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The 219th Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva from Tuesday, 2 March, to Friday, 5 March 1982.

The Governing Body was composed as follows:

**Chairman**: Mr. VENTEJOL (France)

**Government group**:
- Australia: Mr. WATCHOPN
- Bahrain: Mr. AL-MADANY
- Bangladesh: Mr. SULTAN
- Barbados: Mr. BOGERS
- Brazil: Mr. TAPGINO BOTTC
- Bulgaria: Mr. PETROV
- Canada: Mr. ARMSTFONG
- Colombia: Mr. CHERRB SAMPEE
- Ecuador: Mr. ALEMAN SALVADOF
- Egypt: Mr. EL REEDY
- France: Mr. DELARBBRE
- German Democratic Republic: Mr. MOACK
- Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. HAASE
- India: Mr. DESHUKH
- Italy: Mr. FALCHI
- Japan: Mr. SUZUKI
- Kenya: Mr. MUSIKO
- Mali: Mr. DIARBA
- Mexico: Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
- Netherlands: Mr. ALBEBA
- Nigeria: Mr. OLOWU
- Philippines: Mr. BRILLANTES
- Senegal: Mr. SENE
- Sri Lanka: Mr. KOSTINE
- United Kingdom: Mr. ROBINSON
- United States: Mr. SERRRY
- Venezuela: Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO

**Employers' group**:
- Mr. BANNERMAN-MENSON
- Mr. ESCOBAR PADRON
- Mr. FLUNDER
- Mr. GEORGET
- Mr. GROVE
- Mr. LINDNER
- Mr. MOUKOKO KINGUE
- Mr. NASR
- Mr. OCHSLIN
- Mr. POLITES
- Mr. TATA
- Mr. VERSCHUEPEN
- Mr. YLLANES RAMOS
- Mr. YOSHINO
Workers' group:

Mr. BROWN
Mrs. CARR
Mr. DOLAN
Mr. GONZALEZ NAVARRO
Mr. ISSIPU
Mr. LLOYD
Mr. MASHASI
Mr. MEHTA
Mr. MUHR
Mr. PROKHOROV
Mr. SOW
Mr. SVENNINGSEN
Mr. TANAKA
Mr. WALCOTT

The following regular members were absent:

Government group:

China
Mozambique

Employers' group:

Mr. EOBNEKIAN
Mr. GHABBAOOI
Mr. VILLALOBOS

Workers' group:

Mr. SANCHEZ MADABIAGA

The following deputy members, or substitute deputy members, were present at all or some of the sittings:

Government group:

Algeria: Mr. BRIKI
Angola: Mr. M'POLO
Argentina: Mr. PEDREROL
Belgium: Mr. WALLIN
Burma: Mr. GYI
Cuba: Mr. SOLA VILA
Denmark: Mr. ANDERSEN
Ethiopia: Mr. MAASHO
Ghana: Mr. WILSON
Hungary: Mr. MARTON
Indonesia: Mr. SUTRESNA
Madagascar: Mr. ZAFERA
Mongolia: Mr. BATBAYAR
Panama: Mrs. AIZPURUA de CONSTANTINO
Portugal: Mr. NASCIMENTO RODRIGUES
Ukrainian SSR: Mr. OUDOVENKO
Uruguay: Mr. PALCHETTI MIGNONE

Employers' group:

Mr. APPADURAI
Mr. ARBESSE-ROSTBURG
Mr. CHAMBERS
Mr. DESCHAMPS
Miss HAK
Mr. von HOLTEN
Mr. BONTT BALMACEDA
Mr. NAMATA
Mr. ONUOR
Mr. PERIQUET
Mr. SAID
Mr. SANTOS NEVES FILHO
Mrs. SASSO MAZZUFFERTI
Mr. SUMBEWE

Workers' group:

Mr. ABONDO
Mr. AHMED
Mr. BARNABO
Mr. BEN-ISRAEL
Mr. BLONDEL
Mr. BRIKI
Mr. DAVID
Mr. MAIER
Mr. MENDOZA
Mr. SUDOWO
Mr. TIMMER
Mr. VANNI
Mr. ZIMBA

The following deputy members were absent:

Government group:

Zimbabwe

Employers' group:

Mr. AL-JASSEM
Mr. CASTELLANO SABATEE
Mr. MUNGA-wa-NYASA

Workers' group:

Mr. CUEVAS

The following representative of a State Member of the Organisation invited under Article 24 of the Constitution was present:

Nicaragua: Mr. SELVA GUTIERREZ

The following representative of a State Member of the Organisation invited under Article 26 of the Constitution was present:

Dominican Republic: Mr. HERNANDEZ SANCHEZ

The following representatives of States Members of the Organisation were present:

Austria: Mr. KOEFFLER
Bolivia: Mr. SAAVEDRA WEISE
Chile: Mr. BUSTOS
Czechoslovakia: Mrs. SLANOVA
Democratic Yemen: Mr. AL-QUTAISH
Finland: Ms. BAIVIO
Gabon: Mr. MANGONGO-NZAMBI
Greece: Mr. IVRAKIS
Ireland: Mr. HAYES
Israel: Mr. SOFFER
Malaysia: Mr. KIBUUNATHAN
Malta: Mr. BORG
Morocco: Mr. BOJJI
Norway: Mr. BRUAAAS
Peru: Mr. SALMON de la JARA
Poland: Mr. ZAWALONKA
Sweden: Mr. GARCIA TEJEDCH
Switzerland: Mr. CORNELL
Tunisia: Mr. BEL HADJ HASSINE

The following were also present:

Mr. BLANCHARD, Director-General
Mr. BOLIN, Deputy Director-General
Mr. JAIN, Deputy Director-General
Mr. WOLF, Assistant Director-General; Legal Adviser
Mr. YOSHIMURA, Assistant Director-General
Mr. GALER, Assistant Director-General
Dr. BURGAN, Assistant Director-General
Mr. KANE, Assistant Director-General
Mr. CHKOUNAEV, Assistant Director-General
Mrs. BEGOIN, Assistant Director-General
Mr. TEVOEDJEE, Director, International Institute for Labour Studies

Representatives of international governmental organisations:

United Nations:
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development:
United Nations Industrial Development Organisation:
United Nations Children's Fund:
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees:
United Nations Fund for Population Activities:
United Nations Development Programmes:
United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation:
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation:

World Health Organisation:

Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organisation:
International Atomic Energy Agency:

African Regional Centre for Labour Administration:
League of Arab States:
Organisation of African Unity:

Arab Labour Organisation:
Organisation of American States:

Mr. TAPZI
Mr. LI
Mr. PATHMARAJAH
Mr. SHIELDS
Mr. KOISSER
Mr. MUNTASSEK
Mr. BURGOIS
Mr. AKSEB
Ms. WYNTREB
Mr. ANDERSEN
Mr. MASSON
Mrs. CFELZ
Mr. GUESSO MOEKONG
Mr. AL-FALLOUJI
Mr. FARAG
Mr. AL-TAGHLABI
Mr. GODODY ANCAIA
Commission of the European Communities:

Intergovernmental Committee for Migration:

Representatives of international non-governmental organisations:

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions:

International Organisation of Employers:

International Social Security Association:

Organisation of African Trade Union Unity:

World Confederation of Labour:

World Federation of Trade Unions:

Substitutes and advisors:

Mr. ABFEUPEPER, accompanying Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO
Mr. ADLER, accompanying Mr. ANDERSEN
Mr. AGUILAR, accompanying Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO
Mr. AJAI, substitute for Mr. CLINN
Mr. AKOPOV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. ALBALATE LAFITA, accompanying Mr. GARCIA TEJEDOR
Mr. AL-HAPMY, substitute for Mr. AL-MADANI
Mr. ALMCEN, accompanying Mr. AL-FALCOOAE
Mr. ALSTON, accompanying Mr. TAZI
Mrs. de ALVAPEZ, accompanying Mr. CHARPY SAMPE
Mr. AMY, accompanying Mrs. CAPP
Mr. ANOUTCH-KINE-TIMOFEEV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. ARR, accompanying Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. ARGUEDAS DEL CAPIO, accompanying Mr. SAAVEEPA WEISE
Mr. BACCOUHE, accompanying Mr. AL-TAGHIAEI
Mr. BARBON, accompanying Mr. WANN
Mr. BASTIEN, substitute for Mr. ARMSTRONG
Mr. BATES, accompanying Mr. ROBINSON
Mr. BATTIUK, substitute for Mr. CUDCVENKO
Mr. BERR, substitute for Mr. MARTON
Mr. BETTELING, accompanying Mr. ALBEAD
Mr. de BOCK, accompanying Mr. WALLIN
Mr. BODEMAE, accompanying Mr. KOESER
Mr. BOH, accompanying Mr. HAASE
Mr. BOISSOV, accompanying Mr. PTPCOV
Mr. BRUEGEE, accompanying Mr. DELABBE
Mr. CAIPO SOLER, substitute for Mr. SCLA VILA
Mr. CAMILLEI, accompanying Mr. BOSS
Mr. CARTEE, accompanying Mr. DELABBE
Mr. CATO, substitute for Mr. WILSON
Mr. CHAWLA, substitute for Mr. DESHMUKH
Mr. CHEFEE, accompanying Mr. BIIKI
Mr. CHOWDHURY, substitute for Mr. SULTAN
Mr. CHRISTENSEN, substitute for Mr. ANDERSEN
Mr. CHRISTIAN, accompanying Mr. WILSCN
Mr. CISE, substitute for Mr. SENE
Mr. CIZEK, accompanying Mrs. SLAMOVA
Mr. CLOESEN, substitute for Mr. WALLIN
Mr. COW, substitute for Mr. SENE
Mr. CONDOMINES PEPEPA, accompanying Mr. GAPCIA TEJIDOF
Mr. CRONSTEDT, accompanying Mr. KOISSEF
Mr. CUEVAS ZIMOP, substitute for Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
Mr. BAKKEVITCH, accompanying Mr. OUDCVENKO
Mr. DAS, substitute for Mr. DESHMUKH
Mr. DAVYDOV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. DECALLON, accompanying Mr. DELABBE
Mr. DESAI, accompanying Mr. BOURGOTS
Mr. DAHVENAS, accompanying Mr. ARMSTRONG
Miss DEMOND, accompanying Mr. ROBINSON
Ms. DIPPMAKOYE, accompanying Mr. TARZI
Mr. van den DOOL, accompanying Mr. ALBEAD
Mr. ERIKSEN, accompanying Mr. ANDERSEN
Mr. FARES, accompanying Mr. AL-QUAISH
Mr. FASANYA, substitute for Mr. OLOMO
Mrs. FAUCHEFE, accompanying Mr. BLEUX
Miss FERREPO, accompanying Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO
Mr. FIONE, accompanying Mr. FALCHI
Mr. FRIANDSEN, accompanying Mr. ANDERSEN
Miss FUJISAWA, accompanying Mr. TAKANA
Mr. GARA, accompanying Mr. SELVA GUTIERREZ
Mr. GARCIA, substitute for Mr. ROBINSON
Mrs. GOELZEF, accompanying Mr. ANDERSEN
Mr. GUMDOBONO, accompanying Mr. PEDERSEN
Mrs. GUPFIA, substitute for Mr. MAASHC
Mr. HAGEN, accompanying Mr. ALBEAD
Mr. HANDLER, substitute for Mr. HANSE
Mr. HAQUE, substitute for Mr. SULTAN
Miss HART, accompanying Mr. ROBINSON
Mr. HARYONO, accompanying Mr. SUTRESNA
Mr. HASCHE, substitute for Mr. NOACK
Mr. HAYASHIDA, substitute for Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. HEALY, substitute for Mr. FLUNDER
Mr. HEECKE, accompanying Mr. NOACK
Mr. HEINZMANN, substitute for Mr. LINDNER
Mr. HELMIS, accompanying Mr. ARMSTRONG
Mrs. HERNANDEZ OLIVA, substitute for Mr. SOLA VILA
Mrs. HEFFAN, substitute for Mr. CHAFFY SAMEEF
Mr. HEYEF, accompanying Mr. MUHIS
Mr. HOYOS SOSA, accompanying Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO
Mr. HUSTADO de MENDOZA, accompanying Mr. GODAY ARCAYA
Mr. IDEP, accompanying Mr. BATBAYAP
Mr. INCISA di CAMIENNA, accompanying Mr. FALCHI
Mr. JIMENEZ DAVALA, substitute for Mr. PEDERSEN
Mr. KANTCHEV, accompanying Mr. PETROV
Mr. KAPAPIS, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. KATO, substitute for Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. ARAY, accompanying Mr. TARZI
Mr. KIBEEF, substitute for Mr. KOSTIN
Mr. KOLESNCK, substitute for Mr. KOSTIN
Mr. KONATE, substitute for Mr. SENE
Miss LAPYRPIFFE, accompanying Mr. SAAVEDRA WEISE
Mr. LAUOPJSSEN, accompanying Mr. VANDERKENDEN
Mr. LAVAL, accompanying Mr. DELARBE
Mr. LIDAL, accompanying Mr. COPPELL
Mr. LINSENMAYER, accompanying Mr. STAPBY
Mr. LOAYZA BAREA, accompanying Mr. SAAVEDRA WEISE
Mr. LORHMANN, accompanying Mr. HABENICHT
Mr. LONG, accompanying Mr. ROBINSON
Mr. LUNA CORONA, substitute for Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
Mrs. MAGISTAD, accompanying Mr. BRUAS
Mr. MALINTOPPI, substitute for Mr. FALCHI
Mr. MANOS, accompanying Mr. SOFFER,
Mr. MANZ, accompanying Mr. ZENGIEF
Mr. MARTINEZ, substitute for Mr. PEDERSEN
Mr. MARTINI UDANETTA, substitute for Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO
Mr. MARTINS da CPUIZ, substitute for Mr. NASCIMENTO FCPURUS
Mr. MASSA MUFIZZI, accompanying Mr. SALCIN de la JARA
Mr. MCDONAGH, accompanying Mr. HAYES
Mr. MITYAYEV, accompanying Mr. PROKHOROV
Mr. MOPOZOV, accompanying Mr. KOSTIN
Mrs. MUJICA de ADAMES, accompanying Mr. FCPURUS NAVARRO
Mr. NADAL, substitute for Mr. FALCHETTI MIGNONE
Mr. NAKATAI, accompanying Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. NALDO, substitute for Mr. BRILLANTE
Mr. NAKASE, substitute for Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. M.S. DIAYE, accompanying Mr. SENE
Mr. M.M. DIAYE, accompanying Mr. DIARFA
Mr. NEKIPELOV, substitute for Mr. KCSTINE
Mr. NEMO, accompanying Mr. DELAFERE
Mrs. NGOUYOU, accompanying Mr. MANGCNGO-NZAMBI
Mr. NONIYAMA, substitute for Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. NOPSKY, accompanying Mr. HABFNICH
Mr. NUSSEP, accompanying Mr. KOSSEF
Mr. CLIVA, accompanying Mr. PALCSI
Mr. FABON, substitute for Mr. ALEEDA
Mr. PADOLECCHIA, accompanying Mr. FATHMARAJAH
Mr. FATCH, accompanying Mr. SEAFEB
Mr. PEEFZ CASTILLO, substitute for Mr. RODEIGUEZ NAVAPPO
Mr. PETERSON, accompanying Mr. SEAFEB
Mr. PILLSBURY, accompanying Mr. SEAFEB
Mr. FITOYO, substitute for Mr. SUTWISNA
Mr. FABERTYFLO, accompanying Mr. ZAFFRA
Mrs. RASDEN, accompanying Mr. LLOYD
Mrs. RASAMUEL, substitute for Mr. ZAFFRA
Mr. PETOUINAD, substitute for Mr. CECHSLIN
Mr. PEYES PETANA, substitute for Miss GMCZALTZ MARTINEZ
Mr. FOBEL, accompanying Mr. BITUX
Mr. ROCMA PIMENTEL, accompanying Mr. NASCIMENTO RODRIGUES
Mr. RODIE, substitute for Mr. GECHSLIN
Mrs. RUISTA DE FUTIER, accompanying Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVAPPO
Mr. RUTH, substitute for Mr. GEVE
Mr. RYS, accompanying Mr. WOLFF
Mr. SADLEUE, substitute for Mr. WATCHOFN
Mr. SHIMIZU, substitute for Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. STAMINOV, substitute for Mr. PETICO
Mr. STEPHENS, accompanying Mr. SEAFEB
Mr. STOCHENOV, accompanying Mr. PETFOV
Mr. SUAPEP, accompanying Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVAPPO
Mr. SUBEHMANYA, substitute for Mr. DESHMUKH
Mr. SUZUKI, substitute for Mr. YCSHINC
Mr. TAHAN, substitute for Mr. EL FEEEF
Mrs. TANAS, substitute for Mr. EPLIANCIES
Mr. TUN, accompanying Mr. GYI
Mr. UTHIN, accompanying Mr. BPUHAS
Mr. VEGA MASIS, accompanying Mr. SELWA GUTIERFEZ
Mr. VERGNE SABOIA, accompanying Mr. TAPGNO BCTTO
Mr. VINOIKOUPOV, substitute for Mr. CUDOVENKO
Mr. de VITES-PFEILING, accompanying Mr. VANDERVEKEN
Mr. WACH, accompanying Mr. SEAPBY
Mr. WAFFEN, accompanying Mr. HABERNICH
Mr. WAZAN, accompanying Mr. AL-MADANI
Miss WEBSTER, accompanying Mrs. CEPEI
Mr. WIDOWS, accompanying Mr. WATCHOFN
Mr. WSN, substitute for Mr. GYI
Mr. ZAKAR, accompanying Mr. MAEON
Mr. ZITPEE, accompanying Mr. HASSI
Mr. ZOUFANOS, accompanying Mr. TAPZE
FIRST SITTING  
(Tuesday, 2 March 1982, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.10 a.m. with Mr. Ventelon in the Chair.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

The Chairman welcomed the persons present, particularly those attending a Governing Body session for the first time.

FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Approval of the minutes of the 218th Session

Subject to the corrections indicated in the Office paper, the Governing Body approved the minutes of its 218th Session.

SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Meeting of Experts on Social Security Financing  
(Geneva, 30 November-3 December 1981)

THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Meeting of Experts on Occupational Safety and Health in the Iron and Steel Industry  
(Geneva, 30 November-9 December 1981)

The Chairman, referring to the second and third agenda items, pointed out that, as mentioned in the Office notes, both reports would be submitted to the Governing Body at its 220th Session (May 1982).

Mr. Dechslir (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' concern about the six months that would pass between the holding of two such important meetings and the decisions to be taken on their reports. Was the procedure adopted by the Office in drafting the reports of the two meetings and then clearing them with the participants by correspondence a sound one? Would it not be preferable for such meetings to produce their own reports and adopt them without further ado, as had been done by the PIACT evaluation meeting whose report was now before the Governing Body under the fourth item of its agenda?

Mr. Rubi (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) said that the Workers shared the Employers' disappointment. In May, on the eve of the Conference, the Governing Body would have less time to consider the reports properly. In future, reports intended for its February and November sessions should be made available on time.

The Director-General said that unfortunately the delay had been unavoidable. The Meeting of Experts on Social Security Financing had lasted only three days. The experts, following a thorough discussion of a particularly complex subject - which would no doubt engage the Governing Body's attention for quite some time to come - had found it impossible to draw up their report during the meeting itself, and had therefore asked the Office to prepare a draft and clear it with them. Some practical problems, such as translation, had added to the difficulties. Much the same could be said about the report of the Meeting of Experts on Occupational Safety and Health in the Iron and Steel Industry.
It might be desirable to consider how such expert meetings might be given the time they needed to finish their work – not only to discuss problems but also to draft the documents expected of them. The Governing Body might reflect on this matter, to which the Office would also give some thought.

Mr. Gnechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) agreed with the Director-General. Meetings should be given the time to complete their work.

The Governing Body noted that the reports of the two meetings would be submitted to it at its next session.

FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Tripartite Advisory Meeting on PIACT Evaluation
(Geneva, 10-15 February 1982)

Mr. Albeda (Government, Netherlands) considered the report of the Tripartite Advisory Meeting on PIACT Evaluation to be an interesting assessment of a programme which, as the Director-General had said in his opening address to the meeting, was at the heart of the ILO's mandate.

While the Office was to be congratulated on having submitted the report of a meeting held only two weeks ago, the report was only a contribution to the larger task of improving the quality of working life.

PIACT, with its occupational safety and health component, was indeed a top priority in both the industrialised and the developing countries. Although most countries were preoccupied with the problem of unemployment, there was no valid reason why steady progress should not be made towards improving the quality of working life.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) said that the report highlighted the usefulness of PIACT evaluation and could help to plot the future of PIACT with greater precision and a deeper understanding of actual needs.

From the very beginning the Workers had given high priority to the programme, whose full development had initially been hampered by the financial crisis. They supported the meeting's request that more adequate resources should be made available to PIACT in the future.

They also fully supported the position taken by the Worker members at the meeting, as reflected in paragraphs 76-78 of the report. The programme should emphasise occupational safety and health, with special emphasis on the rural sector and small enterprises. Contrary to what the Employers thought, the ILO should concern itself with the control of toxic chemicals, including pesticides, medicaments and food additives. Workers were exposed to grave risks in factories and farms and the ILO was the right place to tackle these problems. Educational and training programmes for workers were also very important.

Another essential component of PIACT was the general improvement of working conditions through shorter hours of work, better work organisation and other measures. Paragraph 22 of the report recorded the stand taken by an Employer participant from a developing country against curbs on working time in such countries. The Workers, and in particular those from developing countries, unanimously rejected his contention that long hours of work were required in order to earn an adequate income. In those countries the excessive hours put in by some workers kept others idle. Nor was it only in factories that a connection existed between excessive hours and employment injuries: the frequency of accidents in agriculture should not be overlooked.

The Workers' views on ILO means of action under PIACT were set out in paragraph 77 of the report. The formulation of practical guidelines, however useful as a supplementary measure, was no substitute for standard setting.
The workers supported the proposal in paragraph 89(a) of the report that the evaluation of PACT should be placed on the Conference agenda for a general discussion in 1984 or 1985, and they proposed that the recommendation in paragraph 3(c)(ii) of the Office paper should be amended to reflect this request through the addition, at the end, of the words "for a general discussion at its 1984 or 1985 session".

Mr. Oehrlin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) welcomed the submission of such an informative and interesting report so soon after the meeting. The tripartite evaluation of PACT at the world level which it had carried out following the several regional exercises was indeed most timely.

But had there been a real evaluation? Had the meeting not merely held a general discussion on problems of working conditions and then offered some advice on the future development of PACT? That in itself was to be welcomed, especially as a virtual consensus had been reached on priorities, and the Employers and the Workers had united in endorsing the emphasis on occupational safety and health. That consensus should be reflected in future PACT activities and in the relevant programme and budget proposals.

The Employers' position was reflected in several passages in the report, more particularly in paragraph 72, and needed no repetition.

As regards the recommendations in the Office paper, most of them were of the usual kind and raised no problem. However, the Employers wished to bring up certain points regarding the proposed general discussion on PACT at the Conference.

If such a discussion was to be useful, some stumbling-blocks would have to be removed. The experts had not wholly succeeded in avoiding them, and they presented a greater danger at the Conference, where the whole membership of the Organisation was represented on a tripartite basis, than in a meeting of experts.

To begin with, there was some danger that the general discussion would range over the whole field of conditions of work. In practice, any social problem could be linked to conditions of work. Moreover, as was pointed out in paragraph 73 of the report, confusion could be caused by failure to distinguish between "working conditions" and "conditions of work". The Office report to the Conference, where the risk of the discussion getting out of hand was much greater, should clearly delimit the problem.

If the Conference was to carry out a real evaluation and not merely comment on various aspects of working conditions, the Office report should try to assess the real impact of PACT activities on working conditions in member countries. Admittedly it would be a difficult task and many countries - and in particular the poorest, which were most in need of PACT - lacked the statistical machinery for measuring progress under the programme in such specific fields as employment injuries. Statistical evaluations raised even greater problems in more subjective areas of PACT concern unconnected with safety. Nevertheless, a realistic effort was needed to provide a sound basis for critical evaluation, and the most suitable procedures and criteria for achieving that purpose should receive consideration at the earliest possible stage. The Employers' group was fully prepared to co-operate in efforts to design a suitable evaluation system.

Mr. Chetty-Sapper (Government, Colombia) felt that, judging from the broad measure of agreement emerging both from the report and from the discussion on it, the Tripartite Advisory Meeting had been a successful and constructive exercise.

The recommendations in the Office paper could be accepted, and so could the proposal to give priority to occupational safety and health, with emphasis on the rural sector, including as far as practicable agro-industrial activities, and small enterprises.

None the less, the major problem facing the world was unemployment. It was not limited to any specific type of society but took a variety of forms depending on the social and economic system, and any action in the areas covered by PACT should be considered in that light.

Reduction of hours of work in developing countries was a case in point. Such a reduction was indeed one of the great achievements of trade union movements, but its implications varied from one country to another. Although the report did not
explicitly mention it, the ILO could usefully make a more systematic study of alternatives to the simple expedient of cutting hours of work. Various studies were no doubt being carried out - on shift work, on rotation, on part-time work - but it would be useful to relate them to the overriding problem of unemployment.

The broad consensus reached by the Employers and Workers afforded a sound basis for an evaluation of concrete and pragmatic means of action which might be made available to PIACT, and which ought not to be limited to standard setting.

At the meeting, the poor response from governments to the Director-General's circular letter had been deplored. Fifty two replies had been received, plus 12 that were late, including the one from the speaker's own Government. None the less, they constituted useful material for the proposed evaluation and handy tools for promoting PIACT as one of the ILO's key means of action.

Mr. Andersen (Government, Denmark), stressing his country's long-standing interest in the ILO's occupational safety and health work, endorsed the meeting's recommendations. Basic to PIACT was the concept of the working environment, and that implied supplementing and strengthening the ILO's occupational safety and health activities. From that point of view, the proposed evaluation of PIACT by the General Conference would be most useful; it would help, in particular, to promote the more diversified action that was needed in addition to standard setting.

When the Medium-Term Plan was reviewed, the need for allocating the necessary resources for that purpose should be borne in mind.

Mr. Subrahmany, (Government, India) regarded PIACT as a symbol of concern within the ILO and its member countries for the quality of working life.

A continuous though gradual effort was required and the programme would have to be adapted to the varying needs of countries at different stages of development. In developing countries like India, the bulk of the workforce was employed in the unorganised or informal sector, where the work was done mostly at home and workers had rather tenuous links with their employers. Despite their deplorable working conditions, many countries had failed to do much for them. The scope of PIACT should be suitably extended to that category of workers.

Second, the actual task of improving the working environment required action at the country level. PIACT should strive to encourage the development of comprehensive national programmes.

Third, improving working conditions and the working environment included action on occupational safety and health, prominently featuring the prevention of occupational risks and maintenance of income. The ILO's Social Security Department and the International Social Security Association (ISSA) were working in the field of income security and some measure of co-ordination between them and PIACT seemed necessary. Indeed, the entire relationship between the ILO and the ISSA should be reviewed.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) considered PIACT to be one of the most important ILO programmes, invaluable for workers and for organisations actively concerned with working conditions and the working environment.

Improvements in working conditions in the broad sense should not be postponed, and the expansion of employment should not take place at the expense of occupational safety and working conditions. It was most important, therefore, that the question should be discussed by the Conference, preferably in 1985 since that would allow more time for preparatory work, including national meetings and consultations. Like the Workers' group, the USSR Government believed that the approach to the problem, far from being limited to occupational safety and health, should be a comprehensive one; it should include, in particular, the legislative and social aspects.

PIACT was of equal importance to industrialised and developing countries, and there was merit in the point of view of the Government participant from the Philippines, as recorded in paragraph 81 of the report, favouring a broad PIACT approach whereby countries might select those activities that were most relevant to their needs.

Where the industrialised countries were concerned, PIACT should promote cooperation on problems of common interest such as job enrichment and methods of
curtailing monotony, stress and noise. The role of social and psychological factors in advanced industrial processes was becoming steadily more important. Publications, meetings and exchanges of experience in that field would be of interest to all industrialised countries.

In developing countries PIACT should concentrate on two main areas: radical improvement in conditions at the workplace and assistance in developing national policies, laws and institutions. The last few years had shown that only a few enterprises had benefited from the work of experts sent to developing countries. Further, some multidisciplinary teams had included insufficiently qualified experts. Why had only one expert from a socialist country - so far as the speaker knew - been included in the 14 multidisciplinary missions fielded to date?

The USSF had extensive experience in the planning and execution of measures for the improvement of working conditions and the working environment. For example, it was currently carrying out projects for the more rational and safer organisation of hundreds of standard jobs in its main industries and undertakings, and it was prepared to share that fund of experience with developing countries as well as to help the ILO in the production of a wide range of teaching materials on safety techniques.

It was to be hoped that the PIACT programme, a relatively new form of ILO action, would grow into a substantial component of the Organisation's regular activities.

Mr. Wallin (Government, Belgium) considered that, in requiring an evaluation of such a wide-ranging and ambitious programme barely five years after its inception, the Conference had been unduly demanding. After barely five years it was not practicable to judge the effectiveness of such a vast programme.

PIACT served two specific purposes. First, it was designed to mobilise governments' political interest and support in improving working conditions. How successful had it been in this? The limited number of replies to the inquiry carried out with governments made one wonder. Perhaps the use of an acronym intelligible only to French-speaking countries had not been a very good idea. Above all, the Office might have made an effort to spell out the programme's objectives more clearly. In the circumstances it was not surprising that so many should appear to view it as concerned essentially with occupational safety and health - an impression which the overwhelming majority of specialists in that field at the February meeting tended to confirm.

It was admittedly difficult to conceive of a policy for the improvement of working conditions that did not pay attention to that aspect, with its overriding impact - psychological, political, social and human - on the workplace. But had the ILO merely wanted to expand its occupational safety and health programme, it need not have launched PIACT. Its aim in doing so had been to break out of the narrow bounds of occupational safety and health and cover a wider area encompassing general conditions of work, institutional structures and remuneration.

The programme had not achieved all its objectives, because of the financial constraints to which Mr. Muhr had referred. It nevertheless remained a top priority programme to which a substantial share of the ILO's resources should be allocated.

There were of course some preconditions for success, and these included a mobilisation - both of governments, employers and workers in support of its objectives, and, within the Office, of all departments and units concerned.

As to whether or not the meeting had actually carried out an evaluation of PIACT - the question raised by Mr. Oechslin - it was at least clear that the Office had not tried to foist off its own evaluation on the experts, but had merely given them a thoroughly honest and factual account of PIACT activities.

The exercise had in fact been merely the first phase of a long process of evaluation. The Office was now better equipped to prepare the next phase and, were the question placed on the 1985 Conference agenda, would have the time and, it must be hoped, the means to do it properly.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) affirmed his Government's support for PIACT as a vehicle for ILO assistance to developing countries in improving their working conditions and environment. The PIACT multidisciplinary team missions were useful in supplementing national policies, and adequate regular-budget as well as extra-budgetary resources should be provided for them.
As recommended in paragraph 80 of the report, the PIACT approach should be as broad as possible and suitably adapted to the development needs of the various countries.

A comprehensive discussion of PIACT at a future session of the Conference would be most useful for assessing its value for developing countries and reorienting its thrust as necessary.

Mr. Petrov (Government, Bulgaria), while approving of the activities carried out under PIACT, agreed that many of the measures described in paragraphs 71 to 78 of the report might be taken up in the future programme.

The basic problem was that of helping governments to work out more effective occupational safety and health programmes, with due emphasis on social and welfare services and medical care for workers, adequate housing, recreation and other benefits. Particular attention should be given to preventing the operation of enterprises which did not provide the necessary safety conditions or which used chemicals that did not satisfy occupational safety and health standards. Workers should receive occupational safety and health training in all sectors, without exception, where hazards arose.

Regional conferences should concern themselves actively with the implementation of PIACT, and the adoption of minimum safety and health standards a Convention or a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation should be considered.

Mr. Send (Government, Senegal) also supported the proposals for the future of PIACT and for a general discussion at the Conference in 1984 or, at the latest, in 1985. The programme was unquestionably central to the ILO's concerns and met the expectations of developing countries.

Senegal, which had benefited from PIACI and had participated in the meeting, considered that substantial resources should be allocated to the programme, since only with strong financial and technical support could governments effectively implement programmes in occupational safety and health and general conditions of work.

It was essential that the meeting's recommendations should be followed if the programme was to succeed, notably in the developing countries, which, owing to the present economic crisis, had enormous difficulties in mustering adequate resources for improving working and living conditions.

Mr. Pelchetti Mignone (Government, Uruguay) praised the report, which effectively highlighted the importance of PIACI in ILO programmes. He fully shared the views of previous speakers, particularly those expressed by Mr. Wallin on behalf of the Belgian Government.

As several participants in the meeting had stressed, the main problem with the ILO's standard-setting activities under PIACT was that the standards might be too high for some countries. Standards should, of course, be high enough to ensure a uniform minimum level of protection everywhere; that, after all, was the reason for which the Organisation was founded. But they should not be so high as to be impracticable for some countries, and indeed Article 19, paragraph 3, of the ILO Constitution made it mandatory to have due regard to countries' special circumstances. Striking a balance between these two requirements represented a challenge that had to be faced.

The Uruguayan Government supported the recommendations in the Office paper.

Mr. Maasho (Government, Ethiopia) associated himself with the expressions of support for PIACT, which particularly in developing countries played an important part in fostering social and economic progress and should therefore continue with undiminished momentum.

Mr. Win (Government, Burma) was fully satisfied with the meeting's report.

It was common knowledge that the working conditions and environment in many developing countries were sub-standard. PIACT could and should play an even greater role in helping such countries to improve conditions, and regular-budget as well as extra-budgetary resources should be made available for the purpose.
The proposals in Chapter IV of the report regarding the future orientation of the programme deserved full support.

The Director-General gathered from the debate, first, that the Governing Body regarded PIACT as one of the ILO's most important activities in the years to come, and, second, that it wished the evaluation exercise to be carried on at the Conference. He would accordingly submit proposals in due course for Conference action.

The discussion had also disclosed a need, first pointed out by Mr. Oechslin, for refining the evaluation technique further. It was to be hoped that the Conference debate would throw full light on the actual impact of PIACT at the country level. The ILO's tripartite constituents were best qualified to answer that question. The Office would of course assemble the necessary data, but ultimately success of the exercise depended on member States and on how thoroughly they reflected upon the information provided and drew the necessary conclusions.

The present discussion had already provided useful guidance, and the Office would carry on, using the fairly sophisticated evaluation techniques it had developed for assessing technical co-operation activities and was now trying to apply to more complex activities, such as research and even standard setting.

As Mr. Wallin and others had urged, the PIACT programme should indeed be strengthened. Steps had in fact been taken in line with Mr. Wallin's call for "mobilisation" within the Office - to ensure that all Office units, and not merely the department formally in charge of working conditions and environment, bore their share of responsibility for PIACT. The discussion that had just taken place could but strengthen the resolve of all concerned.

Mr. Subrahmany's remark about extending PIACT coverage to the informal sector was interesting and deserved careful consideration, as did a number of other suggestions. They would be duly reflected upon and taken into account in formulating future proposals.

Subject to the amendment proposed by Mr. Muhr, the Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 3 of the Office paper.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JEAN DE GIVRY

The Director-General announced that Mr. Jean de Givry, special adviser for PIACT questions, was about to retire from the Office after many years in the course of which he had brought credit on the ILO and derived from it well-earned career rewards.

Mr. de Givry had served on the French delegation to the first post war session of the General Conference, held in Paris in 1945. In 1947, as a young ILO official, he had taken part in the 100th Session of the Governing Body and the 30th Session of the Conference. In 1948 he had participated in the session of the Conference held in San Francisco - a true ILO milestone. His whole career had been one of hard work and outstanding success. He had been one of those who had developed the ILO's freedom of association activities. In 1958 he had gone to Peru to advise the Ministry of Labour on labour relations policy, and that mission had directly or indirectly influenced the entire development of labour relations in Latin America. In 1976 he had been put in charge of PIACT, which had been launched largely on his initiative.

Mr. de Givry was a man of extensive culture, with a sound legal background. He was gifted with considerable political finesse and impressed all by his unfailing courtesy and kindness. He had produced many articles and reports, which bore the stamp of his vast technical knowledge and stylistic flair.

By the excellence of his work, the firmness of his convictions and his unquestioning devotion to the ILO Mr. de Givry had brought honour on the Organisation and earned his colleagues' gratitude, friendship and admiration.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) had had the honour and pleasure of knowing Mr. de Givry for many years in the successive positions he had occupied, and most recently in his connection with PIACT, which, as the Director-General had recalled, was largely his brain child.
Mr. de Givry's dealings with the Employers' group had always been marked by fruitful and friendly co-operation. He had always taken the deepest interest in the social questions he had tackled. He had also shown a strong sense of tripartism: he would listen to all sides and then find the formula most likely to advance harmonious social progress.

The present turning point in Mr. de Givry's life represented not an end but a fresh start, since he would be freer to devote his full energies to the activity on which his whole career had been focused - stimulating thought on the major social issues of concern to the ILO. The Employers hoped that they would have the privilege of seeing and reading Mr. de Givry again.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman), expressing the Workers' sadness at Mr. de Givry's departure, said that the Office had many good officials and some exceptional ones: Mr. de Givry was one of the latter. The Workers were appreciative of all that he had done during the past five years for PIACT - a programme of vital importance to workers everywhere. The best way of showing gratitude to him would be to work hard at ensuring its success.

Mr. de Givry had dedicated his whole life to the furthering of social harmony, social justice and human and trade union rights. He had now earned himself some relief from the duties he had so diligently discharged in the workers' interest all his life.

The Workers wished him good health and looked forward to welcoming him again at the Conference and elsewhere.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico), while regretting the departure of an able official who had done so much for workers' rights and tripartism, observed that he would now have more time to pursue his interests and, through his writings, give others the benefit of his thinking.

She welcomed the opportunity to thank Mr. de Givry for his outstanding services to the ILO and conveyed to him the best wishes of the Government group.

The Chairman associated himself with the tribute to Mr. de Givry, whose field of activity - conditions of work - fell pre-eminently within the competence of the Organisation, and whom he himself had known as far back as the 1950s. At meetings in Geneva and elsewhere he had had many opportunities to appreciate Mr. de Givry's deep feeling for the problems he had to deal with. Their long and fruitful relations had ripened into a lasting friendship and he hoped that they would meet often in the future. Mr. de Givry would always be welcome and at home in the ILO.

FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Activities of the International Occupational Safety and Health Information Centre (CIS) in 1981

Mr. Cochslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) found the report on CIS activities most interesting and informative. It showed that the Centre was engaged in a great many activities and was operating smoothly. It contained a good many new ideas, particularly as regards the computerisation of CIS data, to which the Employers attached much importance. The Employers were, however, a little worried about the financial situation described in paragraph 22 of the report, and in particular the drop in the Centre's extra-budgetary income, due apparently to some difficulty with subscriptions. Could more information be given about the causes of the situation and possible remedial action?

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) considered that the report gave a good account of CIS activities in 1981.

His Government attached great importance to the effective assistance the Centre provided for national occupational safety and health programmes, thus contributing to the success of PIACT at the country level.

The correct title of the Cuban national centre, referred to in paragraph 2 of the Spanish text of the report, was: Departamento de información técnica del Comité Estatal de Trabajo y Seguridad Social de Cuba.
The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) stated that the drop in income referred to by Mr. Cechslin was due largely to subscriptions having been collected by some national centres but not yet received in Geneva, and also, to some extent, to exchange rate fluctuations.

It was, he hoped, only a passing phase. Action was being taken to ensure that subscriptions received by the national centres were remitted to Geneva more quickly.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Discrimination

Mr. Andersen (Government, Denmark), introducing the report as Chairman of the Committee, stated that the Committee's work on apartheid followed logically from the 1981 updated Conference Declaration.

In November 1981 the Committee had discussed how best to carry out the Director-General's mandate to monitor and follow the labour and social situation in South Africa and to submit every year for consideration by the Conference Committee on Apartheid a Special Report on the subject. At the present session the Committee had considered Office proposals regarding the procedure for examining information furnished by governments and employers' and workers' organisations in pursuance of paragraph 5 of the Declaration.

As the report showed, the Office would prepare a summary and analysis of the information received, comparable to that published in the relevant part of the 1981 Special Report, but which, this year, would form a supplement to the Special Report.

The Office would do its utmost to circulate the information collected well in advance of the Committee's May 1982 meeting.

Mr. Taha (Government, Egypt), endorsing the broad lines of the Committee's report, expressed the hope that all ILO member States would supply information on the measures they had taken against apartheid and that the Director-General's proposals for the establishment of the voluntary fund requested in the Declaration would be forthcoming in the near future. His Government supported the steps the Director-General was taking in that direction.

Egypt was ready to go on making its modest contribution to the struggle against apartheid by providing facilities in its workers' education or training centres for Africans from the liberation movements.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) considered the measures outlined in paragraph 2 of the report a sound basis for further analysis. It was gratifying that the Office had been so prompt, following the Governing Body's November decision, in inviting governments and employers' and workers' organisations to provide the fullest possible information. If they co-operated properly, the Committee in May would have much interesting material before it and its report to the Conference would be most instructive.

The Committee should take into account not only the information received in response to the Office request, but also reports in the media newspapers, magazines and television - about new economic or trade links with the South African régime, which could only strengthen it in its outrages against humanity.

The Mexican Government fully endorsed the suggestion that the Committee should, following its consideration in May of the report on the replies received, decide what might be done so that the 1983 report would be more complete.

Mr. Cairo Solar (Government, Cuba) supported the action proposed in the report.

All member governments and employers' and workers' organisations should make a point of sending comprehensive replies to the Director-General's inquiry, to
enable the Conference to form a realistic judgement of the measures taken by the ILO's constituents towards eradication of the inhuman system of apartheid. Any information about support being given to the racist régime of South Africa would, of course, be useful as well.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada) expressed the Workers' satisfaction with the report and with the progress being made in the monitoring of anti-apartheid measures.

Regarding paragraph 9 of the report, the Workers could not agree with the Employers about the need in the near future for a meeting similar to that held at Livingstone in May 1981. The information which the Office would be submitting to the Committee should be examined before it was decided to hold a further meeting.

The new wave of arrests of trade union officials mentioned in paragraph 12 showed that over the past 12 months the South African authorities had in no way relaxed their policy of discrimination and oppression against the Black majority. Indeed, in October 1981 they had passed legislation forbidding the collection of funds by or for the largest grouping of independent Black trade unions, the Federation of South African Trade Unions. And, even worse, large numbers of trade unionists, over half of them women, had been newly arrested and maltreated. Sma Mashanini, a leader of the fast-growing Commercial Catering and Allied Workers' Union, had been brutally arrested at her home in Soweto. Dr. Neil Aggett, a leading office-bearer of the African Food and Canning Workers' Union, had recently been found dead — according to most sources other than the official ones, murdered — in his prison cell.

Such atrocities underscored the need for complete replies to the Director-General's inquiry, and the Workers' group pleaded for the full cooperation of governments and employers in the exercise, in order to strengthen the ILO's action against apartheid.

Mr. Mário Polo (Government, Angola), expressing satisfaction with the Committee's report, appealed to the ILO's constituents in general and to governments in particular to reply as specifically and rapidly as possible to the Office inquiry.

Mr. Barnabo (Worker, Togo) associated himself with Mrs. Carr's statement. He had been concerned to learn that the International Organisation of Employers, using facilities placed at its disposal by the Office, had held a meeting which South Africa had apparently attended, with tickets paid for by the IOE. As the proceedings had not been made public, the Workers asked whether the Office could enlighten them on the subject. They knew that South Africa had taken an active part in the meeting, since it had sent representatives.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice Chairman) wished to make it clear that the Committee's report and the measures proposed had the approval of the Employers, who would continue to participate in the ILO's struggle against apartheid and fully associate themselves with the views expressed in the Committee and the Governing Body.

While the meeting to which Mr. Barnabo had referred had been an internal IOE meeting, Mr. Barnabo might rest assured that it had been held with the objective of the ILO Declaration in mind, namely to bring South Africa to abandon its shameful policy of apartheid, an objective which the Employers' group and the IOE supported. It would be reported on in the IOE reply to the Office inquiry.

The Government of South Africa had not been involved in the meeting.

Mr. Adeb (Government, Nigeria) observed that, whereas hitherto the debate on apartheid had tended to become something of a routine matter, in 1981 statements of principles had been backed by action and some definite goals set.

Although the African Government members of the Governing Body would no doubt be studying the situation created by the Employers' meeting, sufficient information was not available as to its proceedings. There was no question of casting suspicion on the Employers' motives: there might well be, from their point of view, some merit in associating participants from South Africa in such a meeting, and perhaps they had in fact managed to derive some benefit from the South Africans' presence. Nevertheless, the situation was disquieting and further information would be welcome, especially as, apparently, the Office had been closely associated with the arrangements for the meeting.
Paragraph 2(d) of the report referred to information on "failure to take action and the active promotion of relations which strengthen the apartheid system". The monitoring of such information did pose a problem. Merely sending a questionnaire to governments, employers or workers would not draw out facts which they did not wish to divulge, particularly as regards any action which tended to strengthen apartheid. Did the Office plan to set up a special unit to sift information from the international news media and thus ascertain the true situation, regardless of whether a government or an employers' or workers' organisation was being forthright or not?

The discussion was adjourned to a later sitting.

The sitting closed at 1.00 p.m.

---

1 See second sitting.
SECOND SITTING
(Tuesday, 2 March 1982, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 4.25 p.m. with Mr. Ventelol in the Chair.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Discrimination (concl.)

Mr. Georget (Employer, Niger), associating himself with Mr. Oechslin's statement, supported the recommendations in the report and expressed the hope that the Office inquiry would receive a full response, of which indeed there were already encouraging signs.

He hoped that, in accordance with the commitment made at the May 1981 meeting in Livingstone, meetings of that type would be held regularly every two years in one of the front-line countries. The Office would no doubt be taking preparatory steps for holding the next one before June 1983, so that its report might be before the General Conference that year. He felt sure that Mrs. Carr and Mr. Muhr would wish to support the holding of such a meeting, whose agenda should be drawn up in the light of the proceedings of the Conference Committee on Apartheid at its next meeting.

The recent IOE meeting had been held in line with the purpose of operative paragraph 6(c) of the updated Declaration, viz "to encourage and extend financial support to workers' and employers' organisations in their programmes of action against apartheid so that they can exert the maximum pressure for the implementation of various recommendations falling within their sphere of competence." The Chairman of the IOE Executive Committee was therefore to be commended for his initiative. The persons attending had been staunch opponents of apartheid whom the Employers could only encourage in their struggle, so that all the people in South Africa - Africans all, whatever their racial origins - might live together in friendship and brotherhood.

Perhaps the Workers too, in a similar spirit, might try to impress on their South African brothers of European origin, who under the job reservation system held jobs to which Black workers did not have access, the need for uniting with them in the name of an overriding common interest.

As for governments - especially those of Africa - their unstinting support was needed in applying the Livingstone recommendations. Regrettably, some of them appeared to be doing less than their full part.

The Employers would have no truck with any supporters of apartheid, and they stood foursquare behind the African people in their anti-apartheid campaign.

Mr. Sow (Worker, Mauritania) doubted whether the best way to fight apartheid was to sit down with its supporters. True, Mr. Georget had described the participants in the IOE meeting as strongly opposed to the system; but it scarcely seemed credible that such fierce anti-apartheid fighters might indeed be found among South African employers - in effect representatives of the large multinationals.

More perhaps than the IOE, it was the ILO whose attitude in the matter raised questions. The IOE was, of course, free to request ILO logistic support for such an exercise: but was the ILO obliged to provide it - especially when the purpose was to give representatives of apartheid their day in court? Did it have to incur additional expenditure, such as overtime pay for interpreters, and for work which, at that, probably did violence to their innermost convictions?

Surely the ILO was free to turn down requests, from whatever quarter they came, whose purpose might not be consistent with its own objectives. There were plenty of other meeting places in Geneva which the IOE could have used.

---

1 See first sitting.
It had often been suggested that ILO technical co-operation should be denied to countries flouting human rights and freedom of association. Moreover, outside the ILO, in the world of sport, it had been acknowledged that South African athletes were part of a system ostracised by the world community, and the necessary consequences had been drawn. South African employers too were part of the system, and the ILO should behave accordingly.

The speaker supported the position stated by Mrs. Carr for the group.

Mr. Owor (Employer, Kenya) endorsed the Committee's recommendations, which were a useful contribution to the anti-apartheid campaign.

He had accepted the invitation to the ILO meeting on the understanding that it was to be a follow-up to the debate of the Conference Committee on Apartheid, but when he had found that South Africans were attending and were to speak, he had refused to attend, in keeping with the policy of isolating South Africa followed by the ILO and other organisations. This position, which his Employer colleagues had understood, was shared by Mr. Sumwe of Zambia, who had also not attended. If the South Africans wanted dialogue, let them first accept dialogue at home - dialogue with the likes of Steve Biko, Neil Aggett and Nelson Mandela.

Mrs. Gutema (Government, Ethiopia) supported the Committee's recommendations and commended the ILO's anti-apartheid activities. She appealed to governments, employers and workers to respond fully and in good time to the Office inquiry.

Could more information be provided about financial aid, notably through trust funds, to liberation movements in Southern Africa?

She associated herself with Mr. Ajai's request for more information on monitoring arrangements.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) felt that the proposed procedure afforded a sound basis for effective Governing Body and Conference action to eliminate the criminal system of apartheid.

He hoped that the Office would supplement its current inquiry by seeking information from such sources as the UN Centre against Apartheid, the CAU, SWAPO and the ANC.

Without wishing to meddle in the affairs of the ILO, he had been surprised to learn of the meeting held with South African participation, and he supported the views expressed by Mr. Ajai and Mr. Sow. Could the Director-General explain the part played by the Office in this regard?

Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Employer, Mexico) confirmed the Employers' unanimous support for the Committee's report and recommendations. As a Mexican he could readily subscribe to Miss González Martínez's statement, which unequivocally expressed the revulsion felt by the entire Mexican people towards apartheid.

As a member of the Employers' group, however, he wished to make it clear that the group, made up of free and independent men and women, could not accept accusations made lightly. The ILO knew what its duties and obligations were, and it had carried them out in the manner described by Mr. Georget. The South African employers had attended the meeting in a purely personal capacity, and they had made their opposition to apartheid perfectly clear. Inviting them did not imply an endorsement of apartheid but, on the contrary, a concern to get reliable information from first-hand sources, in a spirit of free and responsible inquiry.

Mr. Sene (Government, Senegal) welcomed the efforts being made to secure information from governments, employers and workers, which paralleled the work being done by the United Nations Human Rights Commission, referred to in paragraph 10 of the report. Given the persistently bleak picture of violations of freedom of association, imprisonments, even murders and suicides in South Africa, it would be useful to secure information also from appropriate sources from within the UN family, including the UN itself and its specialised bodies - the Special Committee on Apartheid, the Human Rights Commission and the Council for Namibia - as well as from UNESCO and others.

The struggle against apartheid concerned all mankind, which was formally committed to it by a whole series of texts, including the resolution proclaiming it
to be a crime against humanity. It was a matter not only of liberating the Black man from oppression but of liberating also the White man from the stifling illusion of racial and cultural superiority, and to do so through dialogue, a dialogue in which all had a stake - employers, workers and governments.

Mr. Owuor had mentioned earlier that if South African employers wanted dialogue they should start at home, and indeed the ILC could help them to do so. No one could, of course, question the Employers' right to organise a dialogue across national frontiers, but they should exercise caution to avoid giving any impression of endorsing apartheid. It would be interesting to learn more about the IOE meeting and to see how far such a technique could actually produce useful results.

Meanwhile it was urgent to promote dialogue between White and Black South Africans, with mutual trust on both sides, while at the same time providing technical and material support, if possible through a special fund, to the liberation movements of Southern Africa.

Mr. Subrahmany (Government, India) said that recent reports concerning killings of trade union leaders in South African prisons underscored the urgency of action, and not mere declarations, to help the South African people in their plight. In so far as the recommendations before the Governing Body could promote progress in that direction, he supported them.

The Director-General commented that the present discussion represented a useful further step along the lines mapped out earlier by the Conference and the Governing Body. The next one would consist of submission in May to the Committee on Discrimination of the results of the Office inquiry, and to the Conference of the usual special report on apartheid.

The IOE meeting about which questions had been raised had been held under the sole responsibility of the IOE, and the ILC had taken no part either in the meeting itself or in the preparatory work, nor had it incurred any extra costs in respect of its organisation.

It was common practice for the ILO to make facilities, in particular meeting rooms, available to organisations so requesting, and indeed it seemed a good thing that major organisations with consultative status, like the ICE, should enjoy such facilities.

As far as the ILO's action against apartheid was concerned, it was an uphill struggle for which, year after year, new techniques had to be devised. There were no normal channels of communication with South Africa, and it would seem that any opportunity for obtaining information about conditions there, and the fate of Black workers in particular, should be welcomed. As Mr. Georget had pointed out, the IOE meeting had been held in accordance with paragraph 6(c) of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid in South Africa, which referred to action by employers' and workers' organisations, and Mr. Sene, in that connection, had made the very important point that action against apartheid was not solely the concern of governments: it was also the concern, and indeed the responsibility, of employers' organisations and trade unions "within their sphere of competence", as paragraph 6(c) of the Declaration stated. The Workers' determination to act had been repeatedly demonstrated, notably in connection with the Livingstone meeting, and the IOE likewise could hardly fail to develop its anti-apartheid activities in that same spirit.

In the circumstances the Office had had every reason to offer facilities; but it had not, once again, assumed any responsibility for the meeting, nor participated in either its holding or its preparation.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

THIRTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Multinational Enterprises

In reply to a question from Mr. Chhary Sappor, the Director-General explained that the Committee had not met because there had been no business to bring before it.
The Governing Body noted that no paper was before it under this item of its agenda.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings

Agenda of the Eighteenth Session of the Asian Advisory Committee

The Chairman pointed out that approval of the second item on the proposed agenda of the Asian Advisory Committee - "Report of the tripartite team for the evaluation of ILO technical co-operation activities in an Asian country" - would be conditional on Governing Body acceptance of the principle of sending such teams when it case to discuss the report of the Committee on Operational Programmes.¹

Mr. Sastradji-ja-ja (Government, Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Asian Government group, announced its approval of the proposed agenda for the Asian Advisory Committee. The group considered that it was in conformity with the conclusions of the Eighth Asian Labour Ministers' Conference held in Manila in 1980. They took the view, however, that sub-item 4(b) should be taken to cover disabled persons. The group also thought it would be helpful to add a fifth item on "other business", to give members of the Committee an opportunity to raise new questions if they so wished.

Mr. Mehta (Worker, India) expressed the approval of the Workers' group for the proposed agenda.

It seemed illogical, especially in the light of the policy of decentralisation, to hold the meeting in Geneva, and he hoped that, while keeping expenditure within reasonable bounds, it would be found possible to hold it in the region.

Mr. Oeghelin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' support for the proposed agenda, on the understanding that the topics listed under item 4 would in fact be discussed in depth by the Asian Regional Conference and not the Committee.

The Chairman, replying to Mr. Mehta, agreed that it would be desirable for the Committee to meet in Asia. The decision to hold it in Geneva had been a compromise, the original proposal to the Governing Body having been that it should not be held at all in this biennium for financial reasons. The holding of the meeting in conjunction with a session of the Governing Body was an experiment, in the light of whose outcome it would be possible to decide whether to hold any more meetings of that type in Geneva.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 16 of the Office paper.

Agenda of the Sixth Session of the Inter-American Advisory Committee

The Chairman pointed out that the position regarding the second item on the proposed agenda was the same as in the case of the paper on the agenda for the Asian Advisory Committee.

Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Employer, Mexico) said that the Employers' group, after studying the paper very carefully and consulting all the employers of the American continent, agreed with the proposed agenda. The group also endorsed the proposal to

¹ See eighth sitting, p. VIII/4.
Mr. Charry Samper (Government, Colombia) stated that his Government also agreed with the proposed agenda for the Inter-American Advisory Committee. It had some comments to make, in addition, on the agenda of the next Conference of American States Members of the ILO.

First, it felt that the Conference should review the action taken on the resolutions adopted at the last one in Medellín. As it happened, one of the conclusions adopted at Medellín related to decentralisation, concerning which Mr. Mehta had raised a point earlier in connection with the agenda for the Asian Advisory Committee. It was indeed paradoxical that regional meetings should be held in Geneva at a time when the Organisation was pursuing a policy of decentralisation designed to bring about a two-way flow of ideas.

Second, it was to be hoped that the tripartite evaluation team would take account of the conclusions reached by the team that had visited Senegal, which were of the utmost interest.

Third, Colombia attached the greatest importance to the concept of horizontal technical co-operation, and would make proposals to include the question in the agenda of the next American Regional Conference. There was general support, not only in Latin America but in the Third World as a whole, for a model of technical co-operation that was not based on the donor-recipient relationship. At the recent meeting of Ministers of Labour in Santo Domingo, he had made a proposal to that effect which had received unanimous support. As often as possible, technical co-operation in Latin America should rely on experts from the region, who were as competent as those from the advanced countries, especially in certain fields.

He also agreed with the analysis of PACT as regards urban development and employment, and rural development with special reference to indigenous populations.

Lastly, he hoped that the papers would in future be circulated in time to enable all concerned to study them carefully and set their priorities accordingly.

Mexico also endorsed the proposed agenda, and attached special importance to the report of the tripartite evaluation team and the application of international labour standards. The discussion on the first point would also be useful, as it would show the impact in the Americas of the activities covered by the Medium-Term Plan. The proposals for the agenda of the next regional conference would have to be examined with care. As Mr. Charry Samper had suggested, it might be necessary to enlarge the discussion to cover the action taken to implement the resolutions adopted at Medellín.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) likewise endorsed the proposed agenda. Cuba too attached special importance to items 2 and 3. He agreed, furthermore, with the Employers on the need for a brief report on the ratification and application of standards in the Americas.

Any future meetings of the Committee should be held in the region.

Regarding the items proposed for the agenda of the regional conference, the Cuban Government would make its priorities known at the proper time.

Mr. González Navarro (Worker, Venezuela) expressed his full agreement with Mr. Charry Samper and Miss González Martinez on the need to resist any centralising tendencies.

Mr. Rogers (Government, Barbados), while appreciating the reasons given by the Office for convening the Committee in Geneva, hoped that more meetings of this type
would be held in the regions. He supported the proposed agenda and agreed that the Committee should discuss the action taken on the Medellin resolutions.

Mr. Walcott (Worker, Barbados) attached particular importance to the question of labour standards, especially human rights, which were in jeopardy in the American region.

As regards the item on urban development and employment proposed for the regional Conference, emphasis should be on employment promotion in urban areas rather than on urban development as such, which did not concern the IOC.

There was merit in the arguments put forward in favour of having the Committee meet in the region; on the other hand, it might be that a meeting held in Geneva would make it easier to see the issues in perspective.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Galer, Assistant Director-General) thanked all the members of the Governing Body who had spoken on this item and assured them, on behalf of the Director-General, that careful note would be made of their comments. The holding of the meeting in Geneva did not mean that there had been any relaxation in the policy of decentralisation, but simply reflected special circumstances which were known to all. For the following meeting, due account would be taken of the observations made.

As regards item 1 on the proposed agenda, he could inform Mr. Charry Samper that the Office paper would of course deal with the follow-up to the Medellin conference and would cover the question of horizontal co-operation in the Americas, which had been going on for some years between some of the countries represented in the Governing Body.

On item 3, Mr. Yllanes Ramos and Mr. Walcott might be assured that the Office paper would make full allowance for the concerns felt by their groups.

Lastly, in reply to Mr. Walcott, the Office quite agreed that it must confine itself to job creation in the cities of Latin America and the Caribbean and not deal with urban development as such.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 17 of the Office paper.

The sitting closed at 6:15 p.m.
THIRD SITTING

(Wednesday, 3 March 1982, morning)

At this sitting, which was held in private, the Governing Body considered a report of its Officers concerning the representation presented by the International Organisation of Employers under Article 24 of the Constitution alleging non-observance of the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105), by Nicaragua, which was submitted to it under the 16th item of its agenda (Report of the Director-General: Fourth supplementary report).

In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 4, of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the minutes of this sitting are being issued separately.
FOURTH SITTING
(Wednesday, 3 March 1982, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.55 a.m. with Mr. Ventejol in the Chair.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA
Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings

Third paper

The Governing Body approved the recommendations in paragraphs 1, 2, 6 and 17 of the Office paper.

FIFTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA
Symposia, seminars and assimilated meetings

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) recalled his earlier suggestion that the paper should first be discussed in the Committee on Operational Programmes and submitted to the Governing Body as part of the report of that Committee. He proposed that the Officers of the Governing Body examine this suggestion.

It was surprising to see in paragraph 10 of the paper that the Inter-American Vocational Training Research and Documentation Centre (CINTERFOB) proposed to hold meetings in Guatemala and Paraguay, having regard to the attitude of those two countries towards the Organisation. As was plain from the reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association and other bodies, the Government of Guatemala had consistently refused to co-operate with them. Moreover, would the ILO be able to guarantee the safety of participants in a meeting held in Guatemala? As concerned Paraguay, it was questionable, in view of its substantial and long-standing arrears of contributions, whether it was appropriate to hold ILO meetings in that country. It was true that CINTERFOB was a relatively autonomous body, but if it did not take account of such important ILO realities the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee might be obliged to reconsider the ILO's financial support. The necessary influence should be brought to bear on the Centre so as to ensure that its meetings were fully acceptable to the Governing Body.

The Chairman agreed that the Officers of the Governing Body should examine Mr. Muhr's suggestion concerning the procedure for the submission of the paper.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) said that the Office had considered the suggestion at the time it had originally been made, but the major difficulty was that the Committee on Operational Programmes met only twice yearly, whereas the programme of symposia, seminars and assimilated meetings had to be brought to the attention of the Governing Body at each session. A synoptic table of such meetings held in the course of the previous period was, however, submitted to the Committee on Operational Programmes, thus providing the Committee with an opportunity to discuss related questions of policy, if it so desired. Needless to say, if the Officers wished to examine the matter it could be left in their hands.

As regards Mr. Muhr's remarks about the meetings planned by CINTERFOB, a body which received support both from the ILO and from national vocational training

---

1 See also second and eighth sittings.
institutes, the Centre's programme of activities was determined in close consultation with the ILO. The Governing Body had not so far taken a firm position concerning the exclusion from ILO technical co-operation activities of countries which did not comply with ILO standards on freedom of association or other important principles of the Organisation. However, the points made by Mr. Muhr would certainly be borne in mind for the future.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) asked that in future care should be taken to ensure consistency in the nomenclature used to denote the regional or subregional nature of the various meetings.

Mr. Rogers (Government, Barbados) observed that no provision for the English-speaking Caribbean countries appeared to have been made in the activities planned by CINTERBOH.

The Governing Body took note of the Office paper.

SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

I. Obituary

The Chairman pointed out that the Governing Body was informed of the death of two prominent figures who had been closely associated with the Organisation, namely Mr. Alun Morgan, who for many years had represented the United Kingdom Government in the Governing Body and at the Conference, and Mr. Manuel Conde Bandrés, a former Employer member of the Governing Body and former Employers' delegate of Spain at the Conference. The Governing Body would certainly wish to ask the Director-General to transmit its condolences to their families.

The Director-General said that the Office paper not only reviewed the careers of the persons mentioned within their own countries but paid tribute to their eminent services to the Organisation. Members of the Governing Body would no doubt have a particularly vivid memory of Mr. Alun Morgan who, during his long association with the Organisation, had demonstrated a keen and at times passionate interest in its activities. The speaker was among those who had known Mr. Morgan personally, had felt for him warm friendship and had held him in high esteem. Mr. Morgan had not only served his country well but also the Organisation, to which he had been deeply attached.

The same could be said about Mr. Manuel Conde Bandrés, who had in particular participated in the Conference at a time especially rich in contacts between Spain and the Organisation. In keeping with the usual practice but, at the same time, with all the sadness which the loss of these figures inspired, the Director-General would convey the Governing Body's condolences to the families of Mr. Alun Morgan and Mr. Manuel Conde Bandrés.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' thanks to the Director-General for what he had said and written about Mr. Manuel Conde Bandrés, a highly esteemed member of their group who had represented the Spanish Employers at a crucial juncture both in the relations between Spain and the ILC and in Spanish history. Mr. Conde Bandrés had served both Spain and the ILC well.

The Employers' group wished to join also in the tribute to Mr. Alun Morgan. The speaker had known him well and remembered in particular their long discussions on the niceties of French linguistic usage, which went to show his openness to other cultures and capacity for dialogue. Mr. Morgan's memory would endure among those who had known him.
Mr. Huhre (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) said that the Worker members also had learned with much regret of the death of these two figures and wished to associate themselves with the condolences to their families.

The Workers were greatly saddened by the loss of Mr. Alun Morgan, who for many years had been a familiar figure in the ILO. Mr. Morgan had always understood the problems of workers and listened sympathetically to what they had to say. He was thus someone with whom the Workers' group had established particularly close cooperation and from whom it had received good advice and support. The Workers remembered Mr. Morgan especially for his sense of humour and his help in difficult situations. He had died far too early, and the Workers wished to extend to his widow and to the Government of the United Kingdom their most sincere condolences.

Mr. González-Martínez (Government, Mexico) associated the Government group with the condolences expressed on the death of Mr. Alun Morgan. As previous speakers had rightly said, Mr. Morgan had been an eminent figure in the life of the Organisation. Some had seen him in action, while others had learned about the impressive role he had played by reading his speeches. Not only had he upheld the principles and aims of the ILO in the meetings which he had attended, but he had issued them with a strength and vigour which betokened an active personal involvement over and above the demands of his official duties.

The Government group had also learned with deep sadness of the death of Mr. Manuel Conde Bandrés, whose contribution had been so eloquently described by Mr. Oechslin, and wished to express their condolences to his family and to the Employers' group.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) wished to add a personal word to the tributes to the memory of Mr. Morgan, who had befriended him when he had been new to the Governing Body. Mr. Morgan's readiness to offer assistance, his sense of humour and excellent knowledge of German had greatly facilitated his initiation into the Organisation. He would always remember Mr. Morgan with affection.

Mr. Waterton (Government, Australia) said that Mr. Alun Morgan had also been a personal friend. The remarks by the previous speakers made it clear that he had been a striking personality, not only because of his sense of humour but also because of his thorough knowledge of the Organisation, which had been a source of advice and guidance to less experienced members of the Governing Body. Mr. Morgan's passing was a great loss and source of sorrow, and the Australian Government associated itself with the condolences to his widow and to the United Kingdom Government.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) had been deeply moved by the tributes paid to his former colleague, Mr. Alun Morgan. Alun Horgan had been for the greater part of his career closely involved with a number of international organisations which had contributed so notably to the construction and development of the post-war world. However, his association with the ILO had been particularly close, especially as the representative of the United Kingdom Government in the Governing Body. The speaker extended warm thanks to all those who had paid tribute to Mr. Morgan's contribution.

Among the various aspects of Mr. Morgan's association with the Organisation, Governing Body members would surely recall his role in the Building Subcommittee, which had supervised the construction of the magnificent building in which the Governing Body was now meeting and which was thus a monument to his work. At a more personal level, Mr. Morgan, with his profound concern for human rights and dignity, had been genuinely convinced of the need for better international understanding and the importance of the aims of the ILO. He had also been a man of wide culture and linguistic ability which had enabled him to participate in an exceptionally constructive way in the work of the Organisation. Opinions might differ about whether the British were insular, but Mr. Morgan surely had not been so. Mr. Morgan's widow would certainly be greatly moved by the appreciation which had been expressed and which the Director-General would be conveying to her on behalf of the Governing Body.

Mr. Villares Ramos (Employer, Mexico), on behalf of the Spanish-speaking Employers, expressed sorrow at the passing of Mr. Manuel Conde Bandrés, who had discharged his responsibilities with dignity, competence and authority during a particularly difficult period. When he had left the Governing Body he had been ably replaced by Mr. Vicente Castellano Sabater, now unfortunately absent and unable to take part in the tribute to the memory of his distinguished countryman.
The speaker considered it his duty to announce also the death of Mr. Luis Galdós García, another former Employer delegate of Spain to the Conference and a man of extraordinary character who, during a very difficult period for his country, had acted with dignity, ability and objectivity, in the best tradition of a Spanish gentleman.

The Spanish-speaking Employers wished their deepest sympathy to be conveyed to the families of Mr. Manuel Conde Bandrés and Mr. Luis Galdós García.

The Chairman, associating himself with the tributes and expressions of sympathy, said that they would be communicated to the families of the deceased.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 6 and 12 of the report.

II. Composition of the Organisation

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) extended a warm welcome to Antigua and Barbuda on joining the ILO. He was sure that the new Member would play a full and constructive part in the Organisation's work.

Mr. Rogers (Government, Barbados) also associated himself with the welcome to Antigua and Barbuda, whose government had for a number of years taken an active part in the work of the Conference and would surely continue to play a useful role in furthering the aims and objectives of the Organisation.

Miss González Martinez (Government, Mexico) expressed her Government's satisfaction at the entry of Antigua and Barbuda. Mexico looked forward to welcoming the new Member's delegation at the next session of the Conference and was happy to note this addition to the American group, in particular the group of English-speaking Caribbean countries.

The Chairman took it that the Governing Body as a whole warmly welcomed the entry of Antigua and Barbuda into the Organisation.

The Governing Body took note of this part of the report.

III. Composition of the Governing Body, Governing Body committees and various bodies

Mr. Ajai (Government, Nigeria) hoped that the Office could clarify what appeared to be an anomaly in the composition of Governing Body committees. Without going into the reasons why there were now 11 States of chief industrial importance even though the Constitution provided only for 10, he wondered why China - which was one of those States - was listed as a member of certain Governing Body committees, when, as everybody knew, it was not participating in the work of the Organisation. Had China applied for membership of those committees or had an application been made on its behalf?

The Director-General said that the essential consideration to be borne in mind was that China was still legally a Member of the Organisation. That being so, it was to be hoped that China would one day take its rightful place and participate fully in the work of the Organisation, at which time the situation referred to by Mr. Ajai would reflect reality.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 2C of the report.

IV. Progress of international labour legislation

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) asked that cases of the coming into force of Conventions - which were important events - should be given more prominent treatment in the report, possibly appearing in a separate paragraph with its own heading.
Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) regretted the denunciation by Sri Lanka of the Night Work (Women) Convention (Revised), 1948 (No. 89). While the Organisation no longer had the possibility of influencing the country's legislation in that field, the Workers appealed to the Government to provide protection for women workers through any appropriate legislative action.

The Governing Body took note of this part of the report.

V. Internal administration

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) wondered why the Governing Body was informed only of some appointments in the Director and Principal Officer category, while other important appointments made during the same period were not mentioned. He understood that it was the practice to report only the cases where officials entered the Director and Principal Officer category, but no doubt the Governing Body would also be interested to know about all staff movements in that category.

The Director-General confirmed that only appointments and promotions to the Director and Principal Officer category were reported and that it was not the practice to report on staff movements within that category. However, in future more complete information would be provided.

The Governing Body took note of this part of the report.

VI. Publications and documents

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) observed that there was a tendency for an increasing number of publications of general interest to appear in English only, even allowing for the time lag between the issue of the original publication and the translated versions. For example, important reports on multinational enterprises still had not been issued in French and Spanish. While it might not be necessary for certain publications to appear in all the working languages, for instance where they were of primary interest to specific regions, such cases were rare, and the general rule that publications should be issued in the three working languages should be observed.

The Employers, noting that a new publication, International Labour Conventions and Recommendations, 1919-1981, was "arranged by subject-matter", did not agree with this presentation. Conventions and Recommendations were the product of their times and should be placed in the historical context in which they had been adopted. The Employers had already expressed their disagreement with a publication along such lines, notably in the Working Party on Standards, and it would be a pity if it were to appear, since the traditional presentation by sessions of the Conference was more in keeping with the nature of international labour standards.

Mr. Armstrong (Government, Canada) referred to a recent joint UNFPA/ILO publication entitled Child work, poverty and underdevelopment. This was an impressive piece of work and he wished to commend it to the Governing Body's attention.

The Director-General said that Mr. Oechslin had well stated the problem of the translation of Office publications.

The problem was twofold. First, the necessary budgetary resources were not always available to cover the costs of translation and publication in the three working languages. However, the Office would make a particular effort to ensure that important reports, such as those concerning multinational enterprises, to which Mr. Oechslin had referred, were translated and published. Secondly, there was a timing problem. It was regrettable not only that certain publications were not translated systematically into the other working languages, but also that a considerable period elapsed between the issue of the original publication and that of the translated versions. Here too an effort would be made to ensure better synchronisation.
The problem was not new and would no doubt be raised again in the Governing Body. However, while the principle that Office publications should appear in the three working languages was unquestionable, there were certain factors, including their sales potential in various groups of countries and regions, that could not be ignored.

The Governing Body took note of this part of the report.

First supplementary report

Tripartite evaluation team on ILO technical co-operation in Asia

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 8 of the report and, on the nomination of the three groups, appointed the tripartite evaluation team as follows:

Government member:
Mr. KIRUBANATHAN (Malaysia)

Employer member:
Mr. GEOVE (United States)
Substitute: Mr. APPADURAI (Sri Lanka)

Worker member:
Mr. MEHTA (India)
Substitute: Mr. AHMED (Pakistan)

Second supplementary report

Complaints concerning the observance by Panama of the Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936 (No. 53), the Repatriation of Seamen Convention, 1926 (No. 23), and the Food and Catering (Ships' Crews) Convention, 1946 (No. 68), made by the Government of France under Article 26 of the ILO Constitution

Mr. Delarbre (Government, France), without awaiting the final outcome of the matter, wished to pay tribute to the Government of Panama for its understanding of the spirit in which the Government of France had made the complaints and for having loyally agreed to revise its legislation, with ILO assistance. In this way the Government had helped to develop a sort of new procedure for the application of Article 26 of the Constitution, which conceivably might be followed in other cases where governments displayed the same spirit of open-mindedness and loyalty.

Mrs. Aizpurua de Constantino (Government, Panama), recalling that the reasonable complaints made by the Government of France had led to the drawing up of a maritime labour code covering seamen employed on ships flying the Panamanian flag, expressed appreciation of the valuable assistance provided by the representatives of the French Government in Geneva, which had made this result possible. The Government of Panama was also most grateful for the technical assistance provided by the Office through its expert, Mr. Argiroffo, in the preparation of the new legislation. The draft labour code would be submitted to the legislature for approval during the coming week.

Subject to its deciding in principle to continue the practice of tripartite evaluation missions for the duration of the Medium-Term Plan, 1982-87. A decision to this effect was taken at the eighth sitting.
Miss González Martinez (Government, Mexico) associated herself with the tributes paid to the Governments of Panama and of France for their constructive approach in overcoming the obstacles arising out of legislation which was perhaps not in conformity with the ILO Conventions. The Office had made an outstanding contribution and the present case was a further example of how, through dialogue and mutual co-operation, a solution could be found for problems connected with the application of Conventions. The Minister of labour of Panama had been good enough to inform the speaker recently of the status of the draft legislation, which was ready for submission to the legislature. The Government of Panama deserved to be congratulated on this achievement, and it was to be hoped that the draft law would be fully approved.

The Chairman thanked all the members of the ILO staff who had contributed to this satisfactory result.

The Governing Board took note of the report.

Third supplementary report

Procedure for the appointment of Conference committees

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers would refrain from taking part in the decision on this question.

The Governing Board adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the report.

Fifth supplementary report

Commission of inquiry to examine the observance of Conventions by the Dominican Republic and Haiti

The Governing Board adopted the recommendation in paragraph 2 of the report.

Sixth supplementary report

Report of the Working Party on Structure

The Governing Board adopted the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the report.

Eighth supplementary report

Report of the Officers of the Governing Body

The Governing Board adopted the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the report.
EIGHTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies

Eleventh Session of the Coal Mines Committee (Geneva, 20-29 April 1962)

On the nomination of the Government group, the Governing Body appointed Mr. WOOLGAR (United Kingdom) as the Government member of the Governing Body delegation to, and Chairman of, this meeting.

EIGHTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Allocations Committee

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), while agreeing with the procedure envisaged in paragraph 4 relating to the assessment of the contribution of San Marino, considered that San Marino's application for membership of the ILO raised a more fundamental problem, namely whether in international law it was qualified to participate in an organisation like the ILO. This was, of course, a matter for the Conference to decide, but the Office should make available to the Conference all relevant information on the legal problems posed by the application of San Marino, including its situation with regard to the United Nations and other international organisations.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) said that the necessary information would be provided to the Conference.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 13 of the report.

The sitting closed at 12.15 p.m.

---

1 See also eighth sitting, p. VIII/11.
FIFTH SITTING
(Wednesday, 3 March 1982, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.20 p.m. with Mr. Ventelol in the Chair.

SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

Fifth supplementary report


The Chairman announced that the Governing Body, having considered this matter in private sitting, had decided that the representation was receivable and had appointed the following committee to examine it: Government member: Mr. Andersen (Denmark); Employer member: Mr. Castellano Sabater (Spain); Worker member: Mr. Maier (Austria).

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association

Mr. Delarbre (Government, France), introducing the Committee's 214th, 215th and 216th Reports, said that the Committee had had before it an unprecedented number of cases - 112 altogether; worse yet, more than half of these concerned violations of basic freedoms, involving the death of trade unionists, their imprisonment and torture and suspension of trade union activities. The Committee had expressed deep concern in the cases relating to Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Morocco, Nicaragua, Poland and Turkey.

In paragraphs 4-11 of the 214th Report, concerning cases adjourned because governments' observations had still not been received, had arrived late or were incomplete, it would be seen that the Committee had addressed urgent appeals for observations to the governments of the Sudan and Grenada in respect of cases concerning the arrest of trade union leaders. As regards the effect given to its previous recommendations (paragraphs 12-26), it had noted with interest the release of a number of trade unionists in Uruguay (paragraph 12), and the reinstatement of trade unionists in Morocco and Mali (paragraphs 20 and 22). As regards Morocco, Poland and Turkey, it had urged the governments to accept on-the-spot missions (paragraphs 574, 678 and 751).

In the 215th Report concerning Guatemala, the Committee proposed, given the seriousness of the case and the persistent lack of response from the Government, that the Governing Body should give the report the widest possible distribution.

As regards the 216th Report concerning Nicaragua, the Committee had, in the light of the information obtained by the ILO mission which had visited the country and the observations since received from the Government, reached final conclusions which were submitted to the Governing Body for approval.

---

1 See also third, fourth and eighth sittings.
Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) agreed with Mr. Delarbre that the volume of complaints was preoccupying. But it was probably also a sign of greater awareness of the possibilities offered by the ILO freedom of association machinery, and in that sense it was an encouragement to the ILO to pursue its efforts.

That machinery’s effectiveness, however, depended on dialogue based on cooperation from all the parties. Although such cooperation was sometimes lacking, it was certainly incumbent on all who had subscribed to the international principles upheld by the Committee.

In cases of particular difficulty or complexity, on-the-spot missions could play a useful role in determining the facts, dispelling misunderstandings and facilitating a solution. Their purpose was to assist and not harass governments, and they had proved their value.

Regarding the 214th Report, it was to be hoped that the governments of Nicaragua and Romania would provide the information requested in paragraphs 5 and 10. In the case of Nicaragua, the ILO mission which had visited the country in connection with Case No. 1084 had reminded the Government that it was expected to supply further information relating to the murder of an employer leader and the repressive measures taken against employers’ and trade union organisations. As regards Case No. 1066 concerning Romania, the Government was called upon to furnish information and explanations about the allegations of exile, arrest and internment in psychiatric hospitals.

The Employers associated themselves with the urgent appeals addressed to the governments of the Sudan, Grenada and Greece, which had been given notice that the Committee would present a report at its next meeting on the substance of the cases even if the governments’ observations had not been received at that date.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) associated the Workers with the concern expressed by Mr. Delarbre at the mounting number of cases before the Committee.

Mr. Verschueren had already drawn attention to paragraph 5 of the 214th Report listing governments which had failed to reply, namely El Salvador, Brazil, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, Bahrain, Greece and Mauritania. Those governments, as well as those mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 10 and those of the Sudan and Grenada (paragraph 11), should provide the information requested as a matter of urgency so that the Committee might act at its next meeting.

The many cases concerning Colombia gave cause for concern and faced the Committee with a very heavy task, in which it was heavily dependent on the Government’s cooperation.

The Workers unanimously accepted all the recommendations in three reports, with the exception of Case No. 1097 (Poland).

TWO HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH REPORT

Mr. Barnabo (Worker, Togo) expressed particular concern at the cases mentioned in paragraph 5 of the report. Trade union freedoms in Africa were under attack, and if governments did not provide the information requested it was often because they were bent on pursuing or even intensifying their repressive measures against the workers. In those circumstances, to adjourn examination of a complaint could only lead to further delay and suffering. Therefore even if a government had not replied, as in the case of Mauritania where the complaints were of long standing and had been brought before the national courts, the Committee should proceed to examine the case. Those referred to in paragraph 5 should be examined by the Committee at its next meeting.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 2, 32, 33, 45, 55, 62, 69, 79, 92, 106, 126, 148, 163, 175, 189, 211, 220, 234, 249, 269, 280 and 290 of the report.

Mr. Subrahmanya (Government, India), referring to Case No. 1024 concerning India, considered that the observations made in paragraphs 299 and 300 were based on an inadequate appreciation of the facts. The statement, unexceptionable in itself, that arrests and dismissals of strikers after a period of industrial action involved dangers to freedom of association might, in the context of a particular complaint, give the impression that such dangers existed in the case in question.
Such an impression would be totally false in the present case. Although India had not ratified Convention No. 87, freedom of association was fully assured under the Constitution, and the Industrial Disputes Act recognised the right to strike. In cases, however, where workers did not observe the prescribed grievance procedures the Government had to act to enforce the law.

In the present case, which had been explained in great detail to the Committee, a minority unrecognised union with a membership of barely 11,000, as compared with the over 1.29 million workers in the recognised federations, had resorted to violence, coercion and intimidation designed to hold to ransom the entire railway system, thus placing the entire economy in jeopardy. The Government had been compelled to act, but had taken only minimal action, as the Committee itself had recognised, and the persons affected were free to seek redress through the courts of law, as in fact most of them had done. Freedom of association, which the Government fully respected, had in no way been endangered.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 300 of the report.

Mr. Martins da Cruz (Government, Portugal) stressed his Government's respect for the Committee's recommendations.

Case No. 1042 concerning Portugal was one of the first relating to the application of Convention No. 151, which perhaps explained why the Government had difficulty in interpreting the Committee's conclusions and recommendations. There seemed, at any rate, to be a contradiction between paragraphs 324, 325 and 331(a), on the one hand, and paragraphs 326 and 327 on the other, in the sense that, in the context of Convention No. 151, the concept of "confidence" was linked with the procedures for the settlement of disputes and not with the decisions of the Government. Moreover, Convention No. 151 had not yet entered into force for Portugal at the time of the events in question.

There also appeared to be a lack of precision in paragraphs 328 and 331(c) as regards the nature of the appeal lodged against the court's decision.

In any event, the Government would without fail keep the Committee informed so that it might, in that light, consider the case further.


Mr. Subrahmanya (Government, India) said that the Government of India would give due consideration to the recommendations in paragraph 540 relating to Case No. 1069.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 540 of the report.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) underlined the seriousness of Cases Nos. 997, 999 and 1029 relating to Turkey.

According to paragraph 559, the Government had stated that a process of normalisation and restoration of democracy had begun. However, recent developments, including the arrest of counsel for the defence of the 52 DISK leaders, proved the contrary. The Committee's recommendations, particularly those in paragraph 574(b), were therefore particularly welcome.

In view of the gravity of these cases, the Government should be urged most strongly to accept a direct contacts mission.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) associated the Employers with Mr. Maier's concern about the situation in Turkey. The Government's refusal to accept a direct contacts mission was particularly disquieting, and it should be urged to do so in order to throw full light on the situation.

Mr. Wallin (Government, Belgium) expressed his Government's deep concern about the lack of any immediate prospect of a return to democracy in Turkey and the severe repressive measures taken against Turkish trade unionists. The arrest of the defence counsel for those imprisoned, referred to by Mr. Maier, showed how serious the situation was.

The European Community, also disturbed by the situation in Turkey, was requesting the Government to receive an envoy, who in all likelihood would be the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs.
The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 574, 584, 603, 617, 628 and 692 of the report.

Mr. Issifu (Worker, Ghana) expressed the Workers' grave concern about Case No. 1054 relating to Morocco.

According to paragraph 665, the Government felt that no mission to Morocco was needed, in view of the detailed observations it had sent. That was, however, contradicted by the requests in paragraph 678 for further information regarding the death, arrest and conviction of trade unionists. In the circumstances, the Office should make a special effort to persuade the Government to accept an on-the-spot mission to ascertain the facts in the interests of the trade unionists concerned.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) supported Mr. Issifu's request, since there did indeed appear to be a discrepancy between the allegations and the Government's explanations. The Employers also favoured a direct contacts mission to ascertain the facts.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 678 and 695 of the report.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Nqack (Government, German Democratic Republic) on a question of procedure related to Case No. 1097 (Poland), said that the representative of the Government of Poland, who was present in the room, had made a request in writing to the Chairman to be granted the right to speak. He hoped that the Chairman would accede to this request, to help the Governing Body to form a clear idea about the situation in Poland. Article 26, paragraph 5, of the ILO Constitution was relevant in that context.

The Chairman said that, having anticipated the question, he had prepared the following statement:

In the first place, there is no provision in the Standing Orders of the ILO Governing Body dealing with participation in its sessions by representatives of governments of member States which are not members of the Governing Body. However, given the public nature of most Governing Body meetings, a practice has developed whereby such governments are increasingly represented by observers. More recently, it has even become the practice for these observers, if they inform the Director-General in advance of their intention to follow the proceedings of a particular session, to have seats reserved in the name of their country. Furthermore, the list of persons attending a session of the Governing Body includes a list of "representatives of other States Members of the Organisation present at the session". These representatives of States which are not members of the Governing Body are not permitted to take part in the proceedings and consequently are not entitled to speak.

As has often been pointed out, this situation stems not only from the absence of any relevant rules but also basically from the fact that if the entire ILO membership were permitted to speak, the size of Governing Body sessions would approach that of the General Conference. Moreover, there would be hardly any distinction between Government deputy members and the representatives of States which are not members of the Governing Body.

However, the Constitution provides for two exceptions whereby a State which is not a member of the Governing Body may take part in its proceedings. In the first place, under Article 26 any government which has ratified a Convention has the right to file a complaint, as defined in that article and subject to the other cases mentioned therein, against another government which has also ratified the Convention. If the latter State is not a member of the Governing Body, it is entitled to send a representative to take part in the proceedings of the Governing Body while the matter is under consideration. The same facility is available to a government against which a representation alleging non-observance of a Convention which it has ratified has been presented by an industrial association of employers or of workers, in
accordance with Article 24 of the Constitution. This rule is confirmed by the Standing Orders concerning the procedure for the examination of such representations made under the ILO Constitution.

It should be emphasised that these are at present the only two cases in which the representative of an ILO member State which is not a member of the Governing Body may take part in its proceedings. This principle has been respected without exception. The question of extending to other cases the right of a representative of a member State which is not a member of the Governing Body to take part in its deliberations has been discussed on a number of occasions. It is at present on the agenda of the Governing Body's Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

When that Committee met recently, its agenda did in fact include the question of the representation of States which are not members of the Governing Body. A number of solutions have been considered. One formula, which was brought up recently and on which the Committee seems to be making progress, concerns possible participation in the proceedings of the Governing Body by a representative of a State which is not a member of the Governing Body when the Governing Body is examining a report of the Committee on Freedom of Association relating to that government.

The Committee on Standing Orders has not yet produced definitive proposals but will continue the discussion at its next meeting in November. It is, of course, understood that what is involved here is the specific complaints procedure established by the Governing Body in November 1951 for the examination of complaints relating to freedom of association presented by governments or industrial organisations, as distinct from the constitutional procedures connected with the non-observance of Conventions provided for in Articles 24 and 26 of the Constitution.

Since, apart from the procedures laid down in these two articles of the Constitution, no other provisions have so far been adopted to extend the right to speak to the representatives of States which are not members of the Governing Body, such representatives are not, under the legal provisions existing at present and apart from the procedures referred to, entitled to speak.

In view of the foregoing, it was not possible at present to accede to the request.

To these arguments of a legal character could be added a practical point. The Governing Body was only at the beginning of the procedure. The report of the Committee on Freedom of Association on the complaint relating to Poland was an interim one, and the Committee would have an opportunity - when further information had become available - to invite the representative of the Government of Poland to appear before it.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) thanked the Chairman for his statement, which he assumed had been prepared by the legal adviser of the Office.

In the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, where the question of representation of States which were not members of the Governing Body was indeed under discussion it had been pointed out that there were no rules on the matter. In that case, it would appear that it was for the Chairman to decide on a request to speak.

From the statement which had been made, it was clear that any member of the Governing Body might speak on a complaint concerning his country, whereas a member State which did not belong to the Governing Body might not. Such a distinction between members of the Organisation was undemocratic, and hence unacceptable.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) fully agreeing with Mr. Noack, recalled that at the November 1981 session of the Governing Body a representative of a non-member government had been allowed to speak on a case concerning his country.

Mr. Marton (Government, Hungary) was surprised that in an organisation like the ILO, which prided itself on its democratic procedures, a representative of a
sovereign member State had to remain silent when its own actions were being discussed. There was clearly much room for improvement in the Organisation's and the Governing Body's working methods.

He appealed to the Chairman, who under Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Standing Orders was empowered to accord or withdraw the right to address the Governing Body to allow the representative of the Government of Poland to speak.

Mr. Petrov (Government, Bulgaria) supported the request.

Mr. Oudovenko (Government, Ukrainian SSR) said that, if the Chairman did not make use of Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Standing Orders, then it was open to the Governing Body itself, under Article 7, paragraph 8, of the Constitution, which empowered it to regulate its own procedure, to authorise the representative of the Government of Poland to speak.

Mr. Muth (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) agreed that the existing arrangements needed to be reviewed, as was in fact being done by the Committee on Standing Orders. Oddly enough, although the procedure had been in force for over 30 years, governments only seemed to react when their own interests were involved.

Definite rules would of course be useful - although it might be objectively argued that, rather than to extend to any government, whether a member or not, the right to plead its case before the Governing Body, the correct course of action would be the reverse, i.e. excluding even Governing Body members from that privilege. The Workers, who had always favoured strengthening the freedom of association procedures and, in that context, often deplored the failure of governments to cooperate, felt that extending to non-members the right to speak in the Governing Body on cases concerning them would further weaken the Committee's authority. The Governing Body would thus be doing itself a disservice, and no change should therefore be made in the existing procedure until all the consequences had been carefully weighed. The practice that had been in force until now should be followed in the present instance, on the understanding that it would subsequently be re-examined with a view to reaching a generally acceptable solution.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) observed that the question of amending the Standing Orders was not before the Governing Body but was pending in the Committee on Standing Orders and Application of Conventions and Recommendations. That being so, the only proper course of action was to apply the existing rules, however imperfect. The Governing Body would thus be discrediting itself if it were to take opportunistic, case-by-case decisions applying a different yardstick to different countries.

On a previous occasion, in a similar situation, the then Chairman of the Governing Body had refused the right to speak to the representative of an ILO member State not represented on the Governing Body. At that time no one had spoken in the government's defence and the Government had deferred to the rules. The governments which were particularly concerned with the present case should do likewise, and the Governing Body should proceed to examine the substance of the case.

Mr. Wullin (Government, Belgium) fully accepted the Chairman's ruling, which was legally unexceptionable.

There was, however, another justification for the procedure being followed, going beyond mere legal propriety. The Committee on Freedom of Association, in fact, was still awaiting a written reply from the Polish Government, pending which it could not reach final conclusions. Should its representative now be allowed to address the Governing Body, there would probably be statements by other governments, which would mean that in effect the discussion was being shifted from the Committee into the Governing Body. The authority and credibility of the Committee on Freedom of Association were arguments in favour of maintaining the established practice. The best way for the Government to vindicate itself was to reply to the allegations and, if it saw fit, to avail itself of the procedure of direct contacts, which was a valuable addition to the traditional purely written procedures.

Mr. Batbavar (Government, Mongolia) associated himself with Mr. Woack's proposal, which was in accordance with Article 26, paragraph 5, of the Constitution. Only the representative of the country concerned was in a position to provide the facts. Any other decision would not be objective.
Mr. Charry Samper (Government, Colombia), after stating his agreement with the Chairman's interpretation of the Standing Orders, as supported by the Employers and Workers, said that he was in favour of the Spanish Government's proposal to give States not represented on the Governing Body the right to speak on matters affecting them. As to whether or not a particular matter did in fact impinge on the national interests and sovereignty of a particular State, only that State itself was qualified to judge.

The Standing Orders were out of date in a number of respects. For instance, paragraph 2 of Article 3 read as follows: "Deputy members have the right to be present at the sittings of the Governing Body and to speak with the permission of the Chairman". Taken literally, this could be interpreted to mean that a deputy member could be refused the right to speak.

Again, paragraph 1 of Article 4 stated that "Each government represented on the Governing Body may furthermore appoint for its regular delegate a substitute of the same nationality, who will replace him should he be absent or unable to attend", while paragraph 2 of the same article stated that "The substitute may accompany the regular delegate during the meetings of the Governing Body. He has not the right to speak". Thus, if Article 4 were strictly interpreted, not even the substitute of a regular delegate had the right to speak.

The present discussion was useful in that it had underlined the need for a reform such as had been proposed by the Government of Spain; but, for the time being, the existing rules had to be applied.

Mr. Cairo Soler had referred to a precedent. However, the precedent known to the speaker — on the basis of his personal experience as Chairman of the Governing Body — was quite the opposite, in that the representative of a Latin American country which was not a member of the Governing Body was neither allowed to speak nor even to have read out a letter concerning a case of violation of trade union rights relating to his country.

As Chairman of the Governing Body, the speaker had naturally respected its point of view. However, it would be quite unacceptable for the Governing Body, having refused a Latin American country the right to speak in a previous case, now to discriminate in favour of a country with a different type of system.

Mr. Delarbre (Government, France) said that, if the Governing Body were to take an ad hoc decision before the Committee on Standing Orders had concluded its examination of the proposals before it, it would be discarding the rule of law in favour of expediency.

As the Chairman had pointed out, the Committee on Freedom of Association was in the early stages of its consideration of the case. It had attempted to single out the points which called for an urgent reply from the Government, but it was well aware that the Government should be allowed, in fairness, to supplement its written reply by oral explanations later if it so wished, in accordance with a procedure repeatedly applied in the past — notably some two years previously, with success, in another case concerning Poland.

The Governing Body might rest assured that, if the Government wished to avail itself of that opportunity, the Committee would at the proper stage be happy to receive its representatives, and all written and oral indications provided by it would be faithfully reported to the Governing Body. The rights of the defence were thus fully safeguarded.

The very purpose of having a Committee on Freedom of Association was to provide for consideration of cases on their merits by a small tripartite body and thus enable the Governing Body itself to reach conclusions without lengthy debate. The present discussion therefore served no useful purpose and, as Mr. Oechslin had suggested, should be closed.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) concluded from the debate that the procedures on freedom of association were not explicit enough. Those giving effect to Articles 24 and 26 of the Constitution were set out in writing and readily accessible, and even though the freedom of association procedure appeared to have functioned satisfactorily for some 30 years, it would be useful if the Governing Body could see it also in writing.
What did seem clear was that, unlike the procedure applicable under Articles 24 and 26, that relating to freedom of association enabled the countries concerned to be heard in the Committee on Freedom of Association only, and not in the Governing Body itself. This matter seemed to require closer scrutiny.

The Chairman considered that he had no option but to apply the existing rules. He accordingly invited discussion on the substance of the case.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association (cont.)

Mr. Rodriguez Navarro (Government, Venezuela) observed that the basic constitutional principle of the ILO whereby universal and lasting peace could be established only if based on social justice could not be separated from two other important aspects of social reality, namely freedom of the individual, which was a basic human need, and freedom of association, which was essential to ensure respect for the rights of labour. The much talked-about new international order could only be built on a foundation of justice and equity.

The Venezuelan Government, having regard to those principles, fully supported the Committee's reports, and especially the recommendations concerning Case No. 1097 relating to Poland. The direct contacts procedure had proved most valuable in enhancing the Committee's effectiveness, and it was to be hoped that, in accordance with paragraph 751(g) of the Committee's recommendations, the Polish Government would agree to receiving an ILO fact-finding mission so that, once the facts had been fully established, the trade union situation in Poland might be restored to normal.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) considered it inappropriate for the ILO to consider the case, since it was not a question of trade union problems but of an organisation known as "Solidarity" which aimed at overthrowing the constitutionally established Government of Poland, as was plain from the facts which the Government had convincingly cited.

During the Gdansk congress of Solidarity, its leaders had openly declared ...

Mr. Hübner (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany: Worker Vice-Chairman) considered that Mr. Kostine was not speaking on a point of order but on the substance of the question. There appeared, therefore, to be no reason to give him the floor before the other speakers on the list.

The Chairman agreed. He would call on Mr. Kostine to speak again in the order in which his name appeared in the list of speakers.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association (cont.)

Mr. Hafer (Worker, Austria) said that the majority of the Workers supported the Committee's recommendations. The case under discussion was not an internal matter for the Government of Poland but derived from its having ratified Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. The Committee on Freedom of Association was therefore perfectly competent to deal with it.

Paragraph 732 of the report quoted the Government as stating that it had passed an "Abolition Act", under which no one could be sentenced for political
activities carried out before 13 December 1981. That statement made strange reading when taken in conjunction with the reference in paragraph 751(c) to persons interned with the sole object of preventing them from carrying on activities pursued prior to 13 December 1981. Those persons should be released immediately, in accordance with the recommendation in paragraph 751(c).

As Mr. Rodriguez Navarro had urged, the Governing Body should endorse the appeal in paragraph 751(g), so that the Government would agree to receive at the earliest an ILO mission to examine not only the legal situation but also the facts.

Mr. Petrov (Government, Bulgaria) observed that, under established practice, a State which was neither a regular nor a deputy member of the Governing Body could request a member of the Governing Body to speak on its behalf. He accordingly wished to make a statement on behalf of Poland.

The Chairman said that he had given Mr. Petrov the floor as the representative of Bulgaria.

Mr. Petrov (Government, Bulgaria) did not consider that the Governing Body was competent to examine the case since the organisation in question was a political one and not a trade union. To do so would therefore constitute a flagrant violation of the ILO Constitution and an interference in the internal affairs of an ILO member State. His Government fully supported the position of the Government of Poland, which had requested permission to make a statement in the Governing Body. There were a number of points in that statement with which he was in complete agreement...

The Chairman reminded the speaker that he was making a statement on behalf of Bulgaria.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) had understood that there was nothing in the Standing Orders to forbid Mr. Petrov from expressing the views of the Polish Government.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) reminded the Governing Body of the precedent referred to earlier by Mr. Charry Samper, when, in a similar case, a government had not been permitted to have a statement made on its behalf by another government.

The Chairman maintained his position. Some explanations might be admissible, but only on condition that they were expressed on behalf of the speaker's organisation or government. The Governing Body would now examine the Committee's report.

Mr. Petrov might, if he so wished, make a statement on behalf of his Government.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association (cont.)

Mr. Petrov (Government, Bulgaria) considered that the present case could not be dealt with either under Article 24 of the Constitution or under the freedom of association procedure.

The information in paragraphs 727, 728 and 729 showed plainly that the activities of Solidarity had gone beyond those of a trade union, since it had fallen under the control of extremist anti-governmental leaders whose objective was to overturn the constitutionally established Government. Those leaders had used the trade union to achieve political objectives at variance both with its own rules and the agreements concluded in 1980 and 1981. Shortly before the proclamation of a
state of war in Poland, Solidarity was clearly seeking to take over political power. That had been confirmed by the decisions taken at Radom and Gdansk in 1981, which had included the creation of terrorist brigades intended to provoke anarchy and economic chaos.

All those actions were in flagrant contradiction with the trade union activities covered by Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. Faced with the threat of economic disaster and bloody civil war, the Government of Poland, after repeated attempts to find a peaceful solution with Solidarity, had had to proclaim a state of war. The issue clearly did not concern freedom of association, but the actions of a political organisation masquerading as a trade union.

Given the seriousness of the situation, the Bulgarian Government was categorically opposed to a procedure that was in conformity neither with Article 24 of the Constitution nor with Article 2 of the Standing Orders. There was no justification for including this question in the Governing Body's agenda, and it should be withdrawn from further consideration.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR), speaking not on the substance but on what he considered to be an illegal procedure, associated himself with Mr. Petrov's remarks.

The ILO had a constitutional obligation to promote the protection of workers' and trade union rights. It was not required to support political organisations openly committed to the overthrow of a member government. Solidarity had made its intentions clear ever since August 1980. At the Gdansk congress its leaders had rejected the principle of an agreement with the Government and had taken the path of confrontation with the legally constituted authorities, thus exposing the country to the risk of civil war and violating the unions' own rules, notably the obligation to conduct its activities within the framework of the national Constitution and to respect the international alliances to which Poland was a party.

As Prime Minister Jaruzelski had stated, Solidarity had shown its true colours at Radom and Gdansk. The Programme adopted at Gdansk called for supervision over the Government's economic policies and over information and communications, education and, more generally, all aspects of national life. Appeals were made for Poland to withdraw from the CMEA and the Warsaw Pact and for the revision of agreements concluded by the Government.

Paragraph 1 of Article 8 of Convention No. 87 stated that "In exercising the rights provided for in this Convention workers ... and their respective organisations ... shall respect the law of the land". But in Poland the law of the land had been grossly and irresponsibly violated by the leaders of Solidarity, which had radically deviated from its trade union objectives.

In such circumstances, for the ILO to examine the complaint would not only be in contradiction with its Constitution but would also constitute blatant interference in the internal affairs of a member State.

Mr. Tanaka (Worker, Japan) associated himself fully with the Worker spokesman and expressed particular support for the recommendations in paragraph 751.

Only the existence and development of free and democratic trade union organisations and a dialogue between them and the government could guarantee an approach to economic and social problems consonant with the best interests of the workers and the nation. The detention of trade unionists for defending the workers' interests constituted a serious violation of trade union rights. It was to be hoped that the Polish trade union, which had been legally recognised by the Government, might resume its activities as quickly as possible on the basis of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, which Poland had ratified.

Last spring, a delegation of Solidarity led by Brother Walesa had visited Japan, and the speaker had been deeply impressed and moved by the determination of the Polish workers to seek social peace and the improvement of their conditions through a free and strong labour movement. The measures taken in December 1981 had come as a severe blow and the Government should move quickly to release the imprisoned trade unionists.

The recommendation in paragraph 751(g) that an ILO mission should be sent to Poland to examine all aspects of the situation was especially important and urgent. Such a step would help to restore hope to the Polish workers.
Miss González Martinez (Government, Mexico) observed that the Committee's report furnished clear and detailed information based both on the complainants' allegation and on the indications provided by the delegation of the Polish Ministry of Labour which had recently visited the ILO, in response to the Director-General's message expressing concern about the situation.

The report told of the detention of trade union leaders and the occupation of trade union premises, in clear contravention of the standards laid down in Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. Thus there was no doubt about the competence of the ILO to deal with the case through the Committee on Freedom of Association and the Governing Body.

The Mexican Government supported the recommendations in paragraph 751 of the report and hoped that the Polish Government would agree to receive the proposed ILO mission. That did not seem likely to raise any insuperable difficulties for the Government, since it had itself described the suspension of trade union activities as a temporary measure. The Mexican Government was confident that, thanks to the Director-General's continuing efforts, the Polish Government would agree to receive the mission.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) expressed surprise at the claim that the complaint did not concern freedom of association. The Committee had had the Polish situation under review for some time, in full agreement with the Polish Government, which had even sent a delegation to appear before it. Throughout that process the same trade union organisation whose activities were now at issue on the ground that they raised political difficulties had been at the heart of the debate.

It was, of course, quite common for governments of all persuasions to brand trade union organisations with which they might be experiencing difficulties as political movements, but that argument had never prevented the Committee from examining the cases, weighing all the evidence and drawing its conclusions.

For some months it had been following events in Poland and had observed that the trade union movement, which aspired not only to more trade union freedom but to more freedom in general, was a widespread and spontaneous one, representing a reaction against certain methods used by the regime towards the workers. It had certainly not been started up, as was now being claimed, by a few dubious individuals for reprehensible motives.

Perhaps the movement had indeed gone a bit far during the last weeks, but, as the Committee was well aware, there were few trade union organisations that did not do so from time to time. Even so, the Polish authorities had seen the need for certain changes and had admitted as much in the Committee. Then suddenly, in December, discussions were abruptly cut off, freedom to voice the workers' demands was stifled and their hard-won gains were suspended, in particular freedom of association and the right to bargain collectively.

As stated in the report, the Government had naturally tried to justify those measures, pointing out that they were purely temporary. However, it was maintaining in detention, in conditions which were unclear, over 4,000 "extremists" whose only offence, by the Government's own admission, was to have been trade union leaders or activists. Then there were the clashes at the Piast mine, which had resulted in a number of deaths, and the dismissals and the pressures brought to bear on the workers to sign the pledge referred to in paragraph 712: all those events required elucidation. The Employers, therefore, were particularly anxious that the imprisoned workers should be released and detailed information provided.

The Committee had suggested that an ILO mission should be sent to Poland to examine all aspects of the situation, both legal - including the draft legislation currently under consideration - and factual - including the situation of the imprisoned workers. There was nothing unusual about such a procedure, which had often been utilised, and the Employers urged the Polish Government to agree to it, with the aim of facilitating return to a situation more in keeping with its expressly acknowledged obligations under Conventions Nos. 87 and 98.

Mr. Searby (Government, United States) asked whether, when a trade union was democratically elected, was representative of a large percentage of a national population and was on the verge of becoming an effective worker organisation, that necessarily made it politically dangerous and therefore illegal. If that were so, then virtually all the large, effective and democratic trade union confederations in the world would have to be deemed politically dangerous and in need of suppression by those with a monopoly of coercive force not consented to by the people.
The case under discussion concerned the basic human right of free civil association, irrespective of ideology. Perhaps Lenin's definition of any worker opposition or disagreement in a socialist State as an anarchist view threatening the Party's leading role might explain the remarks of some of the previous speakers.

As noted in the report, Solidarity was a legitimate trade union organisation. The case thus concerned a fundamental question of freedom of association, universally recognised as an essential means by which nations could determine the forms of social and economic organisation most appropriate to their needs and sovereign national character.

In an overwhelming movement to gain freedom of association and dignity for the nation's workers, the Polish people had joined and supported Solidarity. The recent suppression of that movement posed a challenge to the international principle embodied in the Declaration of Philadelphia that freedom of expression and association was essential to sustained progress.

The imposition of martial law in Poland was also in flagrant disregard of the international treaties to which Poland was a signatory, not least among them ILO Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, which were intended precisely to prevent the kind of situation existing in Poland, where the State was suppressing by force a 10-million strong free trade union movement.

A little over a year ago, the Governing Body had considered a case against Poland. It was ironic that the case had been closed en a note of satisfaction and hope that trade union freedoms would be extended to the Polish workers. It was also ironic that the leader of that national federation should have made such an inspiring speech at the last session of the Conference.

The Government of the United States fully supported the Committee's report and urged the Government of Poland to avail itself of the benefit of due process by sending a full reply and accepting a direct contacts mission.

Mr. Delarbre (Government, France), in reply to those who argued that the ILO was not competent to deal with what allegedly was no longer a trade union issue but a political one, said that the Committee on Freedom of Association was used to dealing with cases where trade union and political activities overlapped or merged, as many of its reports showed. The present debate added nothing to the contents of the 214th Report: well aware of the views of the Polish Government concerning the political nature of the Solidarity movement, the Committee considered itself competent to deal with the present case, and it formally requested the Governing Body to recognise that competence.

Obviously, the mere fact of being a trade unionist was no excuse for irresponsible action. The line had to be drawn somewhere, and in order to do so the Committee had invariably made it a rule to ascertain the full facts of each case before reaching conclusions: that was precisely the purpose of the requests in paragraphs 751(b) to (f) of the report. In paragraph 751(g), the Committee was confirming the steps initiated by the Director-General under the authority conferred upon him by the Governing Body to act in particularly serious or urgent cases without waiting for the Committee to meet. In drafting that paragraph the Committee, fully aware of the Polish Government's difficulties in working out a typically Polish solution to the problem, with the full co-operation of the entire nation and in accordance with the Conventions it had ratified, had merely wanted to help the Government in a fraternal spirit and without any desire whatsoever to interfere in Poland's domestic affairs, bearing in mind that freedom, a basic human need, might be momentarily stifled but could never be suppressed.

Mr. Timmer (Worker, Hungary) agreed that Poland should work out its own solution: the Hungarian trade unions had never felt otherwise.

As a trade union representative, he naturally favoured the lifting of martial law and the restoration of trade union rights. However, the Government had had to take certain steps, in accordance with its Constitution, to avoid economic chaos and civil war.

The Polish workers had learned from the mistakes of the past and had drawn up a programme of reforms, for which they had tried to mobilise mass support. However, certain extremist leaders of the trade union movement, ignoring their own trade union rules, had turned their attention to political questions and tried to
overthrow the existing system. They had used strikes to bring the country to the verge of economic chaos and civil war and to prevent the implementation of the policy of reform. In the circumstances, the proclamation of a state of emergency had been inevitable.

The Polish authorities had stated that as soon as the situation no longer warranted the state of emergency it would be lifted. There were already signs of a return to normal, and the ILO could best speed up that process and help the Polish workers by preventing any interference in Poland's internal affairs.

Mr. Batbavar (Government, Mongolia) said that the case of Poland was quite different from the other cases concerning freedom of association dealt with by the ILO, in that it was not the Government that was violating trade union rights but the trade unions that were violating the law of the land by exceeding their proper functions as defined in international labour Conventions and engaging in activities that directly threatened the legitimate Government.

Yet the ILO was defending these trade unions, which had gone far beyond generally accepted principles of trade union action. It would be more logical if the Governing Body were to call for strict observance by trade unionists of the law and of their own rules and to require them to refrain from political activities directed against the Government.

The Governing Body should not be dealing with a question which was not within the ILO's competence. The leaders of Solidarity were not true trade union leaders but persons who, under the cloak of trade union activities, were trying to seize the reins of power.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) said that the German Democratic Republic, a friendly socialist neighbour of the People's Republic of Poland for over three decades, could not remain indifferent to the fate of its people. Poland was its close partner within the Warsaw Pact, and it was important to stability and peace in Europe. The people of the German Democratic Republic had contributed substantial material aid to show their solidarity with the Polish people.

The measures taken by the highest authority of Poland against anti-government forces whose activities were provoking an imminent danger of civil war, and thereby also threatening stability in Europe, had been designed to safeguard national security, which was an internal affair of Poland, and were in accordance with its Constitution. They served the true interests of the Polish people and the cause of peace, and deserved full support. It was slander to say that human rights were being violated in Poland, when in fact outside forces seeking to exert pressure on the country and to interfere in its domestic affairs were the ones violating the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, the Helsinki agreements and the fundamental standards of international law.

The complaint was therefore not receivable. It had no objective basis and was part and parcel of efforts in certain circles to internationalise the Polish crisis at the expense of the Polish people, to maintain confrontation and change the international balance of power.

Solidarity was not a trade union but a political opposition movement which, in violation of the national Constitution, had set out to undermine systematically the constitutional foundations of the country, to overthrow the legitimate government and to overturn the socialist regime. The culmination of this anti-revolutionary movement was the programme of action drawn up by the leaders of Solidarity, which called for the replacement of members of the representative organs of the Polish people and the constitution of a so-called national government.

Having set up paramilitary organisations and arms depots, the leaders of Solidarity had incited political confrontation and the disregard of law and order. By pressure, threats and force, including the occupation of state undertakings, they had paralysed the economic and social life of the country.

The dramatic increase in purely political strikes had led the country to the brink of economic chaos and jeopardised its international alliances - all this clearly in violation of the August 1980 agreement with the Polish Government and the union's own rules. Solidarity's leaders had rejected all government overtures aimed at finding a solution through dialogue.
Those who maintained that Solidarity was a bona fide trade union and were requesting the release of the interned persons were really asking the Governing Body to intercede on behalf of individuals whose purely political aim of overthrowing the State was beyond doubt.

The United States Government representative had referred to the state of emergency as violating international treaties. In fact, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights permitted such a measure in certain situations. Such a statement was all the more surprising from the representative of a government which, according to its own sources, had taken such measures in a number of recent cases, in particular that concerning the strike of air traffic controllers. Nor was the status of the United States as a defender of human rights enhanced by its support of regimes, such as that in El Salvador, where human rights were trampled underfoot.

In the present circumstances there were clearly no grounds for invoking Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, and any attempt to discuss the case in the ILO would constitute flagrant interference in the internal affairs of an ILO member State and a disregard of its sovereignty.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) observed that the authority of the Committee on Freedom of Association and the Governing Body resided in their objectivity and impartiality.

The Governing Body had just examined Cases Nos. 997, 999 and 1029 relating to Turkey, in which the Government had stated that the trade unionists on trial had participated in terrorist and illegal activities aimed at overthrowing the regime and installing another, and Case No. 1054 relating to Morocco, in which the Government considered that the real motives of the general strike had much more to do with politics than with trade union matters. Such arguments had not prevented the Governing Body from acting on those cases, and it should do likewise at present.

The statement made at the Conference by Brother Walesa, as the official representative of Solidarity, had been remarkable for its moderation, in no way suggesting that the organisation was engaging in political activities. In fact, Brother Walesa had expressed the hope that a solution to the problems at issue could be found within Poland.

In seeking to justify the state of war, a number of speakers had referred to the risk of chaos and civil strife. But were not those who were now passing judgement on the events in Poland themselves interfering in the country's internal affairs?

From the degree of understanding and good will shown by the Government in response to the Committee's recommendations, especially as regards the release of the imprisoned trade unionists, it would be possible to judge whether further action was called for.

Mr. Oudovenko (Government, Ukrainian SSR) stated that the present complaints, allegedly concerning freedom of association, not only gave an exaggerated and tendentious picture of the situation but were part of a campaign being waged by certain Western countries against Poland and the other socialist countries as a result of the failure of the attempts to overthrow the present regime.

In proclaiming a state of war in Poland, the Council of State had acted, in complete conformity with the national Constitution, to preserve the legitimate Government and prevent civil war. At the time, the extremist elements in Solidarity had destroyed the economy, were seeking to bring about anarchy and were blatantly violating the laws in force, including their own agreements with the Government. Those activities had reached their peak with the declarations made at Hadom and Gdansk calling for the overthrow of the established order and the seizure of power. Why, then, had the authors of the complaints not urged the leaders of Solidarity to exercise greater moderation and respect for the law of the land, as called for in paragraph 1 of Article 8 of Convention No. 87? No doubt because the situation served their own ends, by provoking economic chaos, the disruption of social life and the threat of civil war.

Unfortunately, the steps the Director-General had taken so promptly following the proclamation of the state of war in Poland had not been in the right direction. The measures taken by the Government on 13 December 1981, and which had temporarily
brought to a halt the activities of Solidarity, had included the internment of a
group of persons who represented a threat to the security of the State. As the
Government of Poland had clearly stated, no trade union leaders engaged in genuine
trade union activities had been subjected to internment, and the authors of the
complaints knew full well what the true situation was.

An earlier decision of the Committee on Freedom of Association was relevant to
the events in Poland. That decision, which was to be found in the 120th and 131st
Reports of the Committee, read as follows: "Measures taken in a state of emergency
may constitute serious interference by the authorities in trade union affairs,
contrary to Article 3 of Convention No. 87, except where such measures are necessary
because the organisations concerned have diverged from their trade union objectives
and have defied the law ...". It was clear that, viewed in that light, the measures
taken by the Polish authorities were perfectly legal and that the complaints were
unfounded.

If the ILO and its Governing Body really wished to act constructively, and in
accordance with the ILO Constitution, to stabilise the situation in Poland and
promote legitimate trade union interests there, they should first and foremost speak
out against all interference in Poland's domestic affairs so that the Polish people
might, in the full exercise of their sovereign rights, work out their own solutions
to their internal problems.

The ILO could also make a useful contribution by mobilising international
support for the immediate lifting of the discriminatory measures taken against the
Polish people by certain Western countries with the sole objective of aggravating
and prolonging the present situation.

The Government of the Ukrainian SSR therefore rejected the conclusions and
recommendations of the Committee on Freedom of Association, which amounted to an
interference in the domestic affairs of an ILC member State and an attempt to exert
political pressure on it.

Finally, as regards the statement in paragraph 705 that Polish prisoners had
been deported to Czechoslovakia, the speaker could inform the Governing Body, on the
basis of information which he had obtained from the representative of the Government
of Czechoslovakia, that the statement was completely without foundation.

Mr. Brown (Worker, United States) had some personal views to express about
events in Poland in the 16 months prior to 13 December 1981.

He had considered the Polish experience as holding out great hopes not only
for freedom of association but also for peace - a word frequently mentioned by those
who defended the actions of the Polish Government.

When Lech Walesa had addressed the Conference as the spokesman for Solidarity,
which had been designated by the Polish Government as a legitimate trade union, he
had seemed to be speaking for the whole Polish nation. What, then, had gone wrong?
Did the fault lie with the Polish Government or with Solidarity? Solidarity had
dealt loyally and legally with the representatives of the Polish authorities,
whenever they were at any given time. The succession of changes in the Government
during that period could in no way be attributed to political action on the part of
Solidarity.

Agreements had been concluded between Prime Minister Jaruzelski, Lech Walesa
and the representatives of the Church - agreements which had been widely hailed as
foreshadowing a form of social pact - and there was no evidence that Solidarity had
violated those agreements. Even if there had been individual violations, why could
they not have been dealt with by due process of law? Why had it been necessary to
proclaim martial law to deal with possible violations? Why had such a step not been
necessary in February when Prime Minister Jaruzelski had come to power, and why did
it become necessary on 13 December? Solidarity was not responsible. It had not
threatened civil war; there was no proof of paramilitary operations; economic
disorder and acute indebtedness were problems in Poland well before August 1980.
Indeed the alarming economic situation and the misery of the workers were the very
reason why Solidarity had come into being.

Those who had defended the action of the Polish Government had accused
Solidarity of wanting to have a voice in economic decisions. What was wrong with
that? Did not the representatives of those same countries make stirring speeches in
the ILO advocating workers' participation in such decisions? And when the congress of Solidarity had called for a reduction in armaments, was that not a clear sign of devotion not only to freedom but also to peace?

Had the Polish Government respected its agreements with Solidarity, the Polish experience might have constituted a basis for reconciling the different economic and social systems existing in the world. The events since 13 December 1981 were therefore a tragedy, not only for the ILO and for Poland but for the whole world. It was also a tragedy that the Governing Body was now engaged in a war of words over a very straightforward proposal, the purpose of which was simply that a fact-finding mission should be sent to Poland.

If, in line with the earlier procedural discussion, any changes were to be made in the Standing Orders to enable a government to speak in its defence in a case relating to the violation of freedom of association, then it would be only right for the representative of the trade union movement concerned to be afforded the same opportunity.

The discussion was adjourned to a later sitting.¹

The sitting closed at 6.45 p.m.

¹ See sixth sitting.
The sitting opened at 10.10 a.m. with Mr. Ventelol in the Chair.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association (concl.)

TWO HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH REPORT (concl.)

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) said that the Government of Poland had had to declare a state of emergency because of the anti-Government attitude adopted by certain extremist members of Solidarity in breach of Convention No. 87. Solidarity had in fact been deviating from its purely trade union objectives and developing into a political movement seeking to overthrow the constitutionally established socialist regime.

Throughout the process its leaders had been assured of the support of governments and trade union organisations hostile to socialism which, on seeing that their plans had been foiled, had whipped up a tremendous propaganda campaign based on preposterous arguments. It was ironical that the Governing Body should be listening today to representatives of countries that curtailed freedom of association at home and abroad, supported such causes as apartheid, Zionism and genocide in El Salvador and Guatemala, while springing to the defence of freedom of association in Poland.

The best way for the ILO to help Poland would be to confirm the principle, which the Polish Government was quoted in paragraph 717 of the report as having stressed, that trade union action should be kept within legal bounds. It was in the interests of the Polish Government and people that the situation should be restored to normal and it should be left to the Government to enforce the law as it saw fit.

Mr. Wallin (Government, Belgium) could not agree that the Polish crisis fell outside the scope of the ILO procedure concerning freedom of association. Quite apart from the question of what and who was responsible for the present crisis in Poland, whenever there was a crisis the Organisation was concerned about its possible effects on freedom of association, and the Committee had consistently taken the view that regulations introduced to meet a war situation should be limited in duration and replaced as soon as possible by legislation guaranteeing freedom of action for trade unions.

Moreover, the Polish Government had accepted the procedure now being challenged right from the time when it was first approached by the Director-General and, while acknowledging that trade union activities had been temporarily suspended, had stated that they would be "re-established as soon as the grounds for their suspension have disappeared". Not once had the Government claimed that the organisations in question were not genuine trade union organisations but political parties in disguise.

There was every indication that the Polish Government accepted the competence of the Committee on Freedom of Association and was ready to comply with its rules. Preference should therefore be given to the procedure freely accepted by the Polish Government rather than to the argument that the matter was outside the ILO's competence, which indeed might well be considered as interference with the Government's policy towards the ILO.

The mission recommended by the Committee should help the Government to establish the facts and pursue the discussions it had agreed to enter into with the Organisation. Had not the Minister of Labour said at the Conference in June 1981 that "there was no problem that could not be resolved by discussion"?

---

1 See fifth sitting.
Mr. Lloyd (Worker, United Kingdom) could not agree that the complaint and the Committee's findings were not receivable: it was the job of the ILO and the Committee to deal with precisely such problems.

He was perturbed that, two or three months previously, various European trade union leaders had been refused permission to go to Poland to look at the situation; the Committee on Freedoms of Association was quite right to say that the ILO should now send a fact-finding mission.

Because it believed in freedom of association the British Trades Union Congress, like other national and international trade union bodies, had helped the Solidarity movement, and it was prepared to continue its efforts in that direction.

The Governing Body must accept the Committee's conclusions, as that was the only way of finding out the truth.

Mr. Palchi (Government, Italy) was struck by the deep sense of bitterness which overclouded the debate, first because trade union freedoms had been completely crushed in Poland, second because of the treatment meted out to thousands of trade unionists who had only been doing their duty, and last because of the excessively uncompromising remarks made by some speakers, which spelt death to the spirit of understanding and co-operation fostered by the new trade union experiment.

If Solidarity were really an engine of subversion and its members merely a gang of criminals, it was curious that, at the Conference last June, the representatives of the Eastern countries had not mentioned the fact, that no objection had been lodged against the Polish Worker delegate's credentials and that so many delegates of all political leanings and from all continents should have gone over to congratulate him on making a speech that was so orthodox from a trade union standpoint.

It had been claimed that certain trade unionists engaged in political opposition, but what trade unionist was not called upon from time to time to discuss politics, and particularly economic policy, especially in the kind of difficult economic situation Poland was going through? The arguments used by the trade unionists now under arrest were, in fact, the very ones which had led to the ousting of successive leaders of the Party.

As for the claim that certain trade unionists were trying to make Poland withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, that was pure conjecture: and even if such an idea had come into the mind of one person or another, a freely organised referendum could easily have disposed of it.

It came as quite a shock to hear the representatives of certain governments express the hope that Polish trade unionists would remain under arrest: in the normal course of events, when trade unionists were imprisoned the first thing the ILO did was to press for their immediate release.

As to the charge that the ILO was interfering in the internal affairs of Poland, in reality it was the coup d'Etat and the proclamation of martial law that constituted such interference, by disrupting the system of international obligations contracted by countries in ratifying ILO standards, and notably by Poland in ratifying Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, which it was the ILO's duty to uphold.

The Polish Government had, as Mr. Wallin had observed, opened discussions on the complaint. It had done so after much hesitation, but paragraphs 714 to 718 and 720 to 738 of the report left no doubt as to its readiness to engage in dialogue, despite meddling and pressure from those quarters which argued that the complaint was not receivable. It had, moreover, according to paragraph 715 of the report, stated that there was room in Poland's social and economic system for self-managed and truly independent trade unions, and that trade union activities would resume as soon as the situation was stabilised - which, it was to be hoped, would be very soon since martial law, if prolonged, could only bring bankruptcy or dictatorship. The Government had also announced its intention of releasing all those who had engaged in political - as distinct from trade union - activities before 13 December 1981; whatever the true situation in that regard, the mere intention was in striking contrast with the desire expressed by some that the prisoners should be kept under arrest.

Finally, the Government had expressed the hope (paragraph 738) that the Office would announce that economic sanctions taken against Poland were unjustified and
were ultimately aimed at the Polish workers and Polish society as a whole. Such an approach might indeed be endorsed, to the extent that the recommendations in paragraph 751 were implemented and a start made towards reconciliation in Poland between the government on the one hand and the workers and society on the other.

Three of the suggestions in paragraph 751 were of the utmost urgency: first, the enactment of legislation guaranteeing respect for the ILO Conventions; second, the immediate release of all the imprisoned trade unionists; and, third, acceptance of a high-level ILO mission with extensive facilities for contacts and fact-finding.

If these three requirements were met before the Governing Body's May session constructive co-operation with one of the ILO's founder Members might be resumed. If not, the Governing Body should refer Case No. 1097 to the Conference for final consideration.

Mr. Armstrong (Government, Canada) expressed deep concern at the increasing number of complaints coming before the Committee on Freedom of Association.

The extreme gravity of the allegations made against Poland was a matter for deep concern. The excellent reports before the Governing Body, and in particular the recommendations it contained, could be accepted unreservedly. It was to be hoped that the Polish Government would agree to receive an early ILO mission and provide it with the information asked for.

The Government had stated that the steps it had taken were only temporary, and that was indeed worth noting. What mainly mattered, however, was that trade union activities might again be carried out normally and that the new trade union legislation was in conformity with Poland's obligations under the ILO Conventions it had ratified.

Mr. Sadleir (Government, Australia) reminded those who queried the Governing Body's competence that Poland had ratified the two Conventions on freedom of association and that, like every other member State, it was subject to the supervisory machinery of the ILO.

The Government had indeed provided some information, but not on the main issue - the suppression of the trade union movement by military force. That was why the Committee's report was no more than an interim one.

The leaders of Solidarity, it was being argued, had engaged in criminal activities. Yet several of them had been held since 13 December in the absence of any charges - and indeed, under the Abolition Act there could be no charges for acts committed before 13 December. Accordingly, the Committee on Freedom of Association was calling for their immediate release.

Facts were needed, not unsubstantiated polemical assertions, and the Polish Government should, in accordance with the Committee's recommendation, be urged to accept the help of the Office in drafting its new trade union legislation in such a manner as to comply with the ILO Conventions it had voluntarily ratified and to bring about the rapid restoration of trade union rights and liberties.

Mr. Barton (Government, Hungary) considered it improper to examine the complaint, which should be withdrawn from the agenda.

The severe social and economic crisis in Poland was being aggravated by certain elements bent on stirring up anarchy for self-serving ends and sabotaging the political process. In declaring a state of emergency the Government, which had a right and a duty to protect the country, had prevented deterioration and foiled the plans of the Solidarity leadership.

The state of emergency was provisional but necessary, and the steps taken would in fact permit the vital social and economic reforms initiated in August 1980 to continue. This was understood abroad by some governments and trade unions, but others had embarked upon an international campaign of subversion against the Polish Government. They professed sympathy for the Polish people, but in reality they wanted things to get worse.

It was the countries which had not ratified the freedom of association Conventions that were clamouring the loudest for other countries to apply them. Their sole purpose was to aggravate relations between East and West, and the ILO should not get involved in such manoeuvres.
Under Article 2 and Article 8, paragraph 1, of Convention No. 87, workers had the right to establish and, subject only to the rules of the organisation concerned, to join organisations of their own choosing. But they were also required to respect the law of the land. The leaders of Solidarity had manifestly paid no heed to that provision, so they had no claim to the protection under Conventions Nos. 87 and 98.

Some speakers doubted that Solidarity was turning into a political opposition party, and others considered it normal that it should engage in political opposition. Perhaps it should be pointed out that at the first congress of Solidarity the discussions had been devoted almost exclusively to matters which had nothing to do with normal trade union activities, and after the congress some leading Western figures had tried to warn the Solidarity leaders, but in vain.

Other speakers had suggested that the proclamation of the state of emergency had interrupted the negotiations between the Government and Solidarity. In reality it was the leaders of that movement who had called a general strike for 17 December 1981 and tried to hold demonstrations all over the country, which might have spelled national disaster.

The Polish Government was being urged to co-operate with the ILO, but quite a few contacts had been established recently: what had been their outcome?

In short, Poland needed time, and it needed peace and quiet, as well as international aid. A hostile ILO campaign would serve neither Poland's interests nor those of the ILO. Nor should the Governing Body take decisions that might harm East-West relations and weaken the Organisation's traditionally friendly ties with Poland.

Mr. Suzuki (Government, Japan) expressed his Government's concern at developments since the previous December and hoped that the restrictions on trade union activities in Poland would soon end.

The Government of Japan commended the Director-General and the Committee on Freedom of Association for their action. It supported the recommendations in the report and, recognising the need for more precise and detailed information, hoped that the proposed ILO mission might visit Poland very shortly.

Mr. Albeda (Government, Netherlands) endorsed the Committee's report and conclusions, while expressing concern at the increase in the number of cases before it.

Mr. Noack's strictures against Solidarity for calling "political" strikes were somewhat surprising. At what point precisely did a strike become political? As Mr. Verschuuren had rightly pointed out, it was commonplace for governments to level the accusation of dabbling in politics at any trade unions that did not restrict their demands to wages or working conditions - or even at those that did, for instance if they contested wage rates that the government considered reasonable; for a political strike, by some definitions, was any strike directed against the government.

What seemed mainly to trouble Mr. Noack about "political" strikes was that their aim was to change society. But change was a major fact of life in the last quarter of this century, and freedom of association was what enabled workers to participate in the process. Societies, whether Eastern or Western, had to change to meet the challenges of modern technology, and the alternative to gradual change brought on by free collective bargaining was likely to be prison, civil war and military repression. Every society nowadays had to choose between those alternatives, and it was to be feared that Poland was making the wrong choice. What the representative of Hungary viewed as just a feature in the East-West debate was therefore, in reality, a matter affecting the whole strategy of social change.

By taking the right decision, and opting deliberately for freedoms of association, the Polish Government would be promoting better understanding between nations. That would entail ending the suspension of Solidarity, resuming discussions with it at the earliest possible date and, of course, immediately releasing the people under arrest for political reasons, in accordance with the Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Searby (Government, United States), not wishing to answer the misstatements regarding his own country, confined himself to pointing out that
whenever the United States Government had been the subject of a complaint under the freedom of association procedure it had always replied promptly to the Committee and co-operated fully with it.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) said that the very serious complaints under discussion were matters of grave concern to the Organisation. The argument that the Governing Body was interfering in Polish internal affairs in examining the complaints was mistaken, as the adoption of international labour standards and the supervision of their application in member States was fundamental to the Organisation's central purpose.

The report respected the procedure generally followed in such cases; it set out the steps already taken to investigate the complaints and recommended further steps aimed at bringing Poland back into conformity with the requirements of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, which it had ratified. The United Kingdom Government attached the greatest importance to the work of the Freedom of Association Committee in defending basic trade union rights and had been deeply concerned over the suspension of independent trade union activity in Poland in the last few months.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) shared Mr. Albeda's surprise and concern at certain statements, particularly that by Mr. Noack suggesting that it was quite in order to prevent trade unions from stating their views on political matters such as the choice of their country's leaders, protesting at a given state of affairs, going on strike to change society, or occupying factories and public places, since all were deemed to be criminal activities. By that standard there were few countries, France included, whose trade unions might be considered as behaving lawfully. By definition, industrial relations implied conflict, and even if matters sometimes seemed to go a bit far the underlying social aspirations could be ignored only at the cost of abetting social upheaval.

The friends of the present Polish Government had not made the slightest gesture but had blankly refused dialogue with the ILO, just as the Polish Government had refused it with those who dared to express views at variance with its own. The Committee on Freedom of Association had already examined more than a thousand cases and had often been accused of interference in the domestic affairs of ILO Members but very few governments had actually refused to discuss matters.

Should the countries describing themselves as socialist enjoy special immunity, and was it a crime of lèse-majesté to express views on how states having freely joined the ILO and accepted certain rules were applying them? Any State joining the Organisation voluntarily relinquished part of its national sovereignty, and the rules it undertook to respect included those concerning freedom of association. If any such State might then declare at will that its affairs were of no concern to the Organisation that would be the end of the ILO.

There was nothing extraordinary about the recommendations in paragraph 751 of the Committee's report; they were couched in very moderate terms that had already been used in other cases. Why not seize the opportunity afforded by clause (g) to ascertain the facts through the time-tested device of on-the-spot investigation by impartial observers? What was there to hide?

The Employers' group unanimously accepted the Committee's proposals, endorsed its handling of the case and congratulated the Director-General on the initial steps he had taken. There could be no question of simply dropping a case in which not only freedom of association in Poland but the Organisation's fundamental principles were in jeopardy.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany), declared that his Government was deeply concerned at the developments in Poland and condemned all violations of human rights, including violations of trade union rights which fell squarely within the jurisdiction of the ILO and the Committee on Freedom of Association.

During the discussion the Committee's competence had been questioned on the ground that Solidarity was not a trade union. But Poland had ratified Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, and the Polish Supreme Court had recognized Solidarity to be a trade union. That status could be taken away from it only by a court decision, and not simply by declaring martial law.

Others had proffered the well-known argument of interference in a State's internal affairs. As Mr. Oechslin had reminded the Governing Body, no State was obliged to belong to the Organisation, but joining it did imply acceptance of its rules and procedures.
The present complaint should be dealt with in the same way as any other, and the Governing Body should approve the Committee’s conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) said that the Polish Government, faced with a very difficult situation, had in accordance with article 33(2) of the Polish Constitution - i.e. in a perfectly legal way - proclaimed a state of war which, in particular, entailed suspension of all trade union activities - and not only to those of Solidarity, with which the authors of the complaint appeared to be exclusively concerned.

Despite the attempts by some speakers to justify the actions of Solidarity, it had been proved that its leaders, making use of the so-called "public committees" they had set up, had sought purely and simply to seize power and set up a new government subservient to their interests.

The report made it appear that there had been a breach in Poland of the fundamental trade union freedoms, whereas in reality the only persons detained were those who had infringed the Constitution and engaged in subversive activities against the lawful Government of Poland.

In supporting the political line of Solidarity, the Committee on Freedom of Association seemed to be departing from its usual practice. So far, it had been recognised that trade unions could lawfully protect themselves from interference in their activities as long as these were not obviously political: but could that be said of an organisation whose leaders described themselves as heading a mass political movement aimed at seizing power, even at the risk of provoking civil war? By its attitude the Committee on Freedom of Association was simply encouraging a violent change in the political structure of Poland.

At its last session the Governing Body had been called upon to examine the Committee's 211th Report, and more particularly Case No. 1074, concerning air traffic controllers in the United States. In paragraph 365 the Committee had denied the controllers' right to strike on the ground that a work stoppage might widely endanger the safety of passengers, and in paragraph 372 it held that resort to military air traffic controllers would not be a breach of freedom of association.

How, then, could it in the case of Poland, where terrorism in the form of strikes was rife, economic disaster was threatening, and the safety of all the citizens as well as the independence and sovereignty of the nation itself were in peril, query the Government's right to protect the security of the State by declaring martial law for a limited period and preventing the lawbreakers seeking to overthrow the constitutional political system from doing further harm?

According to paragraph 701 of the report, the ICFTU condemned the martial law established in Poland: that amounted to questioning the sovereign right of a State to apply its own Constitution. The United States' internal security legislation, in force since 1950, and the constitutions of many other countries contained provisions applicable in exceptional circumstances where the security of the country was threatened: why, in the case of Socialist Poland, should such provisions constitute a breach of international law?

In paragraph 745 it was suggested that the Polish Government should submit to the ILO the trade union legislation it intended to adopt; but it was one thing for a State to seek the help of the Office on its own initiative, and quite another for it to be obliged to do so.

The ILO supervisory machinery, consisting of small bodies like the Committee on Freedom of Association, was given, it seemed, to adopting conclusions wholly to the advantage of the Western countries. It was pointless for these bodies to meet if their findings were foregone conclusions. In this case, the Committee's report and conclusions were nothing more than an expression of bias and interference in the affairs of a sovereign State - a practice which had been explicitly condemned by the United Nations General Assembly at its 36th Session.

Certain Western countries had imposed economic and other sanctions on Poland which were contrary to the spirit of the ILO Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia. The Governing Body too seemed to have been drawn into an anti-Polish campaign - an improper attitude for an international organisation, and extremely harmful to détente. The real friends of Poland believed that the Poles should be allowed to solve their own problems and that the conclusions of the Committee on Freedom of Association should be rejected as being in flagrant contradiction with the principles on which the organisation was based.
Mr. Martins da Cruz (Government, Portugal) joined earlier speakers in expressing deep concern at the growing number and seriousness of complaints alleging violations of trade union freedoms.

The Committee on Freedom of Association, accepted by all Members of the Organisation as part of its supervisory machinery, had amply demonstrated that it was the appropriate body to consider such complaints.

Those against the Government of Poland concerned extremely serious violations of freedom of association; they were therefore perfectly receivable and the Government of Portugal supported all the recommendations in paragraph 751 of the report.

Mr. Andersen (Government, Denmark), sharing the Committee's deep concern at the gravity of the complaints, wholeheartedly supported the Committee's recommendations, and in particular the one concerning an ILC mission to Poland, which he earnestly hoped the Polish Government would accept so that it might visit Poland very shortly.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) could agree that trade unions in an ILO member country should indeed obey the law - provided that the law ensured trade union freedom in conformity with the principles the country had freely subscribed to in joining the ILO. In the case of Solidarity, its rules must have been found to be in conformity with the law, since otherwise it would be most difficult to understand why it had been granted registration after a review of its rules by an independent judicial authority. As to whether or not certain members of Solidarity had behaved in a manner inconsistent with those rules and with the laws of the country, that claim could not be rejected out of hand, but required very careful investigation, and it was for that very purpose that a fact-finding mission to Poland was being proposed. However, even if some members or leaders of Solidarity had disobeyed the legal provisions in force, that was no reason for suspending the whole union.

Some speakers had claimed that Solidarity was no longer a trade union but a political opposition movement, and the same must be true of the other Polish trade union organisations since, according to Mr. Kostine, they too had been suspended. In other words, not only the ten million-odd members which Solidarity had succeeded in recruiting in such a short time but the members of the other unions had suddenly gone over to the opposition in violation of the Constitution and the law. If so, this represented quite a mass movement - and quite an indictment of the régime, leading one to wonder how far it was still in touch with the people.

Solidarity had been accused of attempting to influence public opinion and the Parliament. But how could anyone claiming to represent the workers not try to exert such an influence? In a country where the State was the sole employer, how could the workers' representatives do otherwise than proclaim their objectives loudly and clearly vis-à-vis the authorities, with whom they had to negotiate and sometimes disagree?

Those who pressed the familiar argument of interference in the internal affairs of a State should be very careful: if it was improper for the ILO to concern itself with the internal affairs of Poland, was it proper that it should concern itself with those of Chile? The ILO had been created to protect the right of workers everywhere, and it would be the end of the Organisation if it were allowed to examine the situation in some countries and forbidden to do so in others.

It was not the actions of Solidarity that had led to economic chaos in Poland, but the reverse.

Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Employer, Mexico), as a member of the Committee on Freedom of Association, indignantly rejected the USSR Government's suggestion that the Committee's findings were foregone conclusions. Such a serious accusation should at least be supported by facts.

The Committee on Freedom of Association was a completely independent body, and in the case of Poland it had noted that Solidarity had initially been recognised as a perfectly legitimate trade union by the Supreme Court in Warsaw, but that it had later been accused of organising illegal strikes to obtain wage increases, improved social security benefits, shorter working hours, etc. Such an accusation was rather surprising, since in all free countries it was considered quite normal, and in no way subversive, for workers to go on strike for such purposes.
The report stated in clear and objective terms that the Polish Government had suspended trade union rights at the very moment when the era of Solidarity offered the prospect of a little more freedom, better human relations and greater equality.

Not even the Government had denied the facts, and all the report did was to point out that, even when there was a state of siege or individual guarantees were suspended, everyone was entitled to due process of law and treatment consistent with the law and human dignity.

The Eastern countries had adopted delaying tactics when it would have been so much simpler and more honest to encourage the Warsaw authorities to agree to the ILO mission, whose objectivity could be absolutely guaranteed.

Martyred Poland needed support in its struggle to emerge from dictatorship and oppression, so that Solidarity might regain its representative status, its freedom of action and the powers it needed. Only then would the situation in Poland be in harmony with the international Conventions it had ratified of its own free will.

Mr. Sene (Government, Senegal) paid tribute to the ILC for the key part it played in the protection of trade union freedoms and to the Committee for its remarkable report, which bore the imprint of its members' wisdom, sense of responsibility and devotion to the cause of trade union rights everywhere.

Few representatives of Third World countries had spoken in the debate, presumably because it did not involve any vital issue of North-South co-operation, but that did not mean that they felt unconcerned. Senegal, for one, which had very strong ties with Poland, could not remain indifferent to the plight of the Polish people.

This should not be regarded as an occasion for East-West confrontation, nor should the report be taken as a ground for levelling accusations against Poland, or Solidarity, or the socialist countries. Certainly there should be no question of imposing sanctions on Poland. At the same time, the ILO could clearly not remain idle.

The Government of Senegal approved the action taken by the Director-General. The Office's role was to help the Polish Government to deal with the serious problems it faced in applying Conventions it had ratified. It was true that trade unions were required to respect the law of the land, but at the same time Convention No. 87 stipulated that the law of the land and the authorities enforcing it must not impair their freedom and independence. It was gratifying to note the Polish Government's statement in paragraph 715 of the report that there was room in Poland for self-managed and truly independent trade unions.

It was to be hoped that Poland would find it possible to revert to normal, unhampered by interference from any quarter, that it would succeed in working out a genuinely Polish solution to its problems, with any necessary help from the Office, and that it would, to that end, accept the recommendations of the Committee on Freedom of Association.

Mrs. Azpirua de Constantino (Government, Panama) commented that it was the Organisation's duty to help its Members in good faith and with good will. The Polish Government could hardly turn down the opportunity being offered to it to submit the matter to an impartial inquiry, since it was not a question of interfering in its internal affairs, but simply of helping it.

Subject to the opposition of the governments of Bulgaria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, the Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 751 of the report.

Mr. Alemán Salvador (Government, Ecuador), referring to Case No. 1032 concerning Ecuador, which had been discussed the previous day in his absence, said that the steps taken by his Government had been dictated by exceptional circumstances.

In the second place, his Government categorically rejected the complainant's allegation that the authorities had threatened to "make him disappear". Nobody had ever disappeared in Ecuador, which had always set great store by human rights, and no such threat had ever been made to anybody.
TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH REPORT

Mr. Issifu (Worker, Ghana), speaking for the Workers' group, noted that in paragraph 8 of the report the Committee had expressed its deep concern at the seriousness of the allegations against the Government of Guatemala, while in paragraph 11 it stated that the Government had chosen to ignore its recommendations.

In view of the Government's stubborn silence the Committee, in accordance with its procedure, had had to submit to the Governing Body at its November 1981 session an interim report on the substance of the case, which the Governing Body had decided should be given the widest possible publicity. This had not produced any change in the Government's attitude. The Committee had resorted once again to the same procedure, and it was doubtful whether the Government would pay any more attention this time.

This unfortunately was one of the cases in which the ILO had had little success in securing justice for workers whose trade union rights had been violated. The Governing Body should accordingly give very serious consideration to the report, and once again press the Government for a positive response to the Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium), after pointing out that in this case nobody had alleged interference in a country's internal affairs, expressed the Employers' support for the Committee's conclusions and the statement just made by Mr. Issifu on behalf of the Workers' group.

What was intolerable was the Government's obstinate refusal to reply over a period of many months. It should be sharply reminded of its obligations, as proposed by the Committee, which was also recommending that the report should be given wide distribution.

Mr. Searby (Government, United States) observed that the complaints machinery could function properly only when governments co-operated and replied promptly to charges. A failure to reply raised suspicions that the charges might be well founded. If they were, the government should reply so that the ILO could act; if they were not, it should still reply, so that the charges might be laid to rest. This was an obligation on all member States, irrespective of their political system or of any temporary difficulties they might be facing.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) supported the Committee's recommendations and wondered how long the Governing Body would continue to tolerate the Guatemalan authorities' total lack of co-operation. In addition to publicising the report, the ILO should give consideration to other measures aimed at ensuring respect for trade union and human rights in Guatemala.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 5, 12 and 13 of the report.

TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH REPORT

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) said that the complaints filed against Nicaragua, some by employers and others by workers, showed clearly that something was wrong in that country as regards freedom of association and indeed freedom of any kind.

It was true that the employers' leaders had now been released, and the Employers were grateful to all those responsible, notably the Director-General and the other officials concerned, but they were not yet entirely reassured about the situation in Nicaragua and they would have to remain vigilant.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) said that the Government, by agreeing to the ILO mission, had proved its willingness to clarify and settle a problem that had arisen out of tensions attending the reconstruction of Nicaragua after 30 years of tyranny.

It was clear from the report that the measures taken were provisional and that the Government as well as the people were anxious to see them rescinded. The case illustrated the adjustment difficulties of countries having just freed themselves from oppression, complicated possibly by some lack of understanding abroad.
As the ILO mission had observed, the compatibility with ILO standards of the legislation under which the Nicaraguan employers had been imprisoned might be questioned. At the same time, the employers' unbending attitude - no doubt justified from their point of view - might help to explain the Government's reaction.

At all events, it seemed that progress was being made, that the Government, the Office and the Committee were satisfied and that the situation would continue to improve for both employers and workers. The Committee's recommendations were encouraging: they showed that, when a government worked hard to maintain domestic order while fulfilling its international obligations, the results were good.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) felt that, since the persons named in the complaint had been released and had been neither ill-treated nor subjected to forced labour, there was no point in proceeding with the complaint, which could be withdrawn.

As the Government had pointed out (paragraph 27 of the report), emergency enactments and temporary measures had had to be introduced for purposes of national reconstruction. The Committee on Freedom of Association should bear in mind the efforts being made by the Nicaraguan authorities to overcome the backwardness, ignorance and exploitation which had been the country's lot for more than 30 years.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 39 of the report.

The sitting closed at 12:40 p.m.
SEVENTH SITTING
(Thursday, 4 March 1982, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.10 p.m., with Mr. Ventejol in the Chair.

SEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee

First report

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany), who had acted as Committee Chairman, deplored the inconsistency with which new activities were approved on one day and greeted with surprise on the next because of the supplementary expenditure they entailed.

At the Conference, the lack of interest in matters relating to the budget was striking, and several years previously the Finance Committee had failed to achieve a quorum. Worse still, last year, when the Organisation's new budget was being voted in the main hall, decisions were being taken in a room nearby which left the same budget unbalanced. As he had repeatedly pointed out in the past, Article 18 of the Conference Standing Orders clearly stated that all proposals involving expenditure must first be referred to the Governing Body and its Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee.

Equally inconsistent were the ritual formulae proposing that supplementary expenditure be financed out of savings or, failing that, by withdrawals from the Working Capital Fund, whereas the Director-General had clearly stated that it was impossible to achieve savings and that the Fund had been run down.

The excuse that the financial consequences of a decision were unforeseeable should in future be avoided when it was obvious that the new activity would entail expenditure.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the grave concern of the Workers at the late payment of contributions by certain member States and the effect on the level of the Working Capital Fund. It was to be feared that the example of late contributors would be copied by countries which paid their contributions on time and that one day no income would be received at all during the first six months.

The Workers' group formally requested the Director-General to make proposals as a matter of urgency on measures to accelerate the collection of contributions. It was wrong that punctual contributors should be penalised for the irresponsibility of late contributors by having to bear the consequences, such as forgoing interest and contributing to the financing of the charges on bank loans.

Mr. Stephens (Government, United States) felt unable to approve the proposed methods of financing supplementary expenditure. The $230 million 1982-83 budget had been adopted by the Conference only in June of the previous year, yet the Governing Body was already examining, at its first session in the new biennium, requests for the authorisation of supplementary expenditure totalling over 1 million dollars. There could be no objection to such expenditure if it really was possible to finance it by making savings elsewhere - which was not the case - or if it could be funded through the Unforeseen Expenditure Account. The latter, however, was set at merely $275,000. As regards the Working Capital Fund, despite the proposed payment of $7.9 million into the Fund in 1982, the Committee had been informed that the Fund stood at $422,000 on 23 February.

Nor did the Government of the United States feel that the requests for authorisation of supplementary expenditure related to the kind of 'exceptional
circumstances referred to in Article 19(1) (b) of the Financial Regulations, whereby the Governing Body was empowered to authorise payments from the Working Capital Fund.

Mr. A哲 (Government, Nigeria), after drawing attention to his Government's views as recorded in paragraphs 12 and 41 of the report and associating himself with the position expressed by Mr. Haase, pointed out that in certain countries, including his own, the national budget for a given year was sometimes not adopted by Parliament until May or June instead of January; that explained the delays in the payment of contributions. He regretted also that the Office was unable to accept part of the contributions in national currencies, for example to cover the administrative expenses of ILO offices in certain countries.

Did the Standing Orders of the Governing Body contain a clause similar to Article 18 of those of the Conference?

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden), as spokesman for the Employer members of the Committee, fully supported Mr. Muhr's statement concerning delays in the payment of a large number of contributions. He also requested the Director-General to make proposals, in the light of what had happened in 1982, to ensure that countries making their payments on time were not penalised on account of delays on the part of others and that the Working Capital Fund was kept at an adequate level.

Mr. Oudovenko (Government, Ukrainian SSR) shared the dismay expressed about the amount of supplementary expenditure being requested so soon after the adoption of the 1982-83 budget. Expenditure in the previous biennium had exceeded income by 22 million dollars, representing more than 10 per cent of the initial budget level. Firm action should be taken to manage the Organisation's resources more economically and efficiently. The right way to finance new activities was to discontinue out-of-date ones. Moreover, the Office's administrative procedures should be streamlined.

Savings could also be made in the organisation of the Conference, such as reducing its duration and cutting expenditure on documentation.

Finally, when requesting authorisation for new expenditure, the Office should present the Committee with detailed estimates.

Mr. Armstrong (Government, Canada) supported the comments concerning additional expenditure made by the representative of the Government of Mexico (paragraph 8 of the report) and by the representative of the Government of the United States (paragraph 36).

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) expressed his concern at the constant growth in additional expenditure financed from the Working Capital Fund. New activities should be financed out of the approved budget, which was flexible enough to provide for savings, reshaping of programmes and shifts in priorities. When a new activity really required an extra appropriation, the Office should cost it accurately. Representatives of a number of governments, including that of the German Democratic Republic, had in the past indicated many ways of making savings, and the Office should draw on these suggestions to put an end to the unsound practice of constantly drawing on the Working Capital Fund.

Mr. Subrahmanyam (Government, India) confirmed his Government's position on supplementary expenditure as summarised in paragraph 5 of the report.

The main purpose of the Working Capital Fund was to finance expenditure pending the receipt of contributions. Amounts allocated from the Fund owing to delays in the payment of contributions should be paid back as soon as the contributions were received, and no such allocation should be regarded as final. If expenditure could not be met from savings in Part I, supplementary contributions should be levied on Members. Governments would then be aware of the liability they would probably have to assume when approving an expenditure proposal. In this way, the level of the Working Capital Fund would be related to a normal collection period. It might not be necessary to set it so high as to eliminate borrowing altogether, since in that case substantial resources might be lying idle.

The fact that the ILO had the lowest rate of collection of contributions in the UN system was perhaps due to the advantages certain member States derived from delaying their payments. Charging interest on payments due beyond a certain date might make the practice less worth while.
The activities listed in the 1980-81 programme implementation report were of unequal merit, and there were many that could be discontinued. It was hard to see, for example, the purpose of the series of monographs on women and rural development listed under item 60.36. In any event, the utility of much of the work done by the ILO depended to a large extent on the dissemination of information concerning it.

As regards programmes implemented by other bodies with ILC financial participation, their cost-effectiveness should be evaluated. This included the programmes of the International Social Security Association, with whose activities member States were not fully acquainted.

Finally, was not the current practice of publishing multilingual editions of certain publications, such as the Yearbook of Labour Statistics, more expensive than publishing separate editions for each language?

Mr. Rodríguez Navarro (Government, Venezuela) shared the concern expressed in the Committee at the excess of 1980-81 expenditure over income and agreed that new activities not provided for by the budget should be financed by savings to avoid excessive resort to the Working Capital Fund or bank loans.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) confirmed his Government's view, as recorded in paragraph 7 of the report, about the excessive number of requests for supplementary contributions, which developing countries could not afford during the present world economic crisis. Any outlay in excess of the approved budget should be financed through savings, more efficient use of resources and adjusting priorities.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) called attention to her Government's views as recorded in paragraphs 8 and 34 of the report. She agreed with Mr. Subrahmanya on the proper use of the Working Capital Fund. The Governing Body was already faced with a request, when the 1982-83 biennium had hardly begun, for supplementary credits to finance activities approved in 1981.

The Mexican Government would find it difficult at present to make additional financial commitments.

It was, however, determined to pay its contribution each year as soon as possible.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. von Mutius, Chief of the Financial and Central Administrative Services Department) recognised that the ILC had a poor record as regards contributions by comparison with other UN bodies, whose practices the Office would study carefully and on which it could, if desired, submit a paper to the Governing Body at a future date.

The reply to Mr. Ajai's question was that, under Article 22 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, no decision on any proposal involving expenditure might be taken without being first referred to the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee. In practice that was not always possible, and, where it was not, proposals were provisionally submitted to the Governing Body and then, at its next session, to the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee.

In reply to the point raised by Mr. Subrahmanya, the speaker confirmed that the Financial Regulations, in paragraph 3 of Article 21, authorised assessments for additional contributions to the Organisation's budget where unforeseen needs or exceptional circumstances arose during the first year of a financial period. Barring a rapid deterioration in the situation, it would not be necessary at the beginning of the current biennium to invoke that provision.

Due note had been taken of the concern expressed over the requests for supplementary expenditure and the need for making savings. However, unlike the budgets of member States, which were annual, ILC budgets covered periods of two years, and there was an interval of three years between preparation and implementation. That was one reason why certain estimates were no longer accurate. As the Director-General had pointed out (paragraph 38 of the report), there was no guarantee at the beginning of a biennium that sufficient savings would be made during the rest of the financial period to finance supplementary expenditure. That did not mean that some at least of the proposed activities might not be financed through savings. In 1980-81, for example, 6.3 million dollars of the authorised supplementary credits had not been spent.
The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 15, 47, 52, 57, 65, 67 and 69 of the report.

Second report

Personnel questions

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) requested that her Government’s views, recorded in paragraph 16 of the report,1 should be reproduced in the minutes.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) reiterated the importance his group attached to a balanced composition of staff in terms of both sex and geographical distribution. Women officials were badly under-represented in senior positions. Apart, moreover, from the need to recruit more officials from developing countries, those from the industrialised countries should not be given permanent contracts until they had served several years in developing countries and thus acquired first-hand knowledge of conditions in the field.

Mr. Win (Government, Burma), after calling attention to his Government’s views as recorded in paragraph 26 of the report, expressed satisfaction with the Director-General’s assurances in the Committee regarding the continuing efforts to improve the geographical distribution of staff. There was surely no dearth of qualified and willing candidates in the developing countries.

Mr. Barnabo (Worker, Togo) reiterated his statement concerning the under-representation of the Third World in the Office staff (paragraph 17 of the report) and recruitment to the General Service category (paragraph 32).

He feared that, despite the Director-General’s assurances, some discrimination was continuing in matters of recruitment. Nationals of Third World countries should not automatically be refused access to the General Services category, which until now seemed to be reserved for nationals of the host country and neighbouring ones. This obstacle also limited entry by Third World candidates into the Professional category. Nor should the recruitment of trade union candidates be limited to workers’ education posts.

Mr. M'Polo (Government, Angola), while congratulating the Office on the effort it had been making for some time, shared the concerns reflected in paragraphs 13, 17, 18 and 20 of the report. The Office should draw up a timetable of the vacancies that would occur on the retirement of certain officials to enable governments and other interested groups to take part in the recruitment procedure.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) asked that her statement in paragraph 61 of the report2 should be reproduced in the minutes.

---

1 This paragraph reads as follows:

"16. The representative of the Government of Mexico said that while the Director-General had frequently explained the difficulty of finding women candidates, she knew of many from developing countries who failed to secure jobs for which they had applied. New recruitment procedures, including competitions in regional or national offices, should be developed. She noted that in 1981 the number of women recruited was far lower than the number of men and was mainly on fixed-term contracts and to the General Service category. She asked that notices of vacancy should be sent to governments."

2 This paragraph reads as follows:

"61. The representative of the Government of Mexico said that the common system and the ICSC, although they might have difficulties, were instruments on which member States relied to arrive at properly organised administration of the international civil service. The Director-General’s ability as a negotiator would enable him to find a formula together with the heads of other international organisations and members of the ICSC which should make it possible to incorporate (Footnote continued on next page)
Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden), for the Employers, deplored the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a resolution criticising the ILO decision on General Service salaries.

Although in principle they favoured the common system, the Employers could only disapprove of the International Civil Service Commission's interpretation of its role. The Statute of the Commission required its members to be persons competent in personnel management, which they were not. It also provided that they should be appointed only after appropriate consultation with the heads of the specialised agencies and representatives of the staff; yet two new members had recently been appointed without such consultation.

Within the UN system the ILO had for more than sixty years been exercising the responsibility of developing international standards on personnel and social matters, and it had, of course, always applied them to its own staff, negotiating with them rather than taking unilateral decisions. ILO standards should be drawn on in the practices and procedures of the UN system, and in particular in those of the ICSC itself.

It was to be hoped that in his negotiations with the United Nations the Director-General would succeed in improving the functioning of the Commission, whose recommendations on salaries the ILO would study, but which it need not adopt uncritically.

Miss Gonzalez Martinez (Government, Mexico), referring to the question of Professional category remuneration, asked that her Government's views, as recorded in paragraph 96 of the report, should be reproduced in the minutes.

The Director-General said he would convey to the Commission, a meeting of which he was to attend the following week, the views expressed in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and the Governing Body.

(Footnote continued from previous page)

ILO procedures in the collective bargaining structure on which the system was based.

1 This paragraph reads as follows:

"96. The representative of the Government of Mexico asked that the Director-General inform the Committee in detail about the deterioration in Professional remuneration, particularly in Geneva. She requested that when this subject was next brought before the Committee an analysis should be presented comparing the salaries of the ILO's Professional category staff (something along the lines of the information given in the table on page 4 of document GB.219/PFA/14/16) with those of the staff of the United States Federal Government and of the employees of private business, and giving details of pensionable salaries, gross salaries, net salaries, various allowances (education, family, etc.), various deductions (taxes, social security, medical care, pension fund, etc.). That would afford a clear picture of the salary and income levels of each of the three groups."
The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 76, 83 and 85 of the report.

Third report

Review of the ILO Medium-Term Plan, 1982-87

The Chairman, before inviting discussion on the report, pointed out that a statement by the World Confederation of Labour concerning the review of the ILO Medium-Term Plan, dated 4 March 1982, had been circulated.

Mr. Cuevas Zamora (Government, Mexico) asked that his Government's views as recorded in paragraphs 97, 18, 74 and 92 of the report should be reproduced in the minutes.

These paragraphs read as follows:

"9. The representative of the Government of Mexico commented that the review was based on a sound methodological approach and provided a realistic description of the social and economic situation in the different regions. The paper had taken note of the recessionary climate that now affected all parts of the world, in some cases as a result of the unfair distribution of international resources. The economic difficulties had given rise to intensive discussions on the need for a balance between policies which sought to promote economic growth and the cost of social policies. However, his Government agreed with paragraph 15 of the paper which stated that "social policy does not merely produce high costs; it also contributes to economic progress in different ways". It felt that consideration should be given to channelling the maximum possible resources into social policies. The economic and social differences described in the review showed the need to tackle problems on a world-wide basis; interdependence between countries should be reflected in a balanced system which promoted the growth of the world economy as a whole, both benefiting and being shared by all countries. His Government had proposed a number of measures in various international bodies designed to achieve, through co-operation between States, the establishment of a new international economic order. He referred in particular to the importance of international trade, dealt with in paragraphs 24 and 25, in stimulating mutual demand for goods between developing and industrialised countries. Similarly, there was a need for structural adjustment, but in the absence of political will, that tended to remain an elusive goal. In this context, both the International Development Strategy for the United Nations Third Development Decade and the global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development were relevant. Moreover, during the Cancun North-South Meeting of the Heads of State of 25 major developed and developing countries (October 1981), his Government had reiterated the view that an open dialogue was indispensable to the attainment of peace and development. The ILC should redouble its efforts in the sphere of labour problems; for example, further attention should be given to the question of migrant workers and to how the flow of such workers could be made beneficial to their countries of origin as well as to the recipient countries. This subject had been raised in a number of international bodies. The ILO should also play its part in helping to expand technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC), the importance of which had been stressed at the UN Conference on Least Developed Countries held in Paris in September 1981. Mexico had always supported the concept of TCDC, and had played an active part in technical co-operation projects which enabled it to share its experience with other countries. The UN Conference on the Development and Utilisation of New and Renewable Sources of Energy, held in Nairobi, had given his Government the opportunity of repeating its position as regards the workplan that had been drawn up for 1979. He wished to stress the need for utilising and fairly distributing all sources of energy, otherwise there could be no real progress for the majority of the world's people. As regards apartheid, he wished to draw attention to various decisions taken by the ILO and to the efforts that had been made to put a stop to that odious form of discrimination. Mexico had been consistent in its support of the African countries in their fight for independence, particularly in the case of Namibia. In the Security Council and elsewhere, his Government had always reiterated its opposition to the Pretoria regime for its many
violations of international principles."

"38. The representative of the Government of Mexico expressed his satisfaction that, as indicated in paragraph 50, close attention had been given to the need to strike a balance between centralised activities of a universal nature and of world-wide interest, and those designed to meet the specific needs of different regions or groups of countries. Such an approach was closely linked with decentralisation, in which the regional components of the Organization would be called upon to play a fundamental role. He stressed the importance of making the most rational use of resources and means of action to enable the ILO in the first instance to define regional priorities in the field of labour. For this purpose, the studies referred to in the second part of the document should be closely linked to operational activities in order to achieve a multiplier effect; that was of particular importance for the developing countries. He supported the comment in paragraph 77 concerning the greater financial support that might be given to the regional centres from the ILO regular budget. During the general discussion of Part I, his Government had stressed the importance it attached to the standard-setting work of the ILO, with special reference to the analysis made in 1980 of the criteria and methods of work of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. His Government considered it important that the criterion of universality should be respected in the framing of international labour standards in order to give a certain flexibility to the instruments to take into account the special needs of countries at different stages of development. He would be glad to have details of the machinery for collaboration between the ILO and the other bodies concerned with labour matters referred to in paragraph 56. With regard to paragraph 58, he believed that the ILO should continue to support the activities of the United Nations Working Group currently preparing a convention on migrant workers and, once the Group had completed its work, take it into account in its own subsequent standard-setting activities. His Government had noted with concern the tendency towards a reduction in the funds provided from multilateral sources for technical co-operation. It agreed that new forms of financing should be sought; it also supported the proposal that the ILO should give priority to action on behalf of the least developed countries. He reiterated the importance which his Government attached to the support that could be given by the ILO through technical co-operation to the countries of Latin America, particularly in the matters dealt with in paragraphs 58, 72 and 73. His Government appreciated the ILO's intention to strengthen its co-operation with various regional and subregional organisations, as described in paragraph 90. A resolution adopted by the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labour had urged the ILO and the Organisation of American States to coordinate their efforts in order to respond more effectively to the social and labour problems of the American region."

"74. The representative of the Government of Mexico felt it necessary to reiterate the warnings that his delegation had given concerning research when the original Medium-Term Plan was discussed. He saw a trend towards retaining certain research and analysis projects that were only remotely connected with practical activities, such as the studies on the international dimensions of employment and poverty and those related to the real costs of labour, mentioned in paragraphs 156 and 157. The ILO's work would be far more effective if it concentrated on concrete action in support of national employment policies, in co-operation with regional bodies. There seemed to be no balance or consistency between the studies and analyses proposed and the programmes mentioned in paragraphs 159 and 160. He noted with satisfaction from paragraph 166 that the Office intended to co-ordinate its training activities with institutions in the regions which were responsible for training. The regional centres and the Turin Centre should be encouraged to assist in drafting projects in this field."

"92. The representative of the Government of Mexico, referring to the section concerning women, observed that while it might be easier to present these activities in a separate section of the review, such activities in practice should be dealt with within the context of workers' questions generally. He agreed that the major problem faced by migrant workers was discrimination. It was particularly important that the protection of their rights should not be limited to equality of treatment in social security; it should cover their labour rights in general. He would like to have more information concerning the proposal to set up an international migration for employment forum, bearing in mind that in examining such problems it
Mr. Subrahmanya (Government, India) said that, if a plan was to achieve its objectives and not remain an expression of intention, its component programmes must be related to those objectives in terms of the financial resources required, the phasing of the programmes and the evaluation of performance. The ILO should try to improve its planning methods.

A prerequisite for drawing up any plan of action was agreement on basic options - a difficult task in any organisation made up of member States with different socio-economic systems and at different stages of development. Was it, for example, to assume an atomised, individualistic society, in which each individual needed to have employment for his or her living, or a family-type society, in which one earning member could maintain a family? This choice also affected social security programmes. Other matters calling for consideration were the different approaches to wage determination; the role of the public sector and the place that workers should occupy in it in a democratic society; and the position of the consumer where the State controlled the means of production.

The concept of tripartism was linked to a system of economic organisation involving three parties, whereas in many countries the government was also the chief employer. In countries with economies based on agriculture small landowners and self-employed workers were predominant, and here some machinery other than tripartism would have to be developed.

The ILO had devoted much of its attention, for historical reasons, to the problems of industrial labour in the advanced countries, but more stress would have to be placed on assistance to workers in the agricultural and related sectors in the developing countries.

As the twin scourges of poverty and unemployment were due to the population explosion, the revised plan should give greater priority to projects concerning population.

The UN International Strategy for the Third Development Decade required a world-wide pooling of efforts to promote over-all development objectives and policies; however, policies in practice often conflicted with that requirement. Isolationist and protectionist tendencies in some countries had aggravated unemployment, and hence poverty in the developing countries. The ILO and other international bodies should try to prevail on their member States to pursue policies more conducive to social justice.

To improve the quality of human life throughout the world, which was no doubt the ultimate goal of the Medium-Term Plan, care must be taken to avoid sacrificing the natural environment and the resources required by future generations to present-day economic and social development. The Indian Government hoped that the ILO would collaborate closely with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in the framework of the Action Plan for the Human Environment, adopted by the recent UN conference on the subject, and give more consideration to the environmental impact of all of its technical programmes.

As regards the ILO's activities related to standards, concerning which the Indian Government's position was recorded in paragraph 8 of the report, it was time to emphasise review and consolidation of the achievements of the past rather than new standard-setting.

Concerning employment creation, future programmes should place greater emphasis on self-employment and on training programmes to encourage initiative and promote entrepreneurship.

(Footnote continued from previous page)

would be necessary to take into account the specific characteristics of each case. In paragraph 239, reference was made to the untoward increase in illegal migrants. He wished to reiterate his Government's doubts about the use of this terminology, since the movement of labour in search of employment should not automatically be classified as a criminal activity. Finally, he wished to know how the Office proposed to undertake the studies mentioned in paragraph 242 and in particular how it considered that amnesties - a term usually associated with criminal cases - could improve the protection of the rights of migrant workers.
In labour-management relations, the emphasis should be on the community of interest rather than on conflict by helping both workers and employers to acquire a sense of their responsibilities towards society.

On wages, the ILO should help member States to evolve criteria for gradually raising minimum wages above the poverty level.

In matters of social security, the Office should give greater attention to preventive medicine, the prevention of occupational risks and the rehabilitation of the disabled.

So far as administrative expenses and staff salaries were concerned, the Office should aim at reducing the cost to member States, many of which had low incomes.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden), for the Employers, criticised the format of the paper. Although it might meet UN criteria, it did not facilitate examination by the Committee because it departed from the layout of the programme and budget. The Employers suggested that a revolving plan should be drawn up for the six-year period following the current biennium which would be easily comparable with the programme and budget. It should contain estimates of both the budgetary and extra-budgetary funds required for each programme. Each plan should, like the present one, begin with a description of the general situation and the consequent demands made on the ILO. Next, there should be a chapter on the financial resources available, followed by conclusions regarding the growth, stability or reduction of expenditure. Then would come the main part, preceded perhaps by an integrated summary and showing for each major programme any changes in the level of its resources, its objectives and means of action, and any new or major project that might be planned. Such a paper would make for a more structured discussion in the Committee.

The present paper did not pay sufficient attention to the main feature of the period that it covered, namely the sharp fall in extra-budgetary contributions. The first version of the Medium-Term Plan and the present programme and budget were adopted when it was believed that the resources of the UNDP would increase by some 14 per cent annually, and that 10 per cent of those resources would continue to be allocated to the ILO. In fact that had not happened: from 1979 to 1980 its resources had increased by only 5 per cent, and from 1980 to 1981 there had actually been a drop of 21 per cent, which meant that during the present biennium the overall resources available to the ILO might be reduced by some $20 million. The Office was trying to diversify its sources of finance, but the seven or eight countries which paid the bulk of the voluntary contributions to multi-bilateral programmes were the very ones experiencing the economic difficulties reflected in the decrease in UNDP resources. The Director-General should therefore re-examine priorities and make every effort to rationalise the Office's activities, avoid duplicating the work of other organisations and see what cuts might be made. The main thing was that the ILO's standard of performance should not deteriorate.

As regards the standards and human rights programme, the Employers insisted that the machinery for supervising freedom of association should be strengthened, despite the fall in resources. The Committee on Freedom of Association had to cope with an ever-growing number of complaints, and its workload was increasingly forcing it to defer examination of cases. It was also urgently necessary to update the Digest of Decisions of the Committee, the last edition of which ended with decisions taken in 1976.

The Employers noted with satisfaction that the employment and development programme was becoming more action-oriented. It contained provision for a series of technical assistance projects financed from extra-budgetary resources for the rural and informal urban sectors, but these pursued very different objectives; as Mr. Subrahmanya had observed, objectives in these fields should be defined more precisely, and the Advisory Committee on Rural Development might look into the matter.

As for technology, it was regrettable that the plan mentioned the dangers resulting from technological change but not the opportunities and advantages which it offered, particularly for employment.

Where population activities were concerned, it was alarming that the resources of the UNFPA, which financed the ILO's entire programme, had also decreased by 10
per cent, and as most of the money was now devoted to China it was to be feared that the ILO's portion would be reduced to a minimum. The ILO's education activities in the field of population should continue and should be financed by budgetary resources.

As for disarmament, the Employers maintained their view that this was a low-priority item.

Regarding conditions of work, the indications given on occupational safety and health would no doubt be updated on the basis of the findings of the Tripartite Advisory Meeting on the Evaluation of PIACT, which presumably would also be taken into consideration in proposals for the next programme and budget.

On sectoral activities, the Employers formally reiterated their opposition to the idea of separate meetings for the industrialised and the developing countries.

Finally, since the programme of assistance to employers' organisations was in heavy demand, it was important to strengthen it even if, in sheer size, it could not match the corresponding activities on behalf of workers.

Mr. Huhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman), to avoid wasting time, would confine himself to general comments; it must be understood, however, that the Workers were by no means in agreement with all the views just expressed.

The Workers subscribed to the procedure of periodic reviews of the medium-term plans, as it allowed them to check once every two years how far the objectives stated in the programme and budget were being implemented in practice. It also afforded an opportunity for giving the Director-General guidance on the major principles that should be reflected in the programme and budget for the following biennium.

It was quite right, from that point of view, that the Medium-Term Plan should be ambitious, for the ILO's mission was more important than ever in the current world crisis. The Workers hoped that financial difficulties would not result in excessive reductions in the activities provided for in the plan when the next programme and budget was drawn up. By comparison with other UN agencies, the ILO had fallen behind in financial terms because it had as yet only partly recovered the resources available to it before the temporary withdrawal of the United States. For that reason the Workers were advocating a plan for making good this loss over three biennia.

Mr. Barnabo (Worker, Togo) stated that the revised Medium-Term Plan largely reflected the aspirations of the workers in the Third World, particularly in Africa. He drew attention to the statement by the World Confederation of Labour which had been circulated.

The concept of tripartism was of particular importance to workers in developing countries, where many employers had not yet become aware of the need for consultation, negotiation and worker involvement in certain decisions. While the current plan was still operative the Office should emphasise the importance of tripartism in its publications and press statements.

The Government of Togo had, with the help of the trade unions and the UNDP, set up a job-creation project for young people. Perhaps the Office might inform other international organisations of its existence in order to obtain further support for it.

Mr. Händler (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the ILO could not, any more than other international organisations, escape the consequences of the crisis currently faced by most countries. Like its member States it would have to forgo expansion of its programmes and the automatic offsetting of price increases.

The questionable device of authorising supplementary credits, which during the present budgetary period had inflated the budget by more than 10 per cent and caused a heavy increase in the cost to member States, should be used more sparingly in future.
Finally, the Governing Body should consider revising medium-term plans less frequently than once every two years.

Mr. Rodriguez Navarro (Government, Venezuela) considered that the Medium-Term Plan represented a genuine effort to reflect the world social and economic situation and to strike a balance between policies of adjustment to cope with the new economic and structural situation and the requirements of development, while providing basic security for the world's peoples.

In its analysis of North-South relations, the plan stated that the training of manpower and changes in product patterns should have a favourable effect on the distribution of resources, the scale of production and economic growth in the countries of the North, provided they abstained from protectionism and raised their productivity by using more advanced technology. The developing countries, in various international organisations, had put forward specific proposals for achieving a fairer international economic order; these would also have beneficial results for the industrialised countries.

As regards technology for development, it was necessary, as the plan contemplated, to diversify, reshape and develop the ILO's programme in the light of the Vienna Programme of Action adopted by the UN Conference on Science and Technology for Development, in order to enhance the technical capacity of the developing countries and restructure international relations in the fields of science and technology.

Mr. Kosting (Government, USSR) stated that his Government, which had long experience in preparing and implementing plans, was unable to accept either the idea of a sliding plan revised every two years or of partial revisions during its execution. If changes and additions proved necessary, they should be incorporated when the biennial programmes and budget were drawn up.

The review of the current plan did not clearly state the proposed changes. Its evaluation of the current world economic and social situation made no mention of certain increasingly blatant contradictions and said nothing on the expansion of multinational enterprises.

Paragraph 15 of the review, which referred to the questions being raised in some countries about the allegedly excessive cost of social security, might suggest that the ILO subscribed to these views - even though the paragraph admittedly stated that social policy, while expensive, also contributed in various ways to economic progress. Such an interpretation would discredit the Organisation in the workers' eyes.

The paper gave priority to human rights, standard-setting activities and the struggle against apartheid; the concept of human rights should, however, be expanded to include the right to a job, to free education and to a retirement pension, and also respect for civil liberties and the right to live in peace. All these aspects of human rights should receive constant attention from the ILO.

Regrettably, the revised plan contained no definite proposal for a study of the economic and social consequences of disarmament and its impact on employment, despite the resolution adopted by the Conference in June 1981 and the decisions taken by the Governing Body in November 1981.

Nor did the paper contain programme proposals for Europe to follow up the recommendations of the Third European Regional Conference.

The review did not suggest any measures to democratise and improve the ILO's machinery of supervision, despite repeated requests from many governments.

The discussions in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee had shown that member States were unanimous in wishing to improve the efficiency of the ILO's operations. That would involve abandoning programmes that were out of date or of secondary importance, avoiding overlapping with other organisations, keeping within the Organisation's field of competence and observing strict financial discipline.

Mr. Suzuki (Government, Japan) also stressed the importance of efficiency. Although the ILO played a major role in such fields as labour-management relations,
standard-setting or occupational safety and health, other international organisations were also involved and overlapping was likely to occur in some areas. The ILO should do its best to avoid such duplication.

On technical co-operation, it was difficult to subscribe to the easy solution of trying to offset the reduction in resources from the ONDP by drawing on the regular budget. In view of the precarious financial situation of a good many member States, the Office should try to diversify its sources of external financing for technical co-operation activities.

Mr. Linsenmayer (Government, United States) advocated reviewing the ILO's programmes and methods from an entirely new angle. The Governing Body should be more selective and establish its priorities more strictly. He hoped that the Office would prepare, for submission to the Governing Body at a later session, the paper requested by the United States Government concerning the procedures for establishing priorities currently being discussed in the United Nations.

In view of budgetary restraints, the Office should explore more imaginatively the resources offered by the private sector for help in its activities, thereby taking fuller advantage of its tripartite structure.

In implementing programmes the ILO's regional centres should be more closely involved as external collaborators.

The need for decisive, effective ILO action on human rights had been properly stressed. The urgency of the matter had been once again highlighted by recent events and the discussion on them. Not only had the rights of workers been trampled upon, but the ILO's competence and the integrity of its Director-General had been disputed. Such insinuations required a clear, strong response. Only by effectively mobilising its three constituent groups through innovative programmes would the ILO achieve results.

On the format for the review of the Medium-Term Plan, the interesting practical suggestions made by Mr. von Holten deserved careful consideration.

Mr. Ajei (Government, Nigeria) said that his Government's views were summarised in paragraphs 13, 53, 61, 78, 85 and 96 of the report.

Referring to paragraph 78 he pointed out that CIADFOR included virtually all the French-speaking African countries, and not only those in Western Africa. The time had come to consider a continental approach to vocational training, either by setting up separate bodies for English-speaking and French-speaking countries, along the lines of AFLAC and CRADAT, or by enlarging the present structure of CIADFOR, without forgetting that Africa also included Portuguese-speaking countries. It was for the countries of Africa themselves, in close consultation with the ILO, to determine what institutional arrangements were most appropriate. It would be useful if consultations could take place on the subject at the meeting of the Labour Commission of the Organisation of African Unity to be held shortly in Harare (Zimbabwe).

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) stated that his Government's views were contained in paragraphs 25 and 54 of the report.

Mr. Neack (Government, Democratic German Republic) wished to make it clear that his Government did not share the views expressed by Mr. von Holten. Its own views were recorded in paragraphs 7, 18, 50 and 75 of the report.

It was desirable that, when proposals for the biennial programme and budget were presented, the Governing Body should also have before it concrete information on the implementation status of programmes, together with any new trends to be taken into account in the programme and of outdated activities that could be discontinued. The programmes would thereby be better adapted to new requirements, and would also match the financial resources available. The procedure of reviewing medium-term plans might then become unnecessary.

Mr. Batbavar (Government, Mongolia) supported the efforts of the ILO to deal with unemployment, alleviate poverty and provide training for workers, all of which fitted into the new International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade. The activities proposed for implementing the Declaration concerning the policy of apartheid in South Africa were also wellcome.
The revised Medium-Term Plan, however, was in some respects inadequate. For example, it did not place sufficient emphasis on the relationship between disarmament and peace, the role of multinational enterprises in developing countries and the need to strengthen the public and co-operative sectors. It provided for comparative studies and analyses without proposing specific action. It made no reference to the improved conditions of workers in the socialist States, ignored the diversity of socio-economic systems and avoided analysing the real factors at the root of the world crisis and inflation. It offered no solution to growing unemployment and underemployment in the developing countries. These were the questions on which the ILO should concentrate in future.

Mr. Ben Israel (Worker, Israel) said that in the developing countries more than 400 million workers were unemployed or underemployed, and in the OECD countries 28 million people were unemployed, which was many more than during the 1929 slump. It was estimated that 1,000 million new jobs would have to be created by the end of the century. The main victims were young people, of whom 25.2 per cent were unemployed in Italy and Spain, and 13.2 per cent in Canada. These were the figures for 1980, and the picture was even grimmer this year. Should not the ILO, therefore, in the years 1982-87, play a much more active part than that foreshadowed in the report? By launching the World Employment Programme in 1976 the ILO had spearheaded the campaign, but since then it seemed to have fallen behind. The workers looked to the Organisation for more vigorous action, including, if necessary, revising the Plan so that it might make at least a contribution towards alleviating such a tragic situation.

Mr. Sène (Government, Senegal) expressed his satisfaction with the review and its penetrating analysis of the world economic and social situation. Now, if ever, was the time to mobilise the Organisation's resources to the full. So far as the developing countries were concerned, the main emphasis should be on employment, training, rural development and entrepreneurship in order to eradicate poverty, ignorance and unemployment.

The Government of Senegal supported the ILO's standard-setting activities, the protection and promotion of human rights and the struggle against apartheid in accordance with the new Declaration adopted by the Conference.

Even though other international organisations were concerned with inflation, recession and unemployment, the ILO's tripartite structure made it the ideal forum for in-depth debate of the world's social and economic problems. One way to expand employment would be to encourage trade between industrialised and developing countries. The Office document promised continuing efforts to overcome the developing countries' problems in such vital areas as the informal urban sector and the transfer of technology, and it was gratifying that employment and the social aspects of industrialisation had been included on the agenda of the Conference's next session.

Another important feature of the Medium-Term Plan was decentralisation, which was becoming increasingly important both in defining and in implementing activities to meet regional and sub-regional needs.

The Government of Senegal was wholeheartedly committed to the tripartite approach in the formulation of policies and in their implementation.

Increased efforts were needed to extend social security to the rural population in order to reduce inequalities still existing in most developing countries.

The financing of all these activities was a source of concern owing to the sharp drop in UNDP resources and the heavy financial burden of charging them all to the regular budget. Yet it did not seem possible in the present crisis to let technical co-operation activities so vitally important to the developing countries depend on the vagaries of extra-budgetary funding.

Interdependence between countries required a more balanced international economic order capable of ensuring economic growth in all States, to the benefit of international co-operation and world peace. However, in the absence of any political will, this would be difficult to achieve and both the International Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and the current global negotiations and North-South dialogue might be endangered.
The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) assured the Governing Body that all the main points made in the discussion would be fully taken into account by the Office.

In particular, the comments concerning the format of the Medium-Term Plan, notably those of Mr. Subrahmanya and Mr. von Holten, would be reflected upon and the Director-General might ask the Committee for further guidance before the next review of the Plan.

The question of resources, both budgetary and extra-budgetary, had attracted a good deal of comment. That had naturally raised once again the problem of priorities and the need to define objectives clearly, to discontinue activities which were no longer relevant and to avoid duplication and overlaps with the programmes of other organisations. There seemed to be general agreement on the importance of technical co-operation.

As regards the substance of the Plan, emphasis had been placed on the overriding importance of human rights and standards-related activities, and the need for strengthening this vital work was unanimously recognised.

On employment and development, note had been taken of the observations concerning the priority to be given to the rural and informal urban sectors, to the self-employed, to the promotion of entrepreneurship and to the problem of youth, as well as the nature of the programmes on technology. The remarks concerning the environment would also be borne in mind in both the preparation and the implementation of ILO programmes.

A number of speakers had mentioned disarmament and its relevance to ILO programmes; the Governing Body would have a further opportunity to consider this at its November session.

Mr. von Holten had urged that, in its sectoral activities, the ILO should concentrate on industrial meetings at an international rather than a regional level. The intention had not been, however, to propose regional or sub-regional meetings except in cases where they might effectively supplement the work of the existing Industrial Committees.

The Governing Body would have an opportunity to revert to these matters at its session in February-March 1983, when it would have before it programme and budget proposals for 1984-85 reflecting the guidance afforded by the present exercise.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

The sitting closed at 6.30 p.m.
The sitting opened at 10.10 a.m. with Mr. Ventelon in the Chair.

**ELEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA**

**Report of the Committee on Operational Programmes**

Mr. Mehta (Worker, India), on the subject of tripartite evaluation teams on ILO technical co-operation activities, called attention to the Workers' views as set out in paragraphs 4 to 8 of the report. The report of the evaluation team sent to Senegal had effectively highlighted difficulties, and in particular the complete lack of tripartite involvement, which was especially preoccupying. It mentioned that the application of the 1974 agreement between the Director-General and the Administrator of the UNDP had not been effective, and in fact many did not even seem to know of its existence. The Workers hoped that the Director-General would take remedial steps. There should be much greater involvement of the social partners in all such technical programmes. It was also important that such missions should be well prepared and team members be properly briefed. The Workers agreed with the point for decision in paragraph 39 of the report of the Committee on Operational Programmes.

The Workers' views on the item concerning technical co-operation matters arising out of the Ninth Asian Regional Conference were reflected in paragraphs 45 and 46. The early setting up of a regional rural training centre for the Asian and Pacific regions was generally supported, but on the question of direct aid to the rural poor through the organisations there had been some difference of opinion. The Employers felt that the ILO should not become a funding organisation. In the Workers' view, however, this was not funding in the ordinary sense, but simply offering small amounts to encourage self-help. Much further thought was needed, and the new paper the Office was to prepare should facilitate the decision by putting the problems in a different light. The Workers, whose opinion was recorded in paragraph 62, agreed with the point for decision in paragraph 66.

The Workers welcomed the memorandum of understanding between the ILO and UNFDAC, although they were a little sceptical about the human and financial resources that would be available for such a project.

The Workers' views on the United Nations Conference on Least Developed Countries were set out in paragraphs 71 and 72. Everything should be done to help the LDCs, and here too tripartite involvement in the planning and implementation of projects was essential. The Workers supported the point for decision in paragraph 86.

The Workers' views on ILO technical co-operation activities in 1981 were reflected in paragraphs 89 to 99. The Committee had had an excellent paper before it, but unfortunately it had been made available too late.

The Office was to be congratulated for the efforts it had made despite the decline in the UNDP's contribution. Bilateral aid was helping to fill the gap, but other programmes must not be allowed to suffer. There should be no skimping on expenditure for experts, equipment and fellowship training, although more use could be made of experts recruited locally, and TCDC arrangements should be encouraged.

As regards decentralisation, rotation of staff would make headquarters officials much more alive to the problems of the Third World. But decentralisation needed to be properly planned and implemented to ensure efficient staffing at the regional level. As for regional advisory committees, it would be much better for them to meet in the regions rather than in Geneva. Efforts should also be made to strike a better regional balance in projects.

As regards the relative emphasis on the various technical programmes, more funds were needed for workers' education, which was not given the priority it deserved. Workers' involvement in projects required more training for them in project management as well as industrial relations.
Lastly, the Workers hoped that the maximum would be done to help national liberation movements develop the administrative structure needed for rebuilding their countries when they became free.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico), after confirming her Government's position on ILO technical co-operation in 1981, as reflected in paragraphs 110 to 115 of the report, as well as its oft-stated views on tripartite evaluation teams, which concurred essentially with those of the Workers, said that her Government, as she had mentioned in the Committee, would make every effort through the Mexican representatives on the UNDP Governing Council to obtain more UNDP funding for ILO technical co-operation programmes.

Decentralisation, which was essential to technical co-operation and which in the American region had progressed steadily, should continue.

Mr. Najar (Employer, Lebanon) recorded the Employers' satisfaction at the successful conduct of the Committee's meeting. The papers were well drafted and had made for a constructive discussion. Although the Employers, like the Workers, were concerned about the late issue of the very important report on technical co-operation activities in 1981, they were deeply appreciative of those activities.

The Employers supported the point for decision in paragraph 39 of the report, concerning tripartite evaluation teams. They were most grateful for the support the last evaluation team had received from the Government and employers' and workers' organisations of Senegal. As mentioned in paragraph 9, they favoured widening project reviews to include completed projects that were no longer the responsibility of the ILO. They hoped that the practice of sending evaluation teams would continue, as they had proved their value.

As regards technical co-operation matters arising out of the Ninth Asian Regional Conference, the Employers supported the point for decision in paragraph 66, while stressing the importance of the role of employers' organisations and the help available to them from the ILO Bureau of Employers' Activities and the Regional Advisers for employers' organisations. However, they maintained that the ILO should not give direct financial help.

On assistance to the least developed countries, the Employers supported the point for decision in paragraph 86. The scope and diversity of the effort needed within the ILO's field of competence might not be fully appreciated by the UNDP and other traditional donors, and it was therefore important to secure additional financing.

The part of the report dealing with ILO technical co-operation activities in 1981 was very important. The Employers deeply appreciated the generous help that DANIDA and NORAD were giving to employers' programmes. They wished to call attention in particular to the statements recorded in paragraphs 102 and 103 of the report, and in particular to subscribe fully to the conclusion that helping small businesses had proved an effective means of creating jobs and improving conditions of life in the developing countries.

The Employers associated themselves with Mr. Mehta's point regarding the need to review the ILO/UNDP relationship. They had repeatedly insisted on more tripartite participation in ILO technical assistance activities, which would have a beneficial effect on the choice, design and implementation of projects.

Mr. Pabon (Government, Netherlands) expressed his Government's interest and concern about the matters covered in the report. Its position was reflected in paragraphs 47 to 50 and later on in paragraphs 127 to 130.

While not abandoning its traditional functions, the ILO was increasingly becoming a development-oriented organisation, which his Government welcomed, especially in view of its experience in the human aspects of development. From that point of view the diminishing support for the UNDP gave cause for concern, as it would hamper the ILO in performing its important tasks. The Government representatives—especially those from industrialised countries—should therefore press their governments to allocate resources to the UNDP. Another subject of concern was the Committee's postponement of a decision to assist activities aimed at promoting grass-roots participation in development projects. There was ample evidence to show that, in the absence of such participation and support, few projects could be expected to succeed. The Netherlands Government was prepared to
support some of the proposed activities - for example, in India, Bangladesh and the Philippines. It hoped to receive confirmation at an early session that the projects, including those financed to a small extent from the regular budget, could and would be continued.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) was gratified that Arabic speakers were now able to have full reports on technical co-operation in their language. It was also very useful to have reports and technical papers for meetings and seminars in Arabic so that all participants could play their part effectively and fully.

Mr. Sultan (Government, Bangladesh) said that a sentence to the following effect should have been included in paragraph 61 of the report, summarising his Government's position: "The Bangladesh Government supported the proposals in paragraph 19 of the report on technical co-operation matters arising out of the Ninth Asian Regional Conference, held in Manila."

His Government was very grateful to the ILO for its efforts under the Substantial New Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries, for whose implementation the LDCs were counting heavily on the international community and the specialised agencies.

On the subject of food aid, it was encouraging that the ILO was strengthening its ties with the main agencies concerned, namely the Wood Food Council, TFAD, FAO and the World Food Programme. The World Food Conference and the World Employment Conference had highlighted the crucial relationships between employment, incomes and food.

Bangladesh attached the greatest importance to food self-sufficiency. Its late President had involved himself personally in the campaign to increase food production and the present government was following in his footsteps in order to maintain the remarkable rate of progress achieved. In Bangladesh, 85 per cent of the population worked in agriculture, which from the employment point of view was its most important sector. The forthcoming national food strategy review was to be carried out with technical and financial support from the ILO, DANIDA and the World Food Council, and within that framework the Government was determined to play its full part.

Mr. Sow (Worker, Mauritania) associated himself with the Workers' position and confirmed his own views as recorded in paragraphs 19 to 21 of the report. Paragraph 37, however, lacked clarity as now worded. His point had been that maintenance was of as much concern to the ILO as it was to Senegal, since it would cost the ILO more to invest in new equipment than to repair and maintain existing equipment.

Lastly, he wished to thank the Government of Senegal, as he had done in the Committee. Those who had criticisms to make should bear in mind that the evaluation team had gone to Senegal at a time when major political changes were taking place. He also thanked the participating ILO officials, who had been most helpful.

Mr. Sene (Government, Senegal), referring to the comments made by the Senegal evaluation team, called attention to the statement recorded in paragraphs 22 to 26 of the report. Senegal, in accordance with its tradition of democracy and trade union pluralism, had initiated the practice of responsible participation, whereby the social partners were closely associated at all stages in the framing and implementation of national social and economic policy. This applied also to technical co-operation projects in so far as they formed an integral part of the general development policies decided upon by the Government after consultation with the social partners. Moreover, at the stage of implementation those in charge of projects had every opportunity to ensure effective tripartite consultation.

It was not true that there was no follow-up to projects once they came under the Government's management. Financial difficulties might sometimes make it difficult to give them the degree of priority desired, but the Government would never consider abandoning a project launched in co-operation with the ILO.

In view of the decline in UNDP funds, an appeal should be addressed to all the governments represented on the UNDP Governing Council so that the UNDP might release the resources needed to supplement the ILO's regular technical co-operation budget.

Mr. Desai (representative of the United Nations Development Programme), on the question of effective implementation of the 1974 agreement between the UNDP and the
ILO and of workers' and employers' participation in the UNDP-assisted ILO technical co-operation programme, acknowledged that, if the agreement and the instructions subsequently issued by the Administrator of the UNDP were indeed not being given due weight, all concerned must certainly be reminded of the importance of observing the agreement in practice. Under UNDP programming procedures, full account was taken of the sovereignty of the recipient government at all stages, and joint responsibility was assigned to governments, the UNDP and executing agencies in programming, implementation and follow-up. The resident representative undoubtedly had an important part to play, but the desire to uphold the tripartite concept at the operating level could best be met if members of the Governing Body invited their own governments to stress it through the ministries which acted as the focal point for UNDP assistance. The matter was, at any rate, to be taken up by the competent Deputy Director-General of the ILO and the UNDP Deputy Administrator.

As regards the decline in resources, the attention of member States had been repeatedly drawn to its adverse effects on the UN system's development efforts. The General Assembly at its last session had called for a substantial increase in the flow of resources to the UNDP to ensure delivery of the 1982-86 programme, and the executive heads of the UN system had also issued a joint statement pointing out the detrimental effects of current financial uncertainties and stringency on both developing and industrialised countries. The governing bodies of all UN agencies and organisations co-operating with the UNDP should exert their influence in support of the General Assembly's call for increased resources on an assured and predictable basis.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) expressed appreciation of the recognition which the Office's efforts to sustain and increase the ILO's technical co-operation work in 1981 had found in the Committee and in the Governing Body. The main reason for the delay in issuing the paper, which he regretted, was that it had to include a detailed analysis of operations right up to the end of 1981. The Officers of the Committee would be considering what might be done to ensure more timely issue.

As Mr. Desai had just pointed out, the dwindling of resources was a problem not only for the UNDP but for multilateral technical co-operation in general, and a challenge to the entire UN system. The Office's response would accordingly take three forms: first, the provision of support through the UNDP Administrator and through other channels for all efforts to re-emphasise the relevance and importance of multilateral as distinct from purely bilateral programmes; second, as far as the ILO was concerned, continuation of its efforts to secure additional resources through its contacts with any and all potential donors; and, third, continued efforts to improve the quality of the programmes offered.

On the question of evaluation, the Committee had already reviewed some selected questions to find out more about the impact of the ILO's work. The Governing Body was about to decide whether the practice of tripartite evaluation by Governing Body teams should be continued, and a number of suggestions had been made as to how their work might be improved. The Office was also refining its internal arrangements for evaluation, including self-evaluation by project management, without of course neglecting the important question of follow-up.

On the question of tripartism, the Office would continue its efforts to ensure even greater involvement of workers' and employers' organisations in the planning and implementation of ILO technical co-operation. The speaker intended to review this whole matter with the Deputy Administrator of the UNDP in a few weeks. In the meantime he was glad that Mr. Desai had reminded the Governing Body about the important role of governments in enlisting the support of 'workers' and employers' organisations in their respective countries. That was particularly important in the beneficiary countries, but it applied to the donor countries too.

As regards the follow-up to the Asian Regional Conference, the Office would be putting further proposals before the Committee at its next meeting on assistance to the organisations of rural poor. In the meantime, Mr. Pabon could rest assured that the work currently in hand would continue and be reflected in the proposals.

It was gratifying that both the Committee and the Governing Body endorsed the general approach to ILO action in the least developed countries - a point emphasised by Mr. Sultan.

Despite the problems over resources, the Organisation remained very committed to technical co-operation and would do its best to provide the services needed.
The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 39, 66 and 86 of the report.

NINTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 11 of the report.

Standing Orders

Mr. Svenningsen (Worker, Denmark) said that, notwithstanding the position it had stated in the Committee on the first proposal from the Spanish Government regarding the representation of States which were not members of the Governing Body, the Workers' group would be reconsidering the matter in the light of a subsequent discussion in the group as a whole and would submit its views to the Committee at its next meeting.

Mr. Falchetti (Government, Uruguay) supported the report's conclusions. As regards the first of the amendments proposed by the Government of Spain, he hoped that the Committee might reach final conclusions at its next meeting and propose an amendment to the Standing Orders that would allow Members of the Organisation not represented on the Governing Body to take part in discussions on reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association - a logical conclusion in view of the quasi-judicial nature of the procedure.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 18 to 49 of the report.

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the International Organisations Committee

Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Employer, Mexico), drew attention to the Employers' statement in the Committee as summarised in paragraph 3 of the report, which clearly reflected their views on how to help the developing countries to emerge from poverty. There was real cause for concern and pessimism at the little progress made. The North-South meeting in Cancún last year and the South-South dialogue now taking place in India had made it clear that the developing countries needed access to markets and international trade in a spirit of fairness and mutual respect.

Mr. Cuevas Zamora (Government, Mexico) said that a sentence along the following lines should have been added at the end of the Mexican Government's statement recorded in paragraph 10 of the report: "He also reiterated his Government's position regarding the different items on the agenda as stated both at earlier sessions of the Committee and in other committee".

Mr. Batiouk (Government, Ukraine) recalled that, during the discussion in the Committee on recent events in the United Nations system, attention had been called
to two inter-related problems: the need to encourage international efforts for the
preservation of peace and eradication of the nuclear threat and the need to
guarantee stable economic progress in the developing countries. On both these
matters severe disappointment had been registered. A paper was to be put before the
Governing Body in November dealing with the role of the ILO concerning disarmament.

The Committee needed fuller information on what was going on in the United
Nations system. In November 1981 the General Assembly, at its special session, had
discussed the annexation by Israel of the Golan Heights, and adopted recommendations
for action by the specialised agencies and the United Nations itself. Information
on what the ILO was intending to do would be welcome.

The Ukrainian Government endorsed the view it had already expressed in the
Committee that, on such matters as new and renewable sources of energy, the World
Population Conference, or relations with the High Commissioner for Refugees, the ILO
should not exceed its competence or duplicate the efforts of other organisations.

As Chairman of the Committee, he had appreciated the constructive spirit which
had enabled it to work quickly and effectively.

Mr. Cherief (Government, Algeria) regretted that no mention had been made of
the special session of the United Nations General Assembly held after the annexation
of the Golan Heights by Israel. The resolution adopted there should prompt ILO
action, particularly where workers' rights were concerned.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) associated himself with that statement.

Mr. Brown (Worker, United States) said that the Workers endorsed the
recommendations in paragraph 48 of the report - the only formal recommendations in
the report.

Issues which the Workers regarded as being within the competence of the ILC
included those related to the United Nations Global Convention on the Rights of
Migrant Workers and Their Families, UNIDO's interest in the training of industrial
manpower, and the training aspects of relations between the ILO and the UNCHCR. If
and when the enterprise under consideration by the Conference on the Law of the Sea
was finally set up, the ILO would have a special role to play as regards the
protection of its employees.

On the question of development, about which there was so much pessimism, the
Workers had made the point that the ILO should concentrate on what it could do as a
tripartite organisation, emphasising particularly the role of international labour
standards in building up the skilled workforce without which no amount of funds
could ignite the development process. The developing countries had made
miscalculations by seeking capital without having the skilled labour needed for its
productive use, or by neglecting the vital question of rural development. People in
the developing countries were disappointed and were becoming rebellious, not only
because of the so-called empty promises of the highly industrialised countries but
also because they were dissatisfied with their own leaders.

The ILO should concern itself more with the question of new and renewable
sources of energy, which was particularly important from the standpoint of rural
development, and should play a prominent role in the next conference on energy.

Lastly, the Workers could not help being concerned about the whole problem of
the entertainment industry, especially as regards cable television and satellite
communications, where the protection of performers had been neglected, and the ILO
should do what it could to help.

Mr. Ben-Israel (Worker, Israel) emphasised the ILO's unique responsibility, as
a tripartite organisation and spokesman for the world of labour, in efforts to
narrow the gap between rich and poor countries. At the beginning of the Third
Development Decade it was right to ask whether, had the industrialised countries
tried harder to understand the mentality and problems of the developing countries,
a true partnership might not have been forged. A man-made society could be changed
by human efforts, going far beyond what any trade union could do, in which human
factors were just as important as economic ones.

Any attempt on the part of the more developed world to indoctrinate or
recommend a way of life was doomed to failure. A way of life could not be taught,
certainly by others outside the developing countries; it must be developed and
passed on to those whose lives were concerned. Within the living laboratory of
Israel's social and economic development processes, people from 107 countries had
learned the truth of that statement.

Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Employer, Mexico), referring to the United Nations Global
Convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers and Their Families, pointed out that
under Article 57 of the United Nations Charter and the Agreement between the ILO and
the United Nations, it was not only the right but the duty of the ILO to concern
itself with the problems of migrant workers, on which the Conference was in fact
currently revising a Convention. Even if ECOSOC and the General Assembly were
senior bodies, they were still bound by the United Nations Charter and the
agreements.

On the problem of population, the Employers' views as recorded in paragraphs
31 and 32 of the report made it clear that they favoured voluntary population
control measures.

It was surprising that the First Consultation on the Training of Industrial
Manpower, which had come before the Committee only under the heading of "other
questions", had attracted so little attention. The Memorandum of Understanding
between the ILO and UNIDO was a vague and wordy document, but the ILO was complying
with it. The training of industrial manpower, an essential part of vocational
training and a crying need in many developing countries, was a matter for the ILO,
not UNIDO. It was gratifying that a tripartite Governing Body delegation had
attended the preparatory meeting in Innsbruck and had done a very good job, but it
was essential for the Consultation itself to be attended by a much larger tripartite
degregation, carrying the necessary weight.

With respect to radiation protection, it might be observed that the ILO had a
Convention of its own on the subject.

The World Assembly on Aging would no doubt have the success it deserved. The
ILO had done a great deal for older workers. It would be interesting to see the
papers the ILO had prepared for the meeting.

Mr. Wallin (Government, Belgium), who had gone to Innsbruck as Government
member of the delegation, said that the report reflected what he had said in the
Committee except on one important point. He was quoted in paragraph 50 as referring
to past consultations, when none had taken place. In reality his remarks related to
the consultations planned for the future, in which there was no assurance of
participation by employers' and workers' organisations. For that reason the
Director-General had been requested to urge member States to include employers and
workers in their delegations. Somewhat paradoxically, the countries in Group "B" -
i.e., the rich, industrially and socially advanced countries - were the ones opposing
employer and worker participation, despite their lengthy tradition of
institutionalised consultation with the workers' and employers' organisations on
vocational training matters. These ideas were not properly reflected in paragraph
50.

Mr. Pabon (Government, Netherlands) called attention to paragraph 65,
according to which Mr. Bolin had assured the Committee that "the ILO would not take
any action in assisting refugees in the absence of an express request of the
government concerned and of an agreement with the UNHCR". That, it was to be hoped,
did not imply a purely passive ILO role and preclude the ILO from offering its
services in the planning of activities to assist refugees.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-
General), referring to the resolution regarding the situation in the occupied Arab
territories, explained that, when the papers for the International Organisations
Committee were being prepared, the resolution had not yet been adopted and could
not, therefore, have been covered. The ILO had been officially notified of it by
the Secretary-General of the United Nations only the previous day. The Office would
be in touch with the Secretary-General for further discussions about possible ILO
action.

As regards the First Consultation on the Training of Industrial Manpower, the
ILO would of course invite participating governments to include representatives of
employers' and workers' organisations in their delegations, and it would certainly
consult UNIDO about a possible joint approach. There were grounds for hoping that
positive results would emerge by the time of the First Consultation.
Mr. Pabon could rest assured that the ILO would not be inactive where refugees were concerned. The Office obviously had to agree on practical arrangements with the governments concerned and with the UNHCR to avoid overlapping and unnecessary costs. However, it would certainly not be a passive partner but would do its utmost within its sphere of competence.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 98 of the report.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings

Fourth paper

Mr. Cherief (Government, Algeria) asked if it would be possible to invite an Algerian expert to the Meeting of Experts on Maintenance of Rights in Social Security.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General) said that the possibility would be examined.

The Governing Body approved the nominations in paragraphs 2, 5, 8 and 11 of the Office paper.

Fifth paper

Mr. Malintoppi (Government, Italy) expressed his regret at the resignation of Professor Grigory Tunkin from the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, and paid a tribute to the eminent jurist who had contributed so much towards the development of international law and better understanding among peoples.

The Chairman was sure that the Governing Body would unanimously agree to thank Prof. Tunkin for his services, and to appoint Mr. Ivanov in his place.

Mr. Batbavar (Government, Mongolia) asked whether a proposal would be put before the Governing Body at the present session for the replacement of Mrs. Bokor-Szegő, the Hungarian member of the Committee of Experts, whose term of Office had expired.

The Director-General replied that in November he had indeed indicated his intention of submitting at this session proposals for the replacement of two members of the Committee on the expiry of their term of office. In one case it had been done, but in the other it had not been possible, as he had informed the Officers of the Governing Body.

In his consultations with the Hungarian Government he had indicated that it would be desirable in the coming months to review the composition of the Committee of Experts with a view to striking a better geographical balance between Europe (i.e. Eastern and Western Europe together) and the countries of the Third World, and he had expressed the hope to the Officers that it would be possible to submit proposals to that end to the Governing Body, perhaps in November 1982. The Officers had strongly supported that approach.

The geographical imbalance in the Committee's composition could not, however, be corrected rapidly as it was a structural problem which might necessitate fairly lengthy consultations with the countries in the regions concerned. He hoped that reasonable proposals could be worked out in time for November.

---

1 See also second and fourth sittings.
Mr. Nekipelov (Government, USSR) thanked Mr. Malintoppi for his warm tribute to Prof. Tunkin's professional and human qualities and the Governing Body for approving the proposal regarding the appointment of Mr. Ivanov.

As regards the Committee's composition, it was indeed necessary to strike a balance between regions, and even between different social systems, as well as between schools of legal thought. That did not mean, however, that as soon as the term of office of one of the experts ran out the existing balance should be changed. The question of balanced composition was one to which the Director-General rightly proposed to give in-depth consideration.

At present, the socialist countries were already insufficiently represented on the Committee, and they could not agree to a further reduction in their representation. Of course there should be experts from Asia, the Arab countries and other regions or subregions, but in the present instance it was the term of office of an expert from Eastern Europe that had expired.

In the circumstances, it should be possible to adopt a compromise decision as an interim measure—namely to extend the term of office of the Hungarian expert for one year, which was the period the Director-General had said he needed to study the question and work out comprehensive proposals. That would enable Mrs. Bokor-Szegő to participate in the Committee's meeting due to start in a few days' time.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) wholeheartedly supported Mr. Nekipelov.

Admittedly, an appropriate balance, both geographical and social, had to exist in the Committee, where the developing countries were under-represented, but that should not be achieved at the expense of the socialist countries. He supported the Director-General's intention of putting the whole problem before the Governing Body for consideration.

In the meantime, why not extend the term of office of the Hungarian expert? It was indeed surprising that such a proposal had not been put to the Governing Body, which had taken a number of decisions aimed at enhancing the status of women in the ILO. It almost seemed as though an attempt was being made to remove a woman from the Committee. The Governing Body, therefore, should extend her term of office until November, or until a final decision was taken on the question of principle.

Mr. Beres (Government, Hungary) associated himself with that proposal.

The socialist countries were ready and willing to discuss the question of achieving a better balance within the Committee, and awaited the Director-General's proposals. For the time being, however, they could not accept a fait accompli and the loss of a seat occupied by one of their experts. The seat could not remain vacant, but must be filled either by extending the term of office of the Hungarian expert or through the temporary appointment of another expert from a socialist country.

Some years ago the Committee's membership had been set at 18, but since then both the membership of the ILO and the Committee's workload had increased steadily. There was accordingly every reason for giving better representation to certain regions by adding a few more members, but definite proposals should be made and formally discussed.

Mr. Cherief (Government, Algeria) said that the developing countries had long been concerned by the flagrant disparity between the representation of the industrialised and Third World countries on the Committee. Moreover, there was not a single woman on the Committee now, in contradiction with the Organisation's declared policy, nor was there any representative of the Arab States. It was to be hoped that these anomalies would be put right when the membership of the Committee was reviewed.

Mr. Timmer (Worker, Hungary) associated himself with the views expressed by the representatives of the OISS, the German Democratic Republic and Hungary.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stressed the importance the Employers attached to the Committee of Experts as an essential part of the ILO supervisory machinery. Since it was, by definition, an independent body it was totally wrong to claim that a State or a group of States was entitled to a seat on it.
It was true that a balance needed to be struck between regions, between legal systems, between traditions, between languages and, indeed, between the sexes. At present there was indeed an obvious imbalance between Europe and the rest of the world, due to historic reasons. Successive Directors-General had been engaged in the task of bringing the Committee’s membership more into line with present-day reality, and the regional groups affected by the process had accepted it with good grace, as, for example, when Ambassador Puegger, who was Swiss, had left the Committee and was not replaced by somebody else from Western Europe. There was no untouchable group in the Governing Body, and the Director-General should pursue his efforts to achieve by stages the kind of geographical representation which all considered so important.

Nor was it only a question of geographical distribution; account had to be taken of individuals’ character, legal qualifications and attitude to the ILO’s activities relating to standards. A number of members of the Governing Body had shown forbearance and realism by acknowledging the need for representation of the socialist countries on the Committee. They had not objected to the appointment of Mr. Ivanov, even though they recalled some of the not very kind remarks he had made about the Committee of Experts in the Conference Committee. It was to be hoped that the Employers’ efforts to facilitate a solution to this complicated problem would be reciprocated.

Mr. Stamenov (Government, Bulgaria) associated himself with the position of the USSR, Hungary and the German Democratic Republic.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) entirely agreed with the Director-General’s approach. The length of time a person remained a member of the Committee of Experts should depend on two factors: first, his or her ability, competence, knowledge of the Organisation and its Conventions, and familiarity with the social, legal and trade union situation in ILO member countries, and, second, the balance in the representation of legal and social systems and regions of the world. The fact that Mrs. Bokor-Szegő was a woman was irrelevant. The decision to extend or not to extend her term of office should be taken purely on the basis of her competence and performance on the Committee.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) agreed that it was not a question of sex but of qualifications, and the Director-General was in fact known to have expressed high appreciation of the work done by Mrs. Bokor-Szegő.

The Chairman took it that proposals would be put before the Governing Body in November, taking into consideration geographical balance, competence and any other relevant factors.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office paper.

SEVENTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Programme of meetings

The Governing Body approved the programme of meetings as set out in Appendix I to the Office Paper.
EIGHTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies

Special Session of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, 10-18 May 1982

On the nomination of the three groups, the Governing Body appointed the following delegation to represent it at the Special Session:

Government member
Mr. PATUK (Ukrainian SSR)

Employer member
Mr. YOSHINO (Japan)

Worker member
Mr. ISSIFU (Ghana)

Substitute
Mr. SOW (Mauritania)

Eleventh Session of the Coal Mines Committee (Geneva, 20-29 April 1982)

The Governing Body appointed Mr. APPADURIY as Employer member of the tripartite delegation representing the Governing Body in the place of Mr. Politis.\(^1\)

SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

Seventh Supplementary Report

Request by a non-member State to be represented by a delegation of observers at the 68th (1982) Session of the Conference

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 2 of the report.

Ninth Supplementary Report

Participation of non-metropolitan territories as observers in the 68th (1982) Session of the International Labour Conference

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the report.

---

\(^1\) Appointed at the previous session; cf. GB.218/PV(Rev.), p. VIII/11.
In the absence of any other business, the Chairman thanked all concerned for their co-operation during the session.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) expressed her gratitude to the Chairman for his able and courteous conduct of the Governing Body's discussions.

The session was declared closed at 12:55 p.m.
ANNEXE

LISTE ALPHABÉTIQUE DES PERSONNES PRÉSENTES À LA SESSION

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF PERSONS ATTENDING THE SESSION

LISTA POR ORDEN ALFABÉTICO DE LAS PERSONAS PRESENTES EN LA REUNIÓN

G  =  Représentant gouvernemental - Government representative - representante gubernamental
E  =  Membre employeur - employer member - miembro empleador
T  =  Membre travailleur - worker member - miembro trabajador
GS =  Suppléant gouvernemental - Government substitute - suplente gubernamental
ES =  Suppléant employeur - employer substitute - suplente empleador
GCT =  Conseiller technique gouvernemental - Government adviser - consejero técnico gubernamental
ECT =  Conseiller technique employeur - employer adviser - consejero técnico empleador
TCT =  Conseiller technique travailleur - worker adviser - consejero técnico trabajador
GA =  Représentant gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government representative (deputy member) - representante gubernamental (miembro adjunto)
EA =  Membre employeur adjoint - employer deputy member - miembro empleador adjunto
TA =  Membre travailleur adjoint - worker deputy member - miembro trabajador adjunto
GAS =  Suppléant gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government substitute (deputy member) - suplente gubernamental (miembro adjunto)
GACT =  Conseiller technique gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico gubernamental (miembro adjunto)
EACT =  Conseiller technique employeur (membre adjoint) - employers' adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico empleador (miembro adjunto)
TACT =  Conseiller technique travailleur (membre adjoint) - workers' adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico trabajador (miembro adjunto)
GNM =  Représentant d'un gouvernement non Membre - representative of a non-Member Government - representante de un gobierno no Miembro
OI =  Représentant d'une organisation internationale gouvernementale - representative of an international governmental organisation - representante de una organización internacional gubernamental
ONG =  Représentant d'une organisation internationale non gouvernementale - representative of an international non-governmental organisation - representante de una organización internacional no gubernamental
GI =  Gouvernement invité au titre de l'article 24 ou 26 de la Constitution - State Member invited in accordance with Article 24 or 26 of the Constitution - Estado miembro de la Organización invitado en virtud del artículo 24 o 26 de la Constitución.
ABONDÒ, J.E., M. (Cameroon), président, Union nationale des travailleurs du Cameroun.

ABBÉU PEPPER, Alejandro, Sr., segundo secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

ADLER, Lone, Mrs., Head of Section, Ministry of Labour, (Denmark).

AGUILAR, Oscar, Sr., segundo secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

AHMED, K., Mr. (Pakistan), General Secretary, All Pakistan Federation of Trade Unions.

AIZPURUA de CONSTANTINO, Iztia, Sra., consejero, Misión Permanente de Panamá en Ginebra, (Panamá).

AJAI, O.A., Mr., Assistant Director, Federal Ministry of Employment, Labour and Productivity, (Nigeria).

AKBIL, Semih, Mr., Representative to the UN Organisations in Geneva, (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations).


ALBALATE LAFITA, Joaquín, Sr., agregado laboral en la embajada de España ante la COT, (España).

ALBEDA, H., Mr., Former Minister of Social Affairs; representative of the Government of the Netherlands on the Governing Body, (Netherlands).

ALEMAN SALVADOR, Mario, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente del Ecuador en Ginebra, (Ecuador).

AL FAL10UJI, Ikbal, Dr., ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la Ligue arabe à Genève, (League of Arab States).

AL-HARMY, Yousif, Mr., Acting Director of Planning and Technical Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, (Bahrain).

AL-MADANI, Abdulla Fashid, Br., Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs; representative of the Government of Bahrain on the Governing Body, (Bahrain).

ALMOMAN, Ala, M., attaché, Délégation permanente à Genève, (League of Arab States).

AL-QUTAISH, Mohammed Salih, H.E., Ambassadour; Permanent Representative of the Democratic Yemen in Geneva, (Democratic Yemen).

ALSTON, P., Mr., Human Rights Officer, Division of Human Rights, (United Nations).

AL-TAGHLABI, Talaat, M., chef, Délégation permanente à Genève, (Organisation arabe du travail).

ALVAREZ de, Bessie, Sra., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra, (Colombia).

AMEY, Alan, Mr., International Affairs Department, Canadian Labour Congress; accompanying Mrs. Carr.

ANDERSEN, Niels Ole, Mr., Head of Division, International Relations Division, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Denmark on the Governing Body, (Denmark).

ANDERSEN, R., Mr., External Relations Officer, Co-ordination with other organisations, (World Health Organisation).

ANGOUTCHKINE-TIMOFEEV, A.S., M., conseiller de section, ministère des Affaires étrangères de l’URSS, (URSS).

APPADUFAI, E.S., Mr. (Sri Lanka), Secretary, Employers’ Federation of Ceylon.
ARA, Tatsuo, Mr., Official, International Labour Affairs Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Labour, (Japan).

ARBESTEFC-RASTBURG, M., Mr., Chief of Personnel, Brevillier-Urban AG.

ARGUEDAS DEL CARRIO, Augusto, Sr., ministro consejero, Misión Permanente de Bolivia en Ginebra, (Bolivia).

ARMSTRONG, Robert, Mr., Assistant Deputy Minister, Policy Co-ordination and Liaison Branch, Department of Labour: representative of the Government of Canada on the Governing Body, (Canada).

BACCOCHE, Habib, M., deuxième secrétaire, Délégation permanente à Genève, (Organisation arabe du travail).

EANNEMANS-MENSON, F., Mr., (Belgica), Executive Director, Ghana Employers' Association.

BARBON, Silvaro, M., Collègue accompagnant M. Vanni.

BARNABO, Nangbog, M., (Togo), secrétaire général, Confédération nationale des travailleurs du Togo (CITT).

BASTIEN, P., M., directeur intérimaire, relations internationales, coordination des politiques et liaison; ministère du Travail, (Canada).

BATBAYAF, Shilegiin, Mr., First Deputy Chairman, State Committee on Labour and Social Security; representative of the Government of Mongolia on the Governing Body, (Mongolia).

BATES, N.H., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva, (United Kingdom).

BATIUK, Victor G., M., représentant permanent de la RSS d'Ukraine à Genève; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la RSS d'Ukraine au Conseil d'administration, (RSS d'Ukraine).

BEL HADJ HASSINE, Sadok, M., chef du bureau de la coopération internationale, ministère des Affaires sociales, (Tunisie).

EEN-ISAACI, G., Mr. (Israel), Member of the Executive Bureau, Histadrut (Federation of Labour in Israel).

BERIS, András, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente de la République populaire hongroise à Genève; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la Hongrie au Conseil d'administration, (Hongrie).

BERTELING, Jan, Mr., Head, Co-ordination and Budgetary Division, International Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (Netherlands).

BLEUX, Flor, M., secrétaire général adjoint, (Confédération mondiale du travail).

BLONDEL, Marc, M., (France), secrétaire conféderal de la Confédération générale du travail Force ouvrière (CGT-FC).

DE BOCK, J., M., attaché, Mission permanente de la Belgique à Genève, (Belgique).

BODEMAR, S., Mr., Inter-Agency Affairs Officer, (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

BOHR, Klaus, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany in Geneva, (Federal Republic of Germany).


BOURJAS, Pierre, Mr., Assistant Administrator; Director, European Office, (United Nations).
GA  BEIKI, Yahia, M., ministre pléiipotentiaire, Mission permanente de la République algérienne démocratique et populaire à Genève, (Algérie).

TA  BEIKI, Youcef, M. (Algérie), secrétaire de l'Union générale des travailleurs algériens.

G  ERILLANTES, Hortencio J., H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of the Philippines in Geneva, (Philippines).

T  BROWN, I., Mr. (United States), International Representative of the AFL-CIO.

GNN  BBUAAS, Odd, Mr., Senior Counsellor, International Relations Division, Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, (Norway).

GCT  BEUGEFE, Alain, M., conseiller des affaires étrangères, Direction des Nations Unies et des organisations internationales; ministère des Relations extérieures, (France).

GNN  BUSTOS, Carlos, Sr., ministro consejero, representante permanente adjunto de Chile en Ginebra, (Chile).

GACT  CAIRO SOLEF, Alfredo, Sr., funcionario de la Dirección de Organismos Internacionales, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, (Cuba).

GNN  CAMILLERI, Vincent L., Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Malta in Geneva, (Malta).

T  CARR, S., Mrs. (Canada), Executive Vice-President, Canadian Labour Congress.

GCT  CARTIER, Jean-Louis, M., administrateur civil, Division des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et de la Participation, (France).

GAS  CATO, A.A., Mr., Minister/Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative of Ghana in Geneva, (Ghana).

EA  CHAMBERS, S.B., Mr. (Jamaica), President, Jamaica Employers' Federation.

G  CHARBY SAMPER, Héctor, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de Colombia en Ginebra; representante del Gobierno de Colombia ante el Consejo de Administración, (Colombia).

GS  CHAWLA, N.B., Mr., Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Labour, (India).

GACT  CHERIEF, Abdelaziz, M., sous-directeur des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et de la Formation professionnelle, (Algérie).

GS  CHOWDHURY, Nazimullah, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh in Geneva, (Bangladesh).

GAS  CHRISTENSEN, Hans Flanse, Mr., Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission of Denmark in Geneva, (Denmark).

GACT  CHRISTIAN, L.K., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ghana in Geneva, (Ghana).

GS  CISSE, Mamadou, M., directeur du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale, (Sénégal).

GNN  CIZEK, Josef, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in Geneva, (Tchécoslovaquie).

GAS  CLOESEN, J., M., conseiller adjoint, Département des relations internationales, ministère de l'Emploi et du Travail, (Belgique).

GS  COLY, Pierre-Marie, M., inspecteur du Travail, chef de la Division des études et des relations internationales, ministère de la Fonction publique, du Travail et de l'Emploi, (Sénégal).

GNN  CONDOMINES PEPERÀ, Francisco, Sr., Ministro consejero, Embajada de España ante la CII, (España).

GNN  CORBELL, Erik, Mr., Minister, Permanent Mission of Sweden in Geneva, (Sweden).
CROWNSTEET, W., Mrs., Legal Officer, Protection Division, (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

CUEVAS, T., Sr. (Colombia), presidente, Unión de Trabajadores de Colombia.

CUEVAS ZAMORA, Mario, Sr., Consejero, Misión Permanente de México en Ginebra; representante suplente del Gobierno de México ante el Consejo de Administración, (México).


DAS, A.S., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva, (India).

DAVID, V., Mr. (Malaysia), Secretary-General, Malaysian Trades Union Congress.


DECALLON, René, M., conseiller technique au Cabinet du ministre du Travail, (France).

DELABBRE, Hubert, M., inspecteur général honoraire des affaires sociales; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la France au Conseil d'administration, (France).

DESAIL, Niranjan, Mr., Chief, External Relations Section, European Office, (United Nations).

DESCHAMPS, Albert, Mr. (Canada), Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

DESMUKH, B.G., Mr., Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of India on the Governing Body, (India).

DHAVERNAS, D., M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Canada à Genève, (Canada).

DIARRA, Mamadou Samba, M., conseiller technique au ministère du Travail, (Mali).

DIMOND, J.M., Miss, Principal, Department of Employment, (United Kingdom).


DOLAN, C.O., Mr. (Australia), President, Australian Council of Trade Unions.

DOOL, Hans van den, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in Geneva, (Netherlands).


EL REEDY, El Sayed A.B., H.E., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Egypt in Geneva, (Egypt).

ERIKSEN, Henning, Mr., Assistant Head of Section, Ministry of Labour, (Denmark).

ESCOAR PÁRDON, Jairo, Sr. (Colombia), vicepresidente (Asuntos Sociales y Laborales), Asociación Nacional de Industriales.

FALCHETTI MIGNONE, Roberto, Sr., profesor de la Cátedra de Derecho del Trabajo, Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales; representante del Gobierno de Uruguay ante el Consejo de Administración, (Uruguay).

FALCHI, Giovanni, S.E., Ambassadeur; représentant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration, (Italie).

FARAG, Aziz, Mr., Senior Labour Officer, (Organisation de l'Unité africaine).

FARES, Salem Abdel Sheikh, Mr., Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of the Democratic Yemen in Geneva, (Democratic Yemen).
GS FASANYA, J.O., Mr., Senior Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission of Nigeria in Geneva, (Nigeria).

ONG FAUCHERE, Béatrice, Mme, bureau de Genève, (Confédération mondiale du travail).

GCT FERRERO, Morella, Srta., tercer secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

GCT FIORE, Nicola, M., premier dirigeant, ministère du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale, (Italie).

E FLUNDER, D.J., Mr. (United Kingdom), Chairman, International Labour Committee, Confederation of British Industry.

GACT FRANSDSEN, Greger, Mr., Deputy Head of the International Relations Division, Ministry of Labour, (Denmark).

TCT FUJISAWA, Ikuko, Miss, International Department, Japanese Federation of Chemical and General Trade Unions; accompanying Mr. Tanaka.

GI GARAY, Ivan, Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente de Nicaragua en Ginebra, (Nicaragua).

GS GARCIA, John L.B., Mr., Assistant Secretary, Overseas Division, Department of Employment, (United Kingdom).

GMM GARCIA TEJEDOR, Electo J., S.E., Embajadora; representante permanente de España ante la Organización internacional de Trabajo en Ginebra, Ginebra, (España).

E GEORGET, Henri, M. (Niger), entrepreneur.

OI GODOY APCAAYA, Oscar, Mr., Permanent Observer in Geneva, (Organization of American States).


G GONZALEZ MARTINEZ, Aída, S.E., Embajadora; Oficial Mayor, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores; representante del Gobierno de México ante el Consejo de Administración, (México).

T GONZALEZ NAVARRO, José, Sr. (Venezuela), Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela.

E GROVE, David L., Mr. (United States), President, United States Council for International Business.

OI GUESSOGO NKONO, Thomas, M., directeur, (Centre régional africain d'administration du travail).

GACT GUIDOBONO, Rubén, Sr., asesor técnico legal, Departamento de Asuntos Internacionales, Ministerio del Trabajo, (Argentina).

GAS GUTEMA, Hannah, Mrs., Expert, International Affairs Section, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, (Ethiopia).

GA GYI, Maung Maung, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Burma in Geneva; representative of the Government of the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma on the Governing Body, (Burma).


OI HABENICHT, H., Mr., Chief, Department of Planning, Liaison and Research, (Intergovernmental Committee for Migration).

GCT HAGEN, Kees, Mr., Collaborator, Department for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, (Netherlands).

EA HAK, Cornelie, Miss (Netherlands), Chief, International Social Affairs Division; Netherlands Council of Employers' Federations.

HAQUE, Alimul, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh in Geneva, (Bangladesh).

HART, C., Miss, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva, (United Kingdom).

HAYANO, Harry P., Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva, (Indonesia).

HASCHKE, Herbert, Mr., Deputy Permanent Representative of the German Democratic Republic in Geneva; Substitute Representative of the German Democratic Republic on the Governing Body, (German Democratic Republic).

HAYASHIDA, Hideki, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva, (Japan).

HAYES, FrancisMahon, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Ireland in Geneva, (Ireland).

HEALY, Thomas Patrick Augustine, Mr., OBE, Head, International Labour Department, Confederation of British Industry; personal substitute for Mr. Flunder.

HECKEL, Reiner, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic in Geneva, (German Democratic Republic).

HEINZEMANN, R., Mr., Confederation of German Employers' Associations; personal substitute for Mr. Lindner.

HÉLÈNE, C.J., M., directeur, direction des finances, ministère du Travail, (Canada).

HERNÁNDEZ OLIVA, Gretel, Sra., funcionaria de la Dirección de Relaciones Internacionales del Comité Estatal del Trabajo y Seguridad Social, (Cuba).

HERNÁNDEZ SANCHEZ, Homero Luis, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de la República Dominicana en Ginebra, (República Dominicana).

HERRAN, Angela, Sra., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra, (Colombia).

HEYER, Albert, Mr., accompanying Mr. Muhr.

HOLLEN von, Johan, Mr. (Sweden), Director, Swedish Employers' Confederation.

HOTOS SOSA, Freddy, Sr., ministré consejero, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

HURTADO de MENDOZA, Félix, Mr., Counsellor, European Regional Office, (Organization of American States).

IDER, Chimidiin, Mr., State Committee on Labour and Social Security, (Mongolia).

INCISA DI CAMERANA, Manfredo, M., premier conseiller, Mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève, (Italie).

ISSIFU, A.M., Mr. (Ghana), Secretary General, Ghana Trades Union Congress.

IVBakis, Constantin, M., premier conseiller, Mission permanente de la Grèce à Genève, (Grèce).

JIMÉNEZ DAVID, Fernando, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente alterno de la República Argentina en Ginebra, (Argentina).

KANTCHEV, Kantcho, M., spécialiste auprès du Comité de planification, (Bulgarie).

KAPARTIS, Costas, Mr., Deputy Secretary-General, (Organisation internationale des employeurs).
GS KATO, Yasuhiro, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body, (Japan).

OI KHAN, A.H., Mr., Liaison Officer, Center Against Apartheid, (United Nations).


GNM KIRUBANATHAN, J.D., Mr., Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission of Malaysia in Geneva, (Malaysia).

GNM KOFFLER, Wernerfried, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Austria in Geneva, (Austria).

OI KOISSER, W., Mr., Chief, Programming and Co-ordination Section, (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

GS KOLESNIK, D.N., M., représentant permanent adjoint de l'URSS à Genève, (URSS).


ONG LABRUNE, Lucien, Mr., Permanent Representative in Geneva, (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

ONG LAGASSE, R., Mr., Secretary-General, (Organisation internationale des employeurs).

GNM LAFERRERE SUEFZ, Martha, Srta., Consejero, Misión Permanente de Bolivia en Ginebra, (Bolivia).

ONG LAURISSEN, E., Mr., Assistant Director, Geneva Office, (Confédération internationale des syndicats libres).

GCT LAVAL, Antoine, M., conseiller technique au Cabinet du Président du Conseil économique et social, (France).

OI LI, C., Mr., Economic Affairs Officer, Manufactures Division, (United Nations).

GNM LIDAL, Bengt, Mr., Head of Section, Ministry of Labour, (Sweden).

GCT LINDNER, Wolf-Tieter, Mr. (Federal Republic of Germany), Chief, International Social Policy Branch, Confederation of German Employers' Associations.

GCT LINSENMAYER, Tadd, Mr., Director, Office of International Organizations and Technical Assistance, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor; substitute representative of the Government of the United States on the Governing Body, (United States).

T LLOYD, Glyn, Mr. (United Kingdom), CBE, Member, General Council of the Trades Union Congress; Member, National Executive of the Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians.

GNM LOAYZA BABEA, Javier, Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente de Bolivia en Ginebra, (Bolivia).

OI LOHRMANN, F., Mr., Research and Liaison Officer, Department of Planning, Liaison and Research, (Intergovernmental Committee for Migration).

GCT LONG, C.W., Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva, (United Kingdom).

GCT LUNA CORONA, Dámaso, Sr., Asesor, Dirección General de Asuntos Internacionales, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social, (México).

GNM MCDONAGH, Philip, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ireland in Geneva, (Ireland).

GA M'POLO, Wuta, M., directeur, Département des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale, (Angola).
GA MAASHO, Mahari, Mr., Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, (Ethiopia).

GNM MAGISTAD, Inga, Mrs., Attaché, Permanent Mission of Norway in Geneva, (Norway).

TA MAIER, H., Mr. (Austria), Adviser, Austrian Confederation of Trade Unions.

GS MALINTOPPI, Antonio, M., professeur ordinaire du droit des Communautés européennes, Université de Rome; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration, (Italie).

GNM MANGONGO-NZAMBI, André, S.E., Ambassadeur, représentant permanent du Gabon à Genève, (Gabon).

GNM MANOR, Uzi, Mr. First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Israel in Geneva, (Israel).

GNM MANZ, Johannes J., M., ministre, observateur permanent adjoint de la Suisse à Genève, (Suisse).

GACT MARTINEZ, Gabriel O., S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra, (Argentina).

GCT MARTINI URDANET, Alberto, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de Venezuela en Nueva York, (Venezuela).

GAS MARTINS DA CEUZ, António, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Portugal à Genève; représentant suppléant du gouvernement du Portugal au Conseil d'administration, (Portugal).

GA MARTON, Tamas, M., chef de département au Bureau d'Etat du travail et des salaires; représentant du gouvernement de la Hongrie au Conseil d'administration, (Hongrie).

T MASHASI, E.J., Mr. (Tanzania), Deputy Secretary-General, JUWATA.

GNM MASSA MURAZZI, Alberto, Sr., tercer secretario, Misión Permanente del Perú en Ginebra, (Perú).

OI MASSON, Francis D., Mr., Liaison Officer in Geneva, (Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation).

T MEHTA, Kanti, Mr. (India), Vice-President, Indian National Trade Union Congress.

TA MENDOZA, D.T., Mr. (Philippines), President, Trade Union Congress of the Philippines.

TCT MITYAYEV, Ivan I., M., chef de service, section internationale, Conseil central des syndicats; accompagnant M. Prokhorov.

EA MONT BALMACEDA, M., Sr. (Chile), presidente, Comisión de Asuntos Internacionales del Trabajo, Confederación de la Producción y del Comercio.

GCT MOBOZOV, V.M., M., conseiller de section, ministère des Affaires étrangères de l'URSS, (URSS).

Z MOUKOKO KINGUE, F., M. (Cameroun), président de l'Union des syndicats professionnels du Cameroun.

T MUHR, Gerd, Mr. (Federal Republic of Germany), Vice-President, German Confederation of Trade Unions (DGB); Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body.

GCT MUJICA de ADAMES, Eusepía, Sra., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

OI MUNTASSER, Bashir S., Mr., Senior Liaison Officer, Geneva, (United Nations).

G MUSIKO, John O., Mr., Assistant Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour, (Kenya).

GCT N'DIAYE, Mohamed Mody, M., directeur général du Travail et des Lois sociales, (Mali).

GCT N'DIAYE, Moustapha, M., attaché d'ambassade, Mission permanente du Sénégal à Genève, (Sénégal).
GACT  NAIPA, Carlos, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente del Uruguay en Ginebra; representante suplente del Gobierno del Uruguay en el Consejo de Administración, (Uruguay).

GCT  NAKATANI, Shigeru, Mr., Adviser, Ministry of Labour, (Japan).

GS  NAADO, José A., Mr., Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Philippines in Geneva, (Philippines).

EA  NAMATA, J., Mr. (Tanzania), Executive Director, Association of Tanzania Employers.

GS  NANAÉ, Tokio, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body, (Japan).

GA  NACMENTO FOGIMDES, Henrique do, M., ancien ministre du Travail; représentant du gouvernement du Portugal au Conseil d'administration, (Portugal).

E  NASR, M., Mr. (Lebanon), Association of Lebanese Industrialists.


GCT  NEMO, André, M., conseiller des affaires étrangères, Mission permanente de la France à Genève, (France).

GNN  NGOYOU, Rose, Mme, deuxième conseiller chargé des questions sociales et des relations avec le BIT, Mission permanente du Gabon à Genève, (Gabon).

G  NOACK, Ingolf, Mr., Deputy Secretary of State, State Secretariat for Labour and Wages; Representative of the Government of the German Democratic Republic on the Governing Body, (German Democratic Republic).

GS  NOMIYAMA, Masayuki, Mr., Director, International Labour Affairs Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Labour; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body, (Japan).

O1  NOBSKY, Karel, Mr., Consultant, (Intergovernmental Committee for Migration).

O1  NUSSE, B., Ms., Assistant External Affairs Officer, (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).


GCT  OLIVA, Carlo Maria, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève, (Italie).

G  OLOWU, E.O., Mr., Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of Employment, Labour and Productivity, (Nigeria).

O1  OPELZ, Merle, Mrs., Head of the IAEA Office in Geneva, (International Atomic Energy Agency).

GA  OUDOVENKO, Gennadi J., M., vice-ministre des Affaires étrangères; représentant du gouvernement de la RSS d'Ukraine au Conseil d'administration, (RSS d'Ukraine).

EA  OWUOR, T.D., Mr. (Kenya), Executive Director, Federation of Kenya Employers.

GS  OABON, Jan W.S., Mr., Director, Department for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment; substitute representative of the Government of the Netherlands on the Governing Body, (Netherlands).

O1  FADDLECECHIA, S.P., Mr., Assistant to the Special Representative of the Executive Director in Geneva, (United Nations).

GCT  PATCH, Renn M., Mr., Staff Director, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, (United States).

O1  FATHMARAJAH, A., Mr., Special Representative of the Executive Director in Geneva, (United Nations).

PEREZ CASTILLO, Germán, Sr., ministro consejero, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

PERIQUEFT Jr., Aurelio, Sr., President, Employers' Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP).

PETEson, David, Mr., Director, Business and Government Issues Division, Department of Commerce, (United States).

PETROV, Peter, M., vice-président du Comité de planification d'Etat, Département général du travail, (Bulgarie).

PILLSBEY, Michael, Mr., Professional Staff Member, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, (United States).

PITOYO, M.A., Mr., Head, Bureau of Public Relations and International Co-operation, Department of Manpower and Transmigration, (Indonesia).
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