendment. The original text made the resolution easier to understand.
 49. The Government member of India emphasized the important role played by the ILO in promoting social dialogue, and therefore also supported the retention of the original text.
 50. In the light of the discussions, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
 51. The Government member of Israel withdrew an amendment (D.32).
 52. The Government member of India, seconded by the Government member of Egypt, presented an amendment (D.47) which would add clarity to the paragraph. “Compare” was a static concept, and did not adequately reflect the dynamic nature of tripartite discussions, which was better reflected in the word “exchange”. It was also important to include “and consensus building” which was one of the objectives of social dialogue.
 53. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
 54. A spokesperson for the Workers’ group preferred the retention of “compare” as in the original text, but supported the inclusion of “consensus building”.
 55. The Government members of Ecuador, Indonesia, Pakistan and South Africa supported the amendment.
 56. A spokesperson for the Workers’ group accepted the amendment.
 57. Paragraph 3 was adopted as amended.
 58. Paragraph 4 was adopted.
 59. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (D.14) to replace paragraph 5 with a more concise text which retained all the important ideas of paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, but avoided pitfalls and eliminated repetition. The amendment also avoided general statements and self-congratulatory elements in the original text. The Employers’ group were also sensitive to the need to avoid highlighting purely workers’ issues.
 60. The spokesperson for the Workers’ group did not support the amendment, strongly preferring the original text.
 61. The Government member of France felt that the amendment would upset quite a few people. The Government member of the Syrian Arab Republic thought the original text was clear and opposed the amendment.
 62. The Government members of India and the Philippines supported the amendment.
 63. The Government member of the Republic of South Africa asked whether the phrase “in the ILO”, which had been excluded from the title of the draft resolution, was to be included in this text. The Employer Vice-Chairperson confirmed its inclusion in the amendment.
 64. Based on this confirmation, the Government member of Canada said she would only support the amendment if it were subamended by the deletion of “in the ILO”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the subamendment.

-
65. The Government members of Ecuador, the Netherlands and South Africa supported the subamended proposal.
 66. A Worker member from Italy urged the Government members to retain the original text which was crucial for the discussion of the paragraphs which followed.
 67. A Worker member from Tunisia recalled that real tripartite dialogue was important both at national level and within enterprises.
 68. A Worker member from Benin noted that it was not possible to determine what related to nations and what related to the international level in the proposed amendment. Because the original text of paragraph 5 covered all aspects of tripartite social dialogue, it should be retained.
 69. The Government member of France asked the Employer Vice-Chairperson to clarify whether or not it was the intention of the amendment to eliminate the reference to workers' rights and workplace issues. The Employer Vice-Chairperson assured him that the words "labour issues" applied to both workers and employers.
 70. The Government member of China, seconded by the Government member of Pakistan, proposed that the words "social concerns" in the amendment be replaced by "labour issues".
 71. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that "labour issues" destroyed the purpose of the Employers' amendment.
 72. The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text.
 73. Based on the discussion, the Chairperson stated that the subamendment of the Government member of China did not stand.
 74. The Government member of Denmark proposed a subamendment to add "social dialogue and" before "tripartism", which led to minor grammatical adjustments to the text. The Government members of Ecuador, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden expressed support. The Workers' and Employers' groups agreed and the subamendment was adopted.
 75. The Government member of Israel, seconded by the Government member of the United Kingdom, introduced an amendment (D.34) which would add the notion that, when effective, tripartism had proven a valuable and democratic means.
 76. The Government member of the United States supported the inclusion of the words "valuable and democratic means".
 77. The Government member of Ecuador noted that these words should apply to both social dialogue and tripartism.
 78. The Employer Vice-Chairperson felt that this text might be a bit negative.
 79. The Government member of Israel subamended his proposal to read: "have proved to be valuable and democratic means". This was seconded by the Government member of the United States.
 80. The Employers' group and the Workers' group supported this proposal.

-
- 81.** The Government member of Pakistan asked for clarification of the term “social concerns”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that this term encompassed all areas within the ILO mandate, such as labour issues and the development of national legislation.
 - 82.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.
 - 83.** The Vice-Chairperson of the Employers’ group introduced an amendment (D.15) to delete paragraph 6. The text raised numerous problems, notably that of attempting to impose a definition of social dialogue, a term which was used and understood differently in different countries. This was inappropriate and restrictive. The paragraph raised more questions than it answered and would best be deleted.
 - 84.** The Vice-Chairperson of the Workers’ group stated that it was the desire to lend definition to social dialogue and to differentiate it clearly from civil dialogue which had initially attracted the Workers’ group. In accepting that the wording had not achieved the desired clarity, his group could support deletion of the paragraph.
 - 85.** The Government member of Ecuador supported the amendment.
 - 86.** Based on the consensus achieved, the amendment was adopted and paragraph 6 was deleted.
 - 87.** The Vice-Chairperson of the Employers’ group introduced an amendment (D. 16) to delete paragraph 7. In the course of his group’s initial discussions, a number of positive aspects of paragraph 7 had been highlighted by various Employer members. Amendments submitted by other delegations had addressed his group’s concerns regarding the original text. He withdrew the amendment in order to provide the opportunity to improve the text through further discussion.
 - 88.** The Vice-Chairperson of the Workers’ group strongly supported retention of paragraph 7 and signalled his group’s willingness to accept amendments proposed by other members.
 - 89.** The Government member of Israel submitted an amendment (D.36), seconded by the Workers’ group, to add the word “democratic” to the attributes of organizations of workers and employers. The intention was to emphasize the representative status of such organizations. This proposal echoed a similarly worded amendment submitted by the Government member of Canada.
 - 90.** The Vice-Chairperson of the Employers’ group supported the proposal, as did the Government members of Ecuador, India and South Africa.
 - 91.** In light of the general consensus, the amendment was adopted and paragraph 7 was adopted as amended.
 - 92.** The Government member of Egypt, also on behalf of the Government member of Pakistan, introduced an amendment (D.40) to paragraph 8. Its purpose was to reflect that the ILO was the competent organization to deal with issues concerning the world of work at the international level. Government members of China, Cuba and India supported the amendment.
 - 93.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson believed that fear of a role for the World Trade Organization in these matters was behind this amendment. He saw no reason for such fear, nor for the amendment. Globalization and its ramifications were being discussed in numerous fora around the globe, and such debate should not be restricted to the ILO.

-
94. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said these issues had been debated earlier within and outside the ILO. He supported the amendment on the understanding that this debate would continue.
 95. The Government member of Argentina did not support the amendment as drafted because it made no reference to the fact that certain regional bodies also dealt with these issues. He therefore proposed to insert the word “regional” in the amendment.
 96. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed and proposed a subamendment to add the word “regional” after the word “national” and, in order to reach a consensus, to add at the end of the amendment the words “, and most pertinently in the ILO”.
 97. The Government members of Cameroon, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Israel, Italy, the Philippines and the United Kingdom expressed support for the subamendment, as did the Employer Vice-Chairperson. The amendment as subamended was adopted and paragraph 8, as amended, was adopted.
 98. The Government member of India, seconded by the Government member of Sri Lanka, introduced an amendment (D.46) to paragraph 9 to emphasize the role of the social partners in examining and reinforcing the role of international cooperation in reducing poverty and promoting full employment. He proposed a subamendment to delete the words “and social development” at the end of the amendment to avoid repetition. The Government member of Pakistan supported the amendment as subamended.
 99. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported it but felt it needed a reference to the decent work concept, for example after the words “full employment”.
 100. The Government member of Japan understood the reasons for introducing the amendment but was unclear about the link between international cooperation and full employment.
 101. The Government member of India responded that if there was no role for international cooperation most of the strategies being discussed in the ILO would be irrelevant. He also accepted the suggestion by the Worker Vice-Chairperson to further subamend his amendment by adding the words “and decent work” after “full employment”.
 102. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the amended text. The amendment as subamended was adopted and paragraph 9, as amended, was adopted.
 103. Amendment D.17, which had been submitted by the Employer members, proposed to delete paragraph 10. The Employer Vice-Chairperson found it another repetitive clause adding nothing not already mentioned, for example, in paragraph 8.
 104. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. The paragraph should stand, if only to point out that tripartism was an undervalued asset, particularly in crisis situations, as had recently been said by the ILO Director-General.
 105. The Government member of Pakistan wanted to be clear about the meaning of certain terms, notably “regional integration” and “transition” before he could judge the need for such a paragraph.
 106. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that many countries belonged to one or more regional groupings, such as the European Union or MERCOSUR, where discussions were held and decisions were taken that had impact on the world of work. The reference to transition

concerned, in particular, countries of Central and Eastern Europe where major social changes were taking place after the downfall of communism.

- 107.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that his group was looking for clarity and brevity in resolutions. The present paragraph was the result of merged text and was at times contradictory. It also repeated what was already covered in paragraphs 8 and 9.
- 108.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that brevity was sometimes the enemy of clarity. There was a need to spell out that social dialogue and tripartism were valuable tools in various situations, including the most difficult ones.
- 109.** The Government members of China, Ecuador, Egypt, New Zealand and the United States agreed with the Employers' position and therefore favoured deleting the paragraph.
- 110.** The Government member of Argentina referred again to the example of MERCOSUR and wanted to retain paragraph 10. The Government members of Cameroon and Malawi also wanted the paragraph to remain.
- 111.** A vote by show of hands was then taken at the request of the Employer Vice-Chairperson. There were 7,020 votes in favour of the amendment, 7,190 against, with 1,125 abstentions. The amendment was rejected and paragraph 10 was adopted unchanged.
- 112.** The Government member of India had submitted an amendment (D.45), seconded by the Government member of Cuba, to add a new paragraph after paragraph 10. He said that globalization had created both opportunities and challenges. The biggest challenge was for developing countries not to be left behind and to integrate further into the world economy. The proposed amendment stressed the role of the social partners in creating a conducive environment for such integration to come about.
- 113.** The Government members of Egypt and Indonesia supported the amendment.
- 114.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could agree to the amendment but was somewhat uneasy about the idea of putting responsibility for creating a conducive environment in all countries on the social partners. He therefore suggested a subamendment, namely to delete the words "and responsibility".
- 115.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the point just made and added that, while he shared the concern of developing countries that they risked being marginalized, he was not clear that a link between globalization and such marginalization was well established. He proposed a subamendment, namely to remove the words "by the globalization process" and "some of its most".
- 116.** In response to the suggestion by the Worker Vice-Chairperson to delete the reference to responsibility, the Government member of India said that playing a role and assuming responsibility went hand in hand, and he therefore wanted to retain the words in question. The Government members of Egypt and Pakistan supported his position.
- 117.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his subamendment and proposed another, so that the amendment would start with "Considering the important and shared role of government and the social partners ...". In response to a question from the Government member of India, he stated that he would not support the subamendment suggested by the Employer members.

-
118. The Government member of India then proposed a new subamendment, namely to read “Considering the importance of creating a conducive environment ...”.
 119. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said he preferred his own subamendment.
 120. The Government member of France said that he supported the Worker Vice-Chairperson since deleting the mention of social partners from the sentence would render the paragraph meaningless.
 121. The Government member of Italy agreed.
 122. The Government member of India said that while he had proposed his new subamendment to help the discussion forward, he preferred his original amendment (D.45).
 123. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested that, in the circumstances and in the interest of brevity, it might be better not to insert the new paragraph.
 124. The Employer Vice Chairperson agreed.
 125. The Government member of India withdrew the amendment.
 126. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (D.18) to delete paragraph 11. He said that paragraphs 11 to 15 were competing texts that incorporated similar ideas relating to the issue of dealing with civil society, NGOs, and other active forces. Paragraphs 13 and 14 contained what was essential and were the most clear and concise. He also questioned the reference to “need” and said it was unclear who were included in other active forces.
 127. The Government members of Ecuador, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic supported the amendment.
 128. The Worker Vice-Chairperson was not convinced that the paragraph should be deleted, even if he was not happy with its language. The principles included in paragraphs 11 to 14 were valuable. The message could be more clearly spelt out by way of subamendments.
 129. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that these principles were duly reflected in paragraphs 13 and 14.
 130. The Government member of the United States supported deletion of paragraph 11 and suggested that subsequent paragraphs could be amended as necessary.
 131. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, in the light of the discussion, agreed to the amendment if the sentiments expressed in paragraph 11 could be incorporated later.
 132. Paragraph 11 was deleted and amendments D.41 and D.44 were therefore not considered.
 133. In presenting an amendment (D.19) to delete paragraph 12, the Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the issues raised therein were better addressed in paragraphs 13 and 14. In addition, the term “social partners” was understood differently in various regions of the world. In much of Africa, for example, the term referred to government, employers and workers. It was better to avoid confusion.
 134. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed the need to differentiate social dialogue, which was carried on exclusively between the social partners, from civil dialogue, which included

other actors in civil society. He proposed a subamendment to add the following words before the existing text: “Recognizing the need of the ILO and its constituents to collaborate with civil society and” and to replace “NGOs” with “civil society actors”.

- 135.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the discussion concerned an amendment to delete the paragraph, not change its wording. Moreover, it was not possible to impose definitions of concepts like social dialogue on others.
- 136.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that his group had opposed the deletion of paragraph 11 because, with its removal, the notion of collaboration between the social partners and civil society organizations had been lost. The deletion of paragraph 12 would remove any reference to the willingness of the social partners to work with other organizations which shared the same values and objectives. He therefore rejected the amendment.
- 137.** The Government member of Norway supported the Worker members’ view.
- 138.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that interrelated ideas were expressed in paragraphs 11 to 14. Dealing with each paragraph individually, particularly deleting whole paragraphs, could result in the loss of important ideas which were not expressed elsewhere. He signalled his desire to see reincorporated into later paragraphs ideas which might otherwise be lost. The most effective way to discuss the remainder of the preamble was as a package, possibly in a tripartite working group.
- 139.** A lengthy procedural debate ensued concerning the desirability of continuing the discussion on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis within the plenary, the possibility of the Committee’s dealing with all the remaining preambular text as an integrated package based on a reformulated text which might emerge following informal tripartite consultations, and the rules concerning the discussion of paragraphs for which no written amendments had been submitted.
- 140.** Returning to the substantive debate, the Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the wording of paragraph 12 was ambiguous. Not all NGOs shared the values and objectives of the ILO.
- 141.** The spokesperson for the Workers’ group agreed that the text was ambiguous, but his group preferred to retain and improve it, rather than delete it.
- 142.** The Government members of South Africa and Zambia supported the retention of the paragraph.
- 143.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reaffirmed that the principal ideas within paragraph 12 were better expressed in paragraph 14, which his group supported.
- 144.** The Government member of Ecuador supported deletion of the text.
- 145.** When it became evident that a clear majority of Governments preferred to retain paragraph 12 for further discussion, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his amendment.
- 146.** The Government member of India presented an amendment (D.48), seconded by the Government member of Egypt, which introduced in paragraph 12 the notion that NGOs should pursue the values and objectives of the ILO in a constructive and responsible manner.

-
147. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that this amendment improved the text and supported it.
 148. The spokesperson for the Workers' group opposed the amendment because it did not add clarity.
 149. The Government members of Canada and South Africa sought clarification as to the meaning of the term "in a responsible manner" and asked who was meant to judge whether or not organizations were acting constructively and responsibly.
 150. The Government member of India explained that in some areas of civil society there were already well-developed mechanisms for accreditation relating to the relevance of an organization's activities. The notion of accountability was an important one, but it raised questions as to how that might be determined. As this was a resolution of a general nature, he had preferred the phrase "in a responsible manner", the meaning of which was self-evident.
 151. The spokesperson for the Workers' group suggested adding at the end of the text: "and in full agreement with the social partners".
 152. The Government member of India agreed.
 153. The Government member of the United Kingdom opposed that change, noting that the point was fully covered in operational paragraph 2(l). She suggested instead to add at the end of the original amendment the following text: "and recognizing the need for the Organization and its constituents to collaborate with civil society".
 154. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment, but suggested that the word "need" be replaced by the word "potential". The Government member of the United Kingdom agreed.
 155. The Government member of India questioned whether a subamendment could be unrelated to the original amendment. The Chairperson confirmed that this was possible if it added text to the existing amendment.
 156. The spokesperson for the Workers' group proposed a further subamendment to add the following words to the end of the paragraph "and pursue them in a constructive and responsible manner; and recognizing the potential for the Organization and its constituents to collaborate with civil society following appropriate consultations with the social partners".
 157. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the text.
 158. The Government member of India proposed replacing "the social partners" with "the tripartite constituents".
 159. The Workers' group and the Government members of Egypt and the United Kingdom accepted the change proposed by the Government member of India.
 160. The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the principle of the change, but urged the Committee to review the wording.
 161. The Government member of South Africa could agree if the words "and responsible" were deleted. History showed how such an idea could be misused to exert control.

-
- 162.** This view was supported by Government members of Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, New Zealand and Switzerland as well as by the Employers' and Workers' groups.
- 163.** The Government member of India urged the Committee to clarify the language and make it tighter.
- 164.** The Employers' group suggested the phrasing: "recognizing the potential for the Office to collaborate with civil society following appropriate consultations with tripartite constituents".
- 165.** The Government member of France had seen no mention of the ILO or of the Office in the original text. The word "Organization" had a broader meaning than "Office".
- 166.** The Government members of Canada, Ecuador and the United Kingdom considered the proposed rephrasing to be an improvement.
- 167.** Paragraph 12 was adopted as amended.
- 168.** Paragraph 13 was not adopted.
- 169.** Paragraph 14 was not adopted.
- 170.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, following consultations, his group had decided to withdraw amendment D.20 to delete paragraph 15. He suggested that this would provide the opportunity for further discussion of its merits.
- 171.** The Government member of France submitted an amendment (D.6), seconded by the Government member of the United States, in order to highlight the need to protect and promote the rights of vulnerable groups who might be outside the tripartite context. He noted the important role that NGOs and other parties played in this respect.
- 172.** The spokesperson for the Workers' group proposed an alternative text, which he believed fully reflected the concerns expressed in the amendment of the Government member of France, but which also incorporated ideas which had not been adequately taken into account earlier. It read as follows: "Recognizing that the International Labour Office, following appropriate consultations with its constituents, has dialogue and works with civil society institutions and organizations that share similar objectives and values; noting their valuable contribution in assisting the International Labour Office in carrying out its work – particularly in the field of child labour; and recognizing that forms of dialogue other than social dialogue are most useful when all parties respect the respective roles and responsibilities of others, particularly concerning questions of representation;"
- 173.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal, which provided an even-handed approach to tripartism and appropriately addressed the issue of representation.
- 174.** A number of Government members supported the amendment of the Government member of France. While not disputing the content of the newly introduced text, several requested that its status be clarified.
- 175.** The Government member of France confirmed that the concerns addressed through his amendment had been taken into account, and associated himself with the alternative text.

-
176. The Government member of Egypt saw merit in the proposed text, but wished to retain the reference to vulnerable groups which had appeared in the original French amendment and to add an explicit reference to migrant workers and workers with disabilities.
177. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Cameroon and India expressed support for the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Egypt.
178. The Government member of the Netherlands, seconded by the Government member of Sweden, could lend her support to the text, if the last five words were removed, namely, “particularly concerning questions of representation;” and the word “the” was changed to “their”.
179. Neither the Employers’ group nor the Workers’ group supported this proposal.
180. The Government member of the United States emphasized the importance of dealing with NGOs which were truly representative, respected transparency and the rule of law, and were working towards democratic ideals. He therefore did not support the subamendment by the Government member of the Netherlands.
181. The Government member of South Africa noted that the new text repeated, at least in part, the wording already adopted in paragraph 12 and should therefore be revised.
182. The Government member of Canada agreed and proposed that the first three lines of the text be eliminated so that the proposal would begin with the word “Noting ...”.
183. This subamendment received the support of both the Employers’ and the Workers’ groups.
184. In light of the discussion, the Government member of the Netherlands withdrew her subamendment.
185. The proposed text was thus adopted as amended.
186. Paragraph 15 was adopted as amended.

Operative paragraphs

187. An amendment (D.21), submitted by the Employer members, sought to delete operative paragraph 1 for three reasons; namely the text invited only governments to take action, it proposed establishing structures at the national level, while there were countries, such as federal states, that considered such structures unnecessary at the national level, and it was unclear who was making undertakings to whom.
188. The Worker Vice-Chairperson had an opposite view. However, since his concerns were met by an amendment (D.49) submitted by the Government member of the Netherlands, he would accept the deletion of paragraph 1 if amendment D.49 were to be adopted.
189. At the suggestion of the Chairperson, the Committee agreed to consider amendment D.49 to add a new paragraph after paragraph 1.
190. The Government member of the Netherlands, whose amendment (D.49) was seconded by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, said that the text should provide for the active involvement of all three partners. The present text only mentioned roles for governments and the ILO.

-
191. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Egypt and South Africa supported the amendment.
 192. The Government member of New Zealand also supported the amendment and withdrew her amendment (D.8).
 193. The Government member of Cameroon also supported the amendment but felt that the text should elaborate what governments were invited to do.
 194. The Government member of Ecuador agreed and suggested that this might be done by adopting amendment D.28 submitted by the Government members of Denmark and Norway and incorporating it in amendment D.49.
 195. The Government member of Denmark welcomed the proposal. She then withdrew amendment D.27 since it was covered by amendment D.49 submitted by the Government member of the Netherlands.
 196. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment suggested by the Government member of Ecuador.
 197. The Government member of Pakistan asked where the subamendment (D.28) would be incorporated in amendment D.49.
 198. Following an exchange of views among members as to whether it should precede D.49 or be integrated into it, the Committee agreed to place it at the beginning.
 199. Amendment D.49 was adopted as subamended by the addition of D.28 and a new paragraph was inserted after paragraph 1.
 200. The Government member of the United Kingdom withdrew amendment D.9.
 201. The Committee returned to amendment D.21 to delete paragraph 1 and adopted it.
 202. An amendment (D.10) to paragraph 2, proposed by the Government member of the United Kingdom, sought to clarify that the Office should use resources already at its disposal. The Worker Vice-Chairperson who seconded the amendment suggested a subamendment, namely to add “ILO” between “existing” and “resources”.
 203. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, together with the Government members of Ecuador, Israel and the Netherlands expressed support and the amendment as subamended was adopted.
 204. Paragraph 2 was adopted as amended.
 205. The Government member of China sought a clarification of the meaning of paragraph 2(a). The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that the paragraph sought to ensure that it was the ILO’s tripartite constituents themselves who legitimately represented the aspirations of its constituents. While the drafting was not particularly elegant, the meaning was clear.
 206. The Government member of Ecuador said that the translated Spanish text, which read “which comprises” instead of “to” was perfectly clear.
 207. Paragraphs 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c) were adopted.

-
- 208.** An amendment (D.22) to replace the text of paragraph 2(d) was introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. He said that some of the Conventions mentioned were dated and had few ratifications and [Conventions Nos. 87 and 98](#) were included in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. He proposed to subamend the amendment by maintaining the original text of paragraph 2(d) as far as the words “social dialogue”, then inserting “as set out in the Preamble and ” before coming to the text of D.22.
- 209.** The Government member of Pakistan suggested that the text should specify what Preamble was being referred to.
- 210.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Ecuador agreed to the subamendment and the amendment.
- 211.** The amendment as subamended was adopted and paragraph 2(d) was adopted as amended.
- 212.** An amendment (D.29) to add a new paragraph after paragraph 2(d) was introduced by the Government member of Norway because in a number of countries the social partners were not involved in consultation processes.
- 213.** The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the Government member of Ecuador supported the amendment.
- 214.** Amendment D.29 to introduce a new paragraph was adopted.
- 215.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (D.23) to replace paragraphs 2(e) and 2(f) in an attempt to have a single, more meaningful paragraph. He proposed a subamendment to replace “social partners” with “labour administrations and workers’ and employers’ associations”.
- 216.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said he would support this provided it was subamended to replace “associations” with “organizations”.
- 217.** This was welcomed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson and endorsed by the Government members of Ecuador and the Netherlands.
- 218.** The amendment D.23 was then adopted as subamended.
- 219.** An amendment (D.30), proposed by the Government members of Denmark and Norway, sought to replace paragraph 2(g) by another. The Government member of Norway said that he preferred to refer to the Social Dialogue Sector in the Office rather than the Bureaux for Employers’ and Workers’ Activities.
- 220.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson thought the amendment laudable but pointed out that the role of the Workers’ Activities Bureau extended beyond the Social Dialogue Sector and on this issue there was a common and clear understanding between the Workers’ and Employers’ groups. He suggested a subamendment so that, instead of replacing the original text, the amendment could be considered as an addition to it.
- 221.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson echoed these concerns in respect of the Bureaux for Workers’ and Employers’ Activities and supported the suggestion by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

-
- 222.** The Government member of Norway agreed but preferred that his amendment came before the current text of 2(g). The Government members of Argentina and Ecuador concurred.
- 223.** Amendment D.30 was thus adopted as subamended and paragraph 2(g) was adopted as amended.
- 224.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (D.25) to replace paragraphs 2(h), 2(i) and 2(j) with a single new paragraph. His group's intention was to make the text of the resolution easier to understand and more meaningful. Moreover, in the light of the discussion he proposed to subamend it to insert "and other mechanisms" after "technical cooperation programmes", "and governments" after "social partners", and "services and representation" after "their capacities".
- 225.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported it, as did the Government member of Denmark who withdrew her amendment D.31.
- 226.** The Government member of Israel suggested a further subamendment to read "and further develop". He withdrew his amendment D.38.
- 227.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Argentina, Ecuador, Malawi, the Netherlands and Norway, supported the subamended amendment which was adopted.
- 228.** Amendments D.11 to paragraph 2(i) and amendment D.39 to paragraph 2(j) were withdrawn by their sponsors, the Government members of Canada, Denmark and Ecuador and the Government member of Israel respectively.
- 229.** The Government member of Israel withdrew amendment D.37 and paragraph 2(k) was adopted.
- 230.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced amendment D.24 to replace paragraph 2(l). Since the Committee had already had a long debate about the role of the ILO's tripartite constituents vis-à-vis NGOs and civil society organizations, those arguments did not need repeating. Following consultations he proposed a subamendment namely to replace "fully involved" with "consulted as appropriate" which he felt reflected more accurately the relation between the Office and donor countries, for example, and gave the flexibility to developing rules over time.
- 231.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment as subamended.
- 232.** The Government member of India preferred to delete the words "as appropriate" from the subamendment. He said it was not possible to state what it was that "as appropriate" related to.
- 233.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and the subamendment which gave the right to ask for reasons for non-consultation. The Government member of Sweden agreed.
- 234.** Amendment D.24 was then adopted as subamended.
- 235.** The Government member of Egypt withdrew amendment D.42 as the adopted text met his concerns.

-
- 236.** Two amendments to delete paragraph 2(m) were submitted by the Employer members and the Government members of Egypt and Pakistan.
- 237.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that his group was totally opposed to this paragraph as it was unclear what was meant by promoting and mainstreaming, and by the development of processes of tripartism and social dialogue in the work of other international organizations, including the Bretton Woods institutions, and as it was not in keeping with decisions taken in Singapore, namely that the ILO was the appropriate place to deal with social and labour issues.
- 238.** The Government member of Pakistan fully agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairperson and added that each international organization had its own mandate and constitutional provisions. It would be unacceptable to the ILO, for example, if another international body adopted a resolution on how the ILO should conduct its work.
- 239.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that brevity of the text had rendered it unclear. It now tried to capture a number of important issues in only four lines. The text was not intended to point to the World Trade Organization and noted that other organizations, such as the OECD had employer and trade union input to their work. He wished that it were possible to amend the text to clarify this but recognized that such a proposal was outside the provisions of the Standing Orders. That being said, it would be regrettable if no clear signal were given, in particular to the Bretton Woods institutions, to take social issues and social dialogue more seriously in their policy-making.
- 240.** A range of views in support of deleting the paragraph were expressed by the Government members of Cuba, Egypt, India and the United States.
- 241.** Various views in support of maintaining the paragraph were expressed by the Government members of Argentina, Denmark, Finland, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the Syrian Arab Republic.
- 242.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed his gratitude for the support he had received from government members. He was also sympathetic to some of the views expressed by those who did not wish to maintain paragraph 2(m). He recognized, however, that there were drafting problems that could not now be addressed. In spite of his strong sentiments, he preferred to be pragmatic because he did not want to jeopardize the results of the Committee's hard work. He would, therefore, support the Employer amendment.
- 243.** The amendments D.26 and D.43 were adopted, paragraph 2(m) was deleted and, the resolution was adopted as amended.
- 244.** The Chairman, reflecting on the way in which the Committee's work had been accomplished, noted that it had departed from traditional practice. In addressing the paragraphs in the preamble of the draft resolution, the Committee had agreed, after considerable debate on the merits of such a procedure, to consider several paragraphs out of sequence. It had taken this course of action in order to develop and adopt a text that met as far as possible the wishes of its members. When these later paragraphs had been amended and adopted, several of the paragraphs appearing earlier in the text were then amended and agreed or, in two cases, not adopted as no amendments had been submitted.

Resolution concerning sustainable development

- 245.** For lack of time it was not possible for the Committee to discuss this draft resolution.

Consideration and adoption of the report

Consideration of the report

246. The Committee considered its draft report at its ninth sitting.

247. Corrections to specific paragraphs were submitted by various members for incorporation in the report.

Adoption of the report

248. At its ninth sitting, the Committee unanimously adopted its report as amended.

Geneva, 15 June 2002.

(Signed) John Chetwin,
Chairperson and Reporter.

Resolution submitted to the Conference

Resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Recalling the Constitution of the International Labour Organization,

Recalling [Conventions Nos. 87, 98, 144, 150, 151 and 154](#), and the Recommendations accompanying them as well as [Recommendation No. 113](#),

Underlining the founding of the International Labour Organization in 1919 as a unique tripartite structure with the objective of “universal and lasting peace”,

Reaffirming the importance of the tripartite nature of the International Labour Organization, which is the only international organization where governments and representatives of workers’ and employers’ organizations can freely and openly exchange their ideas and experiences and promote lasting mechanisms of dialogue and consensus building,

Stressing that among the strategic objectives of the International Labour Organization is the strengthening of tripartism and social dialogue,

Aware that social dialogue and tripartism have proved to be valuable and democratic means to address social concerns, build consensus, help elaborate international labour standards and examine a wide range of labour issues on which the social partners play a direct, legitimate and irreplaceable role,

Reaffirming that legitimate, independent and democratic organizations of workers and employers, engaging in dialogue and collective bargaining, bring a tradition of social peace based on free negotiations and accommodation of conflicting interests, therefore making social dialogue a central element of democratic societies,

Recalling the numerous challenges and opportunities facing the world of work in the framework of ongoing globalization and the importance of strengthening the collaboration between the social partners and governments in order to achieve appropriate solutions at national, regional and international levels and, most pertinently, in the International Labour Organization,

Recalling the essential role of the social partners in stable economic and social development, democratization and participative development and in examining and reinforcing the role of international cooperation for poverty eradication, promotion of full employment and decent work, which ensure social cohesion of countries,

Stressing that social dialogue and tripartism are modern and dynamic processes that have unique capacity and great potential to contribute to progress in many difficult and challenging situations and issues, including those related to globalization, regional integration and transition,

Emphasizing that the social partners are open to dialogue and that they work in the field with NGOs that share the same values and objectives and pursue them in a constructive manner; recognizing the potential for the International Labour Office to

collaborate with civil society following appropriate consultations with the tripartite constituents,

Noting the valuable contributions of civil society institutions and organizations in assisting the Office in carrying out its work – particularly in the fields of child labour, migrant workers and workers with disabilities; and recognizing that forms of dialogue other than social dialogue are most useful when all parties respect the respective roles and responsibilities of others, particularly concerning questions of representation;

1. Invites the governments to ensure that the necessary preconditions exist for social dialogue, including respect for the fundamental principles and the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining, a sound industrial relations environment, and respect for the role of the social partners, and invites governments as well as workers' and employers' organizations to promote and enhance tripartism and social dialogue, especially in sectors where tripartism and social dialogue are absent or hardly exist:

- (a) invites workers' organizations to continue to empower workers in sectors where representation is low in order to enable them to exercise their rights and defend their interests;
- (b) invites employers' organizations to reach out to sectors where representation levels are low in order to support the development of a business environment in which tripartism and social dialogue can flourish.

2. Invites the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to instruct the Director-General to ensure that the International Labour Organization and its Office within existing resources of the Organization:

- (a) consolidate the tripartite nature of the Organization – governments, workers and employers – legitimately representing the aspirations of its constituents in the world of work;
- (b) continue to this end their efforts to strengthen employers' and workers' organizations to enable them better to collaborate in the work of the Office and be more effective in their countries;
- (c) enhance the role of tripartism and social dialogue in the Organization, both as one of its four strategic objectives and as a tool to make operational all strategic objectives, as well as the cross-cutting issues of gender and development;
- (d) promote the ratification and application of ILO standards specifically addressing social dialogue, as set out in the preamble above and continue to promote the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work;
- (e) promote the involvement of the social partners in a meaningful consultative process in labour reforms, including dealing with the core Conventions and other work-related legislation;
- (f) carry out in-depth studies of social dialogue in collaboration with the Organization's constituents with a view to enhancing the capacity of labour administrations and workers' and employers' organizations to participate in social dialogue;
- (g) reinforce the role and all the functions of the Social Dialogue Sector within the Office and in particular its capacity to promote social dialogue in all the strategic objectives of the Organization, and recognize the unique functions and roles of the Bureaux for

Employers' and Workers' Activities within the Office and strengthen their abilities to provide services to employers' and workers' organizations worldwide in order to enable them to maximize the outcome of the Office's work;

- (h) promote and reinforce the tripartite activities of the Organization to determine its policies and work priorities, and further develop technical cooperation programmes and other mechanisms with the social partners and governments to help strengthen their capacities, services and representation;
- (i) reiterate in headquarters and in the field the importance of strengthening the tripartite structure of the International Labour Organization and to ensure that the Office works with and for the constituents of the Organization;
- (j) ensure that the tripartite constituents will be consulted as appropriate in the selection of and relationships with other civil society organizations with which the International Labour Organization might work.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Report of the Resolutions Committee</i>	1
Resolution submitted to the Conference	24