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Report of the Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards
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Introduction

1. In accordance with the decision adopted by the Governing Body at its 270th Session (November 1997), the Working Party met on 17 March 1998 under the chairmanship of Mr. J.-L. Cartier (Government, France). The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson were Mr. D. Funes de Rioja (Argentina) and Mr. J.-C. Parrot (Canada).

2. The Chairperson said that the examination of the needs for revision of Recommendations (third item on the agenda) had been deferred to the Working Party's next meeting.

3. A representative of the Director-General explained that the examination of the needs for revision of Recommendations was a new field for the Working Party. During the process of drafting the preparatory document by the Office, a number of conceptual questions had arisen, necessitating a more in-depth study. It had not been possible to carry out that study within the time available. Consequently, it had been found more appropriate to defer submission of that document to the Working Party, in order to allow the Office time to examine all the relevant questions.

* * *

A. Information note (1)

4. The Chairperson emphasized that the information note was a very useful document that gave a good overview of the Governing Body's decisions.

5. The Worker members expressed the wish for paragraph 4 of the information note to place greater emphasis on the impact of the World Summit on Social Development that took place in Copenhagen in March 1995. They also emphasized that paragraph 9(b) should not be included in the chapter devoted to proposals for revision, since the Conventions in question were those for which the Governing Body had invited member States who had not yet ratified to consider doing so. They also recalled, with regard to paragraph 18, that the Governing Body had requested the Director-General to carry out a survey on the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142).

6. The Employer members considered that the information note was very useful and gave a good reflection of the progress being made in the work of the Working Party. However, they added that the early stages of that work had been more promising than the relatively modest results actually obtained. They emphasized that the Working Party needed to achieve a more sustained pace of work, based on the existing consensus and of a kind that would respond to constituents' expectations. Care needed to be taken to ensure that standards were appropriate to prevailing economic and technological circumstances, while still respecting the principle of universality. With regard to paragraph 4 of the information note, which referred to the World Summit on Social Development, the importance of the core Conventions
was recognized by everyone and there was no need to give greater emphasis to this question. As regards the Conventions listed in paragraph 9(b), the Governing Body had invited member States to consider ratification, without going so far as to promote ratification, given the possibility that they might be subject to revision. In the case of these Conventions, certain problems had come to light with regard to which member States had been requested to provide information to the Office.

7. Mr. Blondel (Worker member), with regard to paragraph 4, stressed that greater emphasis should be given to the role of the ILO as acknowledged by the Copenhagen Summit.

8. The Chairperson considered that paragraph 4 acknowledged the importance of the Copenhagen Summit and that it would be possible to strengthen the reference to the ILO’s role in the next version of the information note.

9. The Worker members had proposed the creation of a separate section for paragraph 9(b), which would not include any reference to the promotion of ratification or the revision of the Conventions in question.


***

B. Deferred examination of six Conventions (2)

I. Employment injury benefits

11. The Employer members referred to the proposal for a general discussion on core standards in the area of social security which had been included in the Conference agenda document for the year 2000. They considered that many social security instruments and institutions were now out of date, including in the field of industrial accidents. Furthermore, they did not consider that the Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121) [Schedule I amended in 1980] was sufficiently flexible. For example, it was necessary not only to provide compensation for victims of industrial accidents or occupational illness, but also to reintegrate them. That concern was not reflected in Convention No. 121. Standards relating to social security needed to have a universal scope, without prejudice to the maintenance in force of Convention No. 12 if that were necessary to guarantee equality of treatment between agricultural and industrial workers. The fact that member States with modern social security legislation had recently ratified Convention No. 42 gave cause for reflection. Unlike Convention No. 121, Convention No. 42 contained simple principles capable of application in different social security systems. It was therefore desirable to keep the previous Conventions in force and to avoid separating the present examination from the general discussion proposed on social security.

I.1 C.12 -- Workmen's Compensation (Agriculture)
Convention, 1921

12. The Worker members expressed their agreement with the Office's proposals.

13. The Employer members approved the Office's proposal, while also recalling their previous general observations, and taking into account the observations on equality of treatment in the Office document.

14. The Chairperson pointed out that, if social security issues were discussed subsequently during the Conference, the Conference would also be able to examine the possibility of including legislation the principles contained in Convention No. 12 in a general instrument.

15. The Working Party proposes:

(a) to recommend to the Governing Body the maintenance of the status quo with respect to the Workmen's Compensation (Agriculture) Convention, 1921 (No. 12);

(b) that the Working Party (or the LILS Committee) re-examine the status of Convention No. 12 in due course.

I.2 C.17 -- Workmen's Compensation (Accidents) Convention, 1925

16. The Employer members proposed an amendment to the Office's proposals, with the purpose of inviting member States to inform the Office of any difficulties and obstacles that might prevent or delay ratification of Convention No. 121. Such a consultation would provide additional information for a future discussion on social security issues. In addition, they stressed the need to retain the reference to the possibility of shelving Convention No. 17 at some later date.

17. The Worker members opposed the inclusion of a reference to the possibility of shelving Convention No. 17. Sixty-eight ratifications had been registered for this Convention. Furthermore, ratification of Convention No. 121 did not imply the automatic denunciation of Convention No. 17. The important point was to place the emphasis on ratification of Convention No. 121 and, where appropriate, on denunciation of Convention No. 17. Any reference at this stage to the possibility of shelving Convention No. 17 might create the impression that it no longer had any value. That was not the case: it remained valid for member States that had not yet ratified Convention No. 121.

18. Following an exchange of views and an amendment to the Office's original proposal, the Working Party proposes:

(a) to recommend to the Governing Body that it invite States parties to the Workmen's Compensation (Accidents) Convention, 1925 (No. 17) and to the Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121) [Schedule I amended in 1980] to denounce Convention No. 17;
(b) to recommend to the Governing Body that it invite States parties to Convention No. 17 to contemplate ratifying Convention No. 121 and denouncing Convention No. 17 at the same time;

(c) that the Working Party (or the LILS Committee) re-examine the status of Convention No. 17 in due course in the light of new ratifications of Convention No. 121 which should result in a substantial reduction in the number of ratifications of Convention No. 17.

I.3 C.18 -- Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention, 1925

19. The Working Party expressed its agreement with the Office's proposals and proposed one amendment identical, mutatis mutandis, to the one adopted during examination of Convention No. 17.

20. The Working Party proposes:

(a) to recommend to the Governing Body that it invite States parties to the Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention, 1925 (No. 18) and to the Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121) [Schedule I amended in 1980] to denounce Convention No. 18;

(b) to recommend to the Governing Body that it invite States parties to Convention No. 18 to contemplate ratifying Convention No. 121 and denouncing Convention No. 18 at the same time; 

(c) that the Working Party (or the LILS Committee) re-examine the status of Convention No. 18 in due course in the light of new ratifications of Convention No. 121 which should result in a substantial reduction in the number of ratifications of Convention No. 18.

I.4 C.42 -- Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention (Revised), 1934

21. The Working Party expressed its agreement with the Office's proposals subject to one amendment identical, mutatis mutandis, to the one adopted during the examination of Convention No. 17.

22. The Working Party proposes:

(a) to recommend to the Governing Body that it invite States parties to the Workmen's Compensation (Occupational Diseases) Convention (Revised), 1934 (No. 42) to contemplate ratifying the Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121) [Schedule I amended in 1980], the ratification of which will, ipso jure, involve the immediate denunciation of Convention No. 42;

(b) that the Working Party (or the LILS Committee) re-examine the status of Convention No. 42 in
due course in the light of new ratifications of Convention No. 121 which should result in a substantial reduction in the number of ratifications of Convention No. 42.

I.5 C.121 -- Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1962
(Schedule I amended in 1980)

23. The Worker members pointed out that the member States had not fully understood the advantages of the flexibility clauses contained in Convention No. 121 and that, consequently, their attention should be drawn to the existence of those clauses. They expressed their agreement with the Office's proposal, subject to one amendment. They considered that it was too soon to refer to the possibility of full or partial revision of Convention No. 121. This would discourage member States contemplating ratification from doing so.

24. The Employer members pointed out that some provisions of Convention No. 121 posed a problem, a fact they had mentioned in the introduction concerning social security. It should also be noted that only 22 ratifications have been registered for this Convention. The Governing Body had already referred on several occasions to the possibility of revising the list of occupational diseases annexed to the Convention. They also stated that recourse to flexibility clauses was rather a matter of technical assistance. They supported the proposal made by the Office to invite member States to consider the ratification of Convention No. 121, provided that the reference to its possible need for revision within the framework of future discussions on the subject of social security was maintained.

25. The representative of the Government of Mexico referred to the information note which, in paragraph 9(b) mentions 13 other Conventions in respect of which recommendations had been made inviting member States to examine the possibility of ratifying these Conventions and, where applicable, informing the Office of obstacles and difficulties which might prevent or delay ratification or indicate a need for the total or partial revision of the Conventions.

26. The Worker members replied that the Working Party was engaged in a case by case examination of the situation of each Convention. As regards Convention No. 121, the reference to the possibility of revising it might give rise to difficulties. There should be no anticipation of the results of the request for information addressed to member States concerning obstacles to ratification of this Convention. Following an amendment proposed by the Chairperson, the Worker members expressed their agreement with the insertion of a reference to the possible revision of the list of occupational diseases.

27. The Employer members insisted on the fact that merely revising the list of occupational diseases was insufficient. Discussions on social security which might be held in the future within the framework of the Conference would highlight the needs for revision of Convention No. 121.

28. The representative of the Government of the United States reminded the Working Party that the Office had prepared a document on methods of recourse to the flexibility clauses contained in international labour standards. It would be very useful if the requests for information were
29. After an exchange of views and following an amendment to the proposal made by the Office, the Working Party proposes:

(a) to recommend to the Governing Body to invite the member States to contemplate ratifying the Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121) [Schedule I amended in 1980] (with due account being taken of the flexibility clauses which it contains) and to inform the Office of the obstacles and difficulties encountered, if any, which might prevent or delay the ratification of this Convention;

(b) that the Working Party (or the LILS Committee) could re-examine the status of Convention No. 121 in due course, in the light of information received and the discussions which will have been held on the subject of social security.

II. Employment policy

II.1 C.96 -- Fee-Charging Employment Agencies Convention (Revised), 1949

30. The Worker members recalled that during the discussions which led to the adoption of the Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181) some member States expressed the wish to maintain a public monopoly over employment agencies. For these member States, the Fee-Charging Employment Agencies Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 96), still retains its usefulness. For this reason, the Worker members were in favour of maintaining the status quo as regards Convention No. 96.

31. In reply to a request from the Employer members, a representative of the Director-General confirmed that Convention No. 181 revised Convention No. 96. The latter will be closed to further ratifications when Convention No. 181 comes into force.

32. After an exchange of views, the Working Party decided to adjourn the examination of Convention No. 96 until its next meeting.

* * *

C. Follow-up on consultations concerning the need for revision and obstacles to the ratification of 13 Conventions

I. Consultations on the need for a total or partial revision of certain Conventions and on the form that such a revision might take
I.1 C.127 -- Maximum Weight Convention, 1967

33. The Working Party expressed its agreement with the proposals made by the Office.

34. The Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body the revision of the Maximum Weight Convention, 1967 (No. 127) and the inclusion of this item in the portfolio of proposals for the agenda of the Conference.

I.2 C.136 -- Benzene Convention, 1971

35. The Worker members expressed their agreement with the Office proposals although they emphasized the need to maintain the possibility of adopting specific Conventions concerning a particular substance if the need arose.

36. The Employer members endorsed the proposals made by the Office and the considerations expressed in paragraph 27 of the document prepared by the Office. If Convention No. 136 were revised, the new Convention should deal with hazards due to dangerous substances in general, including benzene.

37. The Chairperson noted that in the light of Community directives on the subject, the Member States of the European Community would probably be required to adopt a joint position in the event of a revision of this Convention, which would not be an easy task.

38. The Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body the revision of the Benzene Convention, 1971 (No. 136), and the inclusion of this revision in an item concerning the use of hazardous substances in the portfolio of proposals of the agenda of the Conference.

I.3 C.27 -- Marking of Weight (Packages Transported by Vessels) Convention, 1929

39. The Working Party expressed its agreement with the proposals made by the Office.

40. The Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body the revision of the Marking of Weight (Packages Transported by Vessels) Convention, 1929 (No. 27), and the inclusion of this item in the portfolio of proposals for the agenda of the Conference.

II. Consultations of intentions to ratify certain Conventions, and to inform the Office of the obstacles and difficulties encountered, if any, that might prevent or delay ratification of these Conventions or that might point to the need for their full or partial revision
41. The Worker members noted that the title of section II did not reflect the decisions of the Governing Body, which included an invitation to member States to contemplate the ratification of the Conventions concerned. The title referred only to consultations "on intentions to ratify". The idea of any promotion of the ratification of these Conventions had thus disappeared.

42. Mr. Edström (Worker member) believed that the requests for information on the ratification intentions or the obstacles encountered to the ratification of Conventions should only be addressed to States which had not yet ratified the Conventions concerned. He added that as far as possible, it would be desirable for future consultations to be carried out in this way.

43. The Employer members believed that the title of section II was appropriate. The role of the Working Party was not to encourage the ratification of Conventions, as there were specific bodies for that. As its name indicated, it was a "Working Party on policy regarding the revision of standards". In any event, the Working Party had pointed out that some Conventions had only gained very few ratifications and that it was necessary to know the difficulties encountered.

44. The Worker members recalled that they had insisted from the beginning on the simultaneity of actions to be taken, including the examination of the revision needs of standards on a case by case basis, promotion of the ratification of certain Conventions and the adoption of new standards. From the beginning, the Worker members had emphasized the promotion of the ratification of Conventions.

II.1 C.156 -- Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981

45. The Employer members stated that although 16 member States were about to ratify Convention No. 156 or were contemplating doing so, 25 others had reported obstacles to its ratification. Care should be taken to ensure that standards could be applied at the world level. Therefore the Employer members opposed the promotion of the ratification of Convention No. 156, preferring instead the continued examination of the obstacles to its ratification.

46. The Worker members endorsed the Office's proposal. Only four member States were in favour of a revision, and six had expressly stated their opposition. States which had already embarked on the path of ratifying this Convention should not be discouraged.

47. The Chairperson noted that this was a recent Convention and that it should be given an opportunity to receive more ratifications, without prejudice to a subsequent re-examination of its status. Although 16 member States had already stated that they were about to ratify it or envisaged doing so, the promotion of its ratification should be envisaged.

48. The representative of the Government of the Russian Federation said that his Government had recently presented to the Director-General the ratification instrument of Convention No. 156.

49. After an exchange of views, the Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body to
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invite member States to contemplate ratifying the Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981 (No. 156).

II.2 C.158 -- Termination of Employment Convention, 1982

50. The Employer members expressed their agreement with the proposals made by the Office, taking account of the difficulties described in the Office documents.

51. The Worker members called for the promotion of the ratification of this Convention, since its ratification outlook was reasonable and very few member States had expressed support for its revision.

52. Mr. Blondel (Worker member) added that in the present circumstances, it was important to promote the ratification of Convention No. 158. Furthermore, the General Survey on this question was carried out in 1995 and if a request were made for another study, this would pose a problem.

53. The Worker members agreed to support the Office proposal, but expressed the wish that the proposed study should be constructive.

54. The Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body to request the Office to undertake a short survey concerning the Termination of Employment Convention, 1982 (No. 158), to be submitted to the Working Party for consideration at its meeting in March 1999.

II.3 C.94 -- Labour Clauses (Public Contracts) Convention, 1949

55. The Worker members called for the promotion of the ratification of Convention No. 94.

56. The Employer members opposed this suggestion, noting that the document referred to obstacles to ratification, in particular in paragraph 65. It would not be appropriate either to promote the ratification of this Convention or to propose its revision but rather to maintain the status quo in this respect, as proposed by the Office. There was also the possibility of a subsequent re-examination of the Convention.

57. In reply to a question from the Chairperson, a representative of the Director-General stated that there was a systematic follow-up of replies provided by governments. In respect of each Convention and each country, updated information on the ratification outlook was provided during the Conference and technical assistance missions. The information collected during the present consultations was transmitted to the Multidisciplinary Technical Teams in order to ensure follow-up of the recommendations made by the Working Party.

58. After an exchange of views, the Working Party decided to adjourn the examination of Convention No. 94 to its next meeting.

II.4 C.95 -- Protection of Wages Convention, 1949
59. The Employer members wished to know the scope of the interpretation of Article 3(2) of Convention No. 95, to which reference is made in paragraph 77 of the document prepared by the Office. Moreover, they expressed reservations about the reference to the Protection of Workers' Claims (Employers' Insolvency) Convention, 1992 (No. 173), and asked for details as to the nature of the relationship between both these instruments.

60. The Worker members felt that the simultaneous reference to both instruments did not raise any problems. Furthermore, they considered that the proposals made by the Office were acceptable. The issue of the protection of migrant workers' wages should also be examined.

61. Referring to paragraph 73 of the document prepared by the Office, the representative of the Government of Sweden pointed out that Convention No. 95 was not relevant to Sweden but that it might, of course, be entirely relevant to other countries.

62. A representative of the Director-General pointed out that paragraph 77 of the Office document confirmed the relevance and importance of Convention No. 95. What is more, he mentioned that Article 3(2) of Convention No. 97 could be interpreted in a wide way. Finally, he recalled that Convention No. 173 revised Article 11 of Convention No. 95. The previous system had been inadequate in the event of the insolvency of some enterprises. Furthermore, the new instrument took account of the introduction at national level of systems of guarantees for workers' claims. All the provisions of Convention No. 95, with the exception of Article 11, remained relevant. Concerning the matter covered by Article 11 of Convention No. 95 and Convention No. 173, the ratification of the latter should be encouraged. From a practical standpoint, this Convention had been adopted after 1985 and, given the mandate of the Working Party, it could only be dealt with as part of the examination of Convention No. 95.

63. The Employer members felt that States should not be invited to ratify Convention No. 173 as its scope was much wider than that of Convention No. 95 and did not therefore come within the mandate of the Working Party.

64. After an exchange of views, the Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body that it invite member States to examine the possibility of ratifying the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949 (No. 95), and to draw their attention to the Protection of Workers' Claims (Employer's Insolvency) Convention, 1992 (No. 173), which revises Article 11 of Convention No. 95.

II.5 C.153 -- Hours of Work and Rest Periods (Road Transport)
Convention, 1979

65. The Chairperson pointed out that this Convention raised complex questions, even if the Office had pointed out that its ratification was not incompatible with the implementation of the AETR. It was Convention No. 153 which had prompted discussions between the European Commission and the ILO on the matter of the external competence of the European Community on matters of common interest.
The Commission felt that the subject covered by Convention No. 153 was exclusively within the competence of the EEC and that, consequently, it was no longer up to member States to ratify ILO Conventions in the Community's sphere of activity on an individual basis. According to the Commission, the decision for ratification was a matter for the EEC. This position had brought to a standstill the ratification of certain ILO Conventions by member States of the European Community, which was regrettable given the extremely positive attitude of these countries with respect to ratifications. Although the Court of Justice of the European Community had recently ruled in an "advisory opinion" that there was a "shared competence" between the Commission and the Member States, the situation had changed little and the time was ripe to re-examine this matter to try and seek a solution.

66. The Employer members stated that the Chairperson's explanation resumed well the complexity of the matter. They were in favour of alternative (a) proposed by the Office, in view of the specific characteristics of the issue, which differed from the concept of working time in general.

67. The Worker members also supported alternative (a).

68. Mr. Blondel (Worker member) pointed out that a similar problem might arise within other regional organizations. He felt that the Office should remind the member States that each State was responsible for its commitments to the ILO.

69. Mr. Oechslin (Employer member) thanked the Chairperson for his detailed analysis of the question. This problem was somewhat overlooked at present but it was bound to come up again. He agreed with the previous speaker that a difficulty of the same nature might arise in other regional contexts. The AETR predated Convention No. 153 and he regretted that the Government representatives of the Member States of the European Community had not taken account of these difficulties when the Convention was adopted. Irrespective of the matter of whether it was appropriate or not to ratify a specific Convention, this situation did indeed result in ratifications being brought to a standstill.

70. The Chairperson pointed out that the fact of being both a Member of the European Community and the ILO could result in difficulties in the area of standard setting. These could not be resolved by merely stating that the standards of a universal organization were more important than those of a regional organization. It should also be pointed out that a number of member States had been forced to denounce an ILO Convention in accordance with their Community commitments. This problem was going to arise more and more as the Community's standard-setting activity gathered pace and the number of its Member States increased.

71. Mr. Edström (Worker member) pointed out that his country, Sweden was also confronted, as a new Member of the European Community, with difficulties concerning the ratification of a number of ILO Conventions.

72. The Government representative of Mexico pointed out that indeed this problem was likely to arise in
other regions of the world.

73. The Working Party supported the proposal made by the Office in subparagraph (a).

74. The Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body the revision of the Hours of Work and Rest Periods (Road Transport) Convention, 1979 (No. 153), and the inclusion of this item in the portfolio of proposals for the agenda of the Conference.

II.6 C.132 -- Holidays with Pay Convention (Revised), 1970

75. The Working Party expressed its agreement with the proposals made by the Office.

76. The Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body to request the Office to undertake a short survey concerning the Holidays with Pay Convention (Revised), 1970 (No. 132), to be submitted to the Working Party for consideration at its meeting in March 1999.

II.7 C.140 -- Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974

77. The Employer members expressed their agreement with the suggestion to undertake a short survey concerning Convention No. 140 and were opposed to promoting its ratification in the immediate future because of the many obstacles encountered. The consultations had shown that only a very few member States were likely to ratify this Convention. Furthermore, the number of replies received had been inadequate to consider that the consultations stage had been completed. They insisted on the request for a special survey.

78. For their part, the Worker members were in favour promoting the ratification of Convention No. 140. They pointed out that it would not be possible to ask the member States the same questions again.

79. After an exchange of views, the Working Party proposed to recommend to the Governing Body:

(a) to invite the member States to contemplate ratifying the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140), and, in the case of the member States which had not yet provided any input to the present consultations, to inform the Office of the obstacles and difficulties encountered, if any, that might prevent or delay the ratification of the Convention or that might point to the need for its full or partial revision;

(b) to request the Office to undertake a short survey concerning Convention No. 140, to be submitted for consideration by the Working Party at its meeting in March 1999.

II.8 C.13 -- White Lead (Painting) Convention, 1921
80. The Worker members agreed with the Office's proposals, whilst reiterating the point of the view they had expressed during the examination of Convention No. 136.

81. The Employer members recalled the statement they had made when examining Convention No. 136 and accepted, with this reservation, the Office's proposals.

82. The Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body the revision of the White Lead Painting Convention, 1921 (No. 13), and the inclusion of this revision in an item concerning the use of hazardous substances in the portfolio of proposals for the agenda of the Conference.

II.9. C.119 -- Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963

83. The Worker members agreed with the suggestion to adopt a protocol to the Convention concerning the safety of machinery being transferred internationally.

84. The Working party expressed its agreement with the proposals made by the Office.

85. The Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body the revision of the Guarding of Machinery Convention, 1963 (No. 119), and the inclusion of this item in the portfolio of proposals for the agenda of the Conference.

II.10. C.152 -- Occupational Safety and Health (Dock Work)
Convention, 1979

86. The Worker members expressed their agreement with the proposals made by the Office.

87. The Employer members recalled that reference had been made to a certain number of obstacles to the ratification of Convention No. 152. For this reason, they suggested that not all the member States but only the States parties to earlier Conventions should be invited to ratify Convention No. 152.

88. The Chairperson pointed out that in paragraph 137 of the document prepared by the Office, the Convention was considered as being up to date. It should therefore be promoted in a general way and not only addressed to States bound by Convention No. 28 and/or Convention No. 32.

89. After an exchange of views, the Working Party proposes to recommend to the Governing Body to invite the member States, especially the States parties to the Protection against Accidents (Dockers) Convention, 1929 (No. 28), and to the Protection against Accidents (Dockers) Convention (Revised), 1932 (No. 32), to examine the possibility of ratifying the Occupational Safety and Health (Dock Work) Convention, 1979 (No. 152).
90. The Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards is invited to:

(a) take note of the report of the Working Party on Policy regarding Revision of Standards, drawn up on the basis of documents submitted by the Office;\(^{(7)}\)

(b) examine the proposals in the corresponding paragraphs of this report on which the Working Party has reached consensus.


Points for decision:

Paragraph 15;
Paragraph 18;
Paragraph 20;
Paragraph 22;
Paragraph 29;
Paragraph 34;
Paragraph 38;
Paragraph 40;
Paragraph 49;
Paragraph 54;
Paragraph 64;
Paragraph 74;
Paragraph 76;
Paragraph 79;
Paragraph 82;
Paragraph 85;
Paragraph 89;
Paragraph 90.

---

1. GB.271/LILS/WP/PRS/4/1.

2. GB.271/LILS/WP/PRS/1.

3. GB.271/4/1.

4. This Recommendation applies \textit{a fortiori} to States that are also party to Convention No. 42.
5. GB.244/SC/3/3.

6. GB.271/LILS/ WP/PRS/2.
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