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MINUTES OF THE 240TH SESSION

The 240th Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva on Thursday, 26 May and Friday, 27 May and on Thursday, 23 June 1988.
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FIRST SITTING
(Thursday, 26 May 1988, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.10 p.m. with Mr. Russomano 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 239th Session

Subject to the corrections set out in the Office paper, the Governing Body approved the Minutes of its 239th Session.

SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Agenda of the 77th (1990) Session of the Conference

The Chairman invited the Governing Body to give preliminary consideration to the topics proposed as possible agenda items in paragraph 8 of the Office paper, and select those on which it wished to receive law and practice reports at its November session. He drew attention to the suggestions made in paragraphs 9 and 11 that the Governing Body might wish to consider at the outset the number of new items it would like placed on the agenda and that Office time could be saved if law and practice reports were not requested on all the items proposed.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) pointed out that it was not customary for the Governing Body to decide on the number of items to be placed on the agenda at this stage. It would be not only unacceptable but impracticable to take such a decision in the absence of the necessary information which was to be provided in November. The only matter to be considered now was the number of potential items on which such information should be supplied.

In this connection, he noted the Director-General's comment in paragraph 6 to the effect that an earlier proposal for an item on working and employment conditions of part-time workers was not being resubmitted because of the excessively heavy workload this would impose on the department concerned. While accepting this argument, the Workers were not prepared to see the item dropped once and for all, bearing in mind the support it had attracted from all sides.
As regards the items listed in paragraphs 8 and 62, the Workers' group would prefer the Director-General to follow the usual practice of submitting reports on all five items. First of all, if an attempt were made to make a selection now the process would take nearly as long as the final exercise in November. Secondly, in order to determine priorities more data was needed than the sketchy information in the present document. Despite the reservation expressed, it should be possible to prepare reports on all five items, on two of which there were already earlier reports which only needed updating, while the others should not require excessive work. After all, a far wider choice had been offered in the past. If the majority were to decide otherwise, however, the Workers would in any event ask for reports on items 1 and 2, to which they continued to attach great importance, for reasons which they had already made clear in the past.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) concurred with Mr. Muhr that the time was not ripe to discuss the number of items to be placed on the agenda of the 1990 Conference. Although the Employers could already indicate which items they would like to see eliminated, it was clear from Mr. Muhr's remarks that the Workers took quite a different view, and the wisest course would be to base the final decision on five law and practice reports along the usual lines.

A few comments were nevertheless called for by way of guidance for the drafting of these reports. In connection with the first item, relating to hotels, restaurants and similar establishments, this was a sector of the utmost importance to developing countries, but it was necessary to determine what measures, particularly in the field of training, would be most helpful in developing this sector rather than hampering its expansion. The Employers would therefore like certain points to be analysed more thoroughly than in previous years: for instance, the extent to which the problems mentioned in the Office paper were already covered by other instruments, and the question of whether it would be feasible to have regulations adaptable to all the many and varied categories of hotels. A few words of explanation should be furnished as to why a special instrument was needed for this sector rather than others, particularly in view of the fact that there was now an Industrial Committee covering this sector, and the agenda for its first session encompassed much of what was proposed for the Conference.

As for the protection of workers' claims in the event of the insolvency of their employer, the Employers' group still did not feel that the time was ripe for such an item to be placed on the agenda of the Conference, bearing in mind the criteria relating to the overall applicability of international standards. The Office paper referred to the views expressed by different participants in the Meeting of Experts held a few years previously. It was to be hoped that the more detailed November paper would make reference to the position of all the experts, including those who had not been particularly in favour of having this item placed on the agenda of the Conference.

It should be easy to prepare a report on the revision of the Appendix of Convention No. 147, since this had been recommended by all three sides of the shipping industry.

The subject of the promotion of self-employment had originally been proposed by the Employers who obviously attached great importance to it. Without committing themselves to a final choice at this stage, they were likely to give strong support to this subject in November. They hoped that in the preparatory work stress would be laid on the fundamental issue of training for self-employment, i.e. the minimum basic training necessary to enable someone without outside help to operate on his own something akin to an
enterprise. There were other aspects to the problem, but this was the keynote to the whole question of self-employment.

The only really innovative proposal was the fifth one, i.e. the proposed item on preventing and reducing drug and alcohol problems in working and social life. Of course, the Employers had no objection to receiving a law and practice report on such an important subject, but there were two points calling for explanations. First of all, since this was a health issue, it would be necessary to define in very precise terms what the ILO's role should be as compared with that of the WHO. Although the title chosen referred to working and social life, this was a rather vague term which needed clearer definition to ensure that there was no question of encroaching on the mandate of another organisation. In any case the two organisations would presumably need to collaborate in the preparatory work. Secondly, the wording of the item appeared to place drugs and alcohol on an equal footing, whereas in the opinion of most experts these were two very different problems which needed to be handled differently. It might not be necessary for them to be dealt with in different instruments, but the report should make a clear distinction between the measures to be taken in respect of each.

In the light of these remarks it would clearly be preferable to have reports on all five items proposed. In addition, the Employers to some extent shared Mr. Muhr's opinion that the topics proposed might well have covered a wider range. They had two types of questions in mind. In the first place, too little account appeared to have been taken of the discussions at the High-Level Meeting on Employment and Structural Adjustment. The conclusions of that meeting should be reflected to some extent in the choice of agenda items. One issue to which the Employers and the Workers had unanimously attached great importance was that of training and education schemes to facilitate structural adjustment with a view to employment creation and development. The other type of question in which the Employers were interested concerned the revision of Conventions. Some existing Conventions - particularly in the field of safety and health - had been ratified by far too few countries, and this was highly regrettable. It would be worth considering whether a few changes in the text of these instruments would facilitate their ratification, and this possibility, which had already been discussed by the Working Party on International Labour Standards, was worth bearing in mind in the future.

The Chairman observed that, as Mr. Muhr and Mr. Oechslin had rightly pointed out, the selection of the items for the 1990 Conference agenda was a matter to be decided at the November session. The only point at issue now was which of the topics listed in paragraph 62 should be the subject of law and practice reports.

Mrs. Pacheco-Egea (Government, Uruguay), referring to the assumption advanced in paragraph 9 that two new technical items would be selected for the agenda of the 1990 Conference, indicated that her Government would prefer that not more than one new item be added.

Mr. Clever (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) agreed that reports should be requested on all five items, but wished to draw attention to a suggestion made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany at the Fourth European Regional Conference in September 1987 that consideration should be given to the protection of workers in connection with the introduction of new technologies as a possible item, not for the 1990 Conference agenda but for a later session. This was a problem to which his Government attached great importance and it should not be overlooked.

Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) echoed Mr. Muhr's hope that the item on part-time workers would not be lost sight of and that it would be
possible to place it on the agenda of the 1991 Conference. As concerns the proposed item on self-employment, he concurred with the Office view that since some aspects of this question had been discussed at an earlier Conference or were to be discussed this year, the report should focus on those not yet dealt with, to which he would like to add another: co-operatives. He agreed that it would be useful to take into consideration the conclusions of the High-Level Meeting on Employment and Structural Adjustment.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) expressed his appreciation of the paper prepared by the Office. It would indeed be desirable to have on the agenda of the 77th Session items which had been supported in the past by many members of the Governing Body. Reports should be prepared on all five items, but his Government attached particular importance to items 1, 2 and 5. More thought might be given to the wording of item 5 and the manner in which it should be approached, as drug and alcohol abuse were linked but nevertheless separate problems. As his Government had often stated in the past, it would be desirable for the Governing Body to have a more exhaustive list of the items recommended by committees of experts or industrial committees, or even by the Conference itself, such as co-operation or vocational training, so that consideration could be given to them in November.

The Governing Body requested that law and practice reports be prepared on all the subjects proposed in paragraph 62 of the Office paper.

THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Annual report of the Governing Body to the Conference

The Chairman pointed out that the draft annual report would have to be updated to reflect the discussions taking place at the current session, in particular as concerns the items to be included on the agenda of the 1990 Conference.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon), referring to paragraph 28, congratulated the Director-General on the attitude he had taken following the discussion on the measures he envisaged with regard to the situation in the Arab territories occupied by Israel. He paid tribute to the wisdom of the Governing Body in expressing the wish that the Director-General should take a closer personal interest in the matter. He understood that the Director-General's mission had been brilliantly and effectively carried out.

The Governing Body approved the draft report.

FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA


The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 7 of the Office paper.
FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

I. Obituary

The Chairman drew attention to the announcement of the death of Mr. Joseph van der Ven, who had been a member of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations from 1970 to 1984. The Governing Body would certainly wish to request the Director-General to convey its sympathy to the Government of the Netherlands and to the family of the deceased, as proposed in paragraph 4.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 4 of the report.

II. Composition of the Governing Body, Governing Body Committees and various bodies

The Governing Body took note of the appointments mentioned in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the report.

III. Progress of international labour legislation

IV. Internal administration

V. Publications and documents

The Governing Body took note of these sections of the report.

Report of the Director-General

First Supplementary Report

Procedure for the appointment of Conference Committees

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that for well known reasons the Employers' group would take no part in the decisions called for in the First Supplementary Report.

1 See also third and fourth sittings.
The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report.

FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association

At the request of Mr. Castellón (Government, Nicaragua) consideration of the 258th Report, concerning Cases Nos. 1129 and 1298 (Nicaragua), was postponed to the following day.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH REPORT
TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH REPORT

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), speaking as Reporter of the Committee, recalled that at the Governing Body's present session, the Committee had had 55 cases before it relating to 35 countries. It had examined 23 of these cases, reaching definitive conclusions in eight of them and interim conclusions in 15.

Special attention was drawn to the case concerning Liberia, the Government of which had been pressed by the Committee to forward its reply as a matter of urgency. The Committee intended to proceed with the case at its next session even if the Government's observations were not received in time. Mr. Oechslin took the opportunity to remind governments once again of the importance of replying speedily in their own interest, so that the Committee could have all the facts before it when examining the substance of cases as it was bound to do once a specified time-limit had expired.

The Committee had requested its Chairman to contact the Government representatives of Haiti and Nicaragua during the Conference to discuss ways and means of enabling the Committee to continue its examination of the cases in question. A representative of the Director-General would be visiting Colombia in September 1988 with a view to obtaining detailed information in relation to two pending complaints.

The introduction to the report referred to 11 cases in which governments had kept the Committee informed of action taken on its recommendations. For instance, the Committee had noted with interest the reinstatement of dismissed workers in Honduras and Morocco and the lifting of certain restrictions on collective bargaining in Greece. It was worth highlighting the importance of this follow-up of the effect given to the Committee's recommendations, which afforded a particularly useful means of enabling the Committee to evaluate the impact of its comments, and it could note with satisfaction that in many cases there had been an improvement in the situation.

Among the cases examined at this session, Mr. Oechslin drew attention in particular to the cases of El Salvador and Côte d'Ivoire, which were illustrative of what he had just said about having to examine cases in the absence of a reply from the governments concerned. The Committee awaited with interest the information requested from these governments.

1 See also second sitting.
The case of Turkey had been dealt with in a separate report as it involved a representation submitted under article 24 of the Constitution. In the English text of that report, the beginning of the second sentence in the eighth point listed under paragraph 22 should read: "if this is not possible ...".

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) speaking on behalf of the Workers, endorsed the remarks made by Mr. Oechslin as Reporter and emphasised the importance of the points he had underscored. He hoped that the Government of Liberia would heed the appeal made to it to reply in time for the next session.

He wished to focus attention in particular on the case of the United Kingdom (paragraph 89). The conclusions and recommendations were quite clear. The Government was requested to bring certain laws into line with the standards and principles of the ILO on freedom of association, especially as concerns the machinery for determining the pay and conditions of teachers, which was not in conformity with Article 4 of Convention No. 98.

Next he referred to a complaint against the Government of the United States (paragraph 233). As pointed out by the Committee, this was the third case highlighting the anti-trade union climate prevailing in the United States at present. Some companies were mentioned by name.

Complaints against the Government of El Salvador had been brought regularly before the Committee for a number of years, and once again attention had to be drawn to serious breaches of trade union laws in that country (paragraph 254). Trade unionists had been murdered or had disappeared. The Committee was requesting the Government for information, as also in the case of Chile (paragraph 281).

Another case warranting mention related to Nepal (paragraph 309), where teachers' trade union leaders were being persecuted by the Government, which had made no attempt to co-operate with the Committee.

In a case involving Czechoslovakia (paragraph 346), the Committee was not in a position to reach final conclusions because neither the Government nor the complaining organisation had provided adequate information. He wished to point out, however, that a musicians' union not only had trade union activities to perform but also needed to take care of certain cultural interests.

In the case of Paraguay (paragraph 418) it was hoped that the Government would finally provide the information the Committee had been requesting for a long time.

The conclusions in the case of Turkey, in the 257th Report, were based on considerations built up by the Committee over a number of years. It was to be hoped that the Government would finally bring its legislation into line with the Committee's recommendations.

On behalf of the Workers' group he invited the Governing Body to adopt both the 256th and the 257th reports.

Mr. Rowe (Employer, New Zealand) drew attention to the seriousness of the complaints originating from employers' organisations, which showed that employers' leaders were sometimes, like trade unionists, victims of government action. The range of complaints the Committee had to deal with was a measure of its standing in the world of industrial relations. Unfortunately, there was little likelihood that the Committee would become redundant in the foreseeable future.
The Governing Body took note of the introduction to the 256th report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 31 and 38 of the report.

Mr. Morton (Worker, United Kingdom), referring to Case No. 1391 (United Kingdom), pointed out that in this case which concerned teachers, complaints had come from both workers' and employers' organisations. The United Kingdom Government had again, as in an earlier case, attempted to argue that this case fell within the scope of Convention No. 151, which superseded the provisions of Convention No. 98, but the Committee had firmly and, he hoped, finally disposed of that argument in paragraph 85 by stating that Article 1, paragraph 1, of Convention No. 151 implied that the rights guaranteed in Convention No. 98 could not be denied or restricted merely by referring to Convention No. 151. He was sure, moreover, that the workers in the United Kingdom would also reject the Government's further argument that the circumstances in the country justified the taking of exceptional measures which amounted to evading its obligations under Convention No. 98. It was to be hoped that the United Kingdom Government would be able to respond very quickly to the Committee's clear and unequivocal recommendation, and would find the report sufficiently convincing to take urgent action on the matter.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 89 of the report.

Mr. Al-Jassem (Employer, Kuwait) prefaced his remarks by an endorsement of Mr. Nasr's comment during the discussion on item 3 that the Governing Body had played its role in a rational and appropriate way in connection with the question of the occupied Arab territories.

Case No. 1414 (Israel) reflected only part of what was happening today in Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories. While appreciating the efforts the Committee had made, the speaker would have preferred it to have devoted more attention to this case, since in some instances the Israeli authorities were now beginning to combat even the ILO's own technical co-operation activities. To cite an example, a number of trade union officials had been arrested as they were preparing to go to Jordan to attend an ILO training seminar. He appealed to the Committee and to the Governing Body to give very careful consideration to the situation of the Palestinian people.

In accordance with article 5 bis of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the Chairman gave the floor to the representative of the Government of Israel, to speak on Case No. 1414.

Mr. Waiden (Government, Israel), while pointing out that his remarks were preliminary as his Government had not yet had the opportunity to study the report, recalled that trade union activities in the Gaza strip continued to be governed by the Egyptian Labour Unions Law enacted by Egypt in November 1954. This law, inter alia, laid down provisions for the conduct of trade union elections in conformity with Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. The unions which had submitted the present complaint had violated two of these provisions: section 8(a), which required elections to be secret and conducted on the basis of equality, and section 7, which prohibited anyone found guilty of a felony from being a member of the executive council of a union.

The method of election used by the Gaza unions was totally at variance with the first of these requirements. The list of candidates had been agreed upon in advance and there had been only one candidate for each position. The principle of secrecy had not been maintained, and it was impossible to
describe the process as a genuine election in any sense whatsoever. The
Committee had felt unable to make any recommendation on this point for lack of
sufficient information, but it had not and could not have denied the
importance of the requirement that elections should be genuine and not rigged.

As regards the second requirement, seven persons who had been found
guilty of a felony had been elected to the executives of these unions
notwithstanding the provisions of the law. Full details of the offences in
question had been submitted by the Government of Israel in a letter summarised
in the report. In brief, these people were guilty of complicity in acts of
violence and terrorism, including the planting of bombs and explosive devices
and attempted murder. The interpretation of section 7 to the effect that it
related only to crimes affecting trustworthiness was not warranted by the
language of the section or by simple common sense. Was lack of integrity
really the only reason why a person should not be allowed to hold public
office? Was involvement in major crimes of violence really not to be taken
into account? The Committee's comments here raised a good many more questions
than they answered.

Finally, with regard to the comments contained in paragraph 129, the
speaker merely wished to point out that the proceedings initiated against the
persons named were not concerned with their trade union activities but with
their involvement in terrorist activities. The Government of Israel certainly
had no objection to genuine trade union activities. But union membership
could not confer immunity from normal criminal process.

In conclusion, he reiterated the fact that his remarks were of a
preliminary nature and did not prejudge any more considered comments his
Government might wish to make later.

Mr. Al-Jassem (Employer, Kuwait) noted from the statement of the
preceding speaker that some of the trade unionists elected had been accused of
planting explosive devices, and perhaps also of throwing stones. In his
opinion throwing stones was not a terrorist act, but he would not pursue this
point.

Mr. Darby (Government, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) stated that he had been
expecting an attempt by the occupying authorities to justify the acts they
were committing against trade unionists in Palestine and the other occupied
Arab territories, and the way they were preventing them from exercising their
trade union rights. Such justification as they had furnished could be easily
refuted on the basis of their own written reply as well as the oral statement
made in the Governing Body. It was easy to make unfounded accusations that
trade unionists had been engaged in illegal activities or in terrorism. But
what was terrorism? The term could not be applied to every form of action
taken with a view to liberating one's country, or all the peoples of the world
would have to be declared terrorists, and that was unthinkable. Such an
epithet should certainly not be applied to trade unionists. This kind of
problem needed to be tackled by much stronger means than mere recommendations
which were of no value to trade unionists deprived of their rights, their
freedom and the possibility of performing their trade union functions.

Mr. Yaseen (Government, Kuwait), considering that the State of Israel had
usurped the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, rebutted the argument
that the Gaza trade unions had organised rigged elections and that persons had
been imprisoned not on the ground of their trade union activities but because
they had committed other acts of a criminal or terrorist nature. The Gaza
uprising had in fact started because of the discriminatory practices of the
occupying authorities including the denial of trade union rights. For years
the reports submitted to the Conference had shown how bad the economic, social
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and trade union situation was in the occupied territories and how all international laws, including international labour Conventions, were being violated by the occupying authorities. The worsening situation had been referred to by the Director-General, who deserved thanks for the efforts he had made during his visit to the occupied Arab territories. In order to uphold the ILO Constitution, the Declaration of Philadelphia and the United Nations Charter, the Governing Body should take decisive action against these discriminatory and inhuman practices which were the negation of human rights – the main theme chosen by the Director-General for the Conference which was to open in a few days' time. Every member of the Governing Body shared the responsibility for ensuring that human rights were guaranteed and exercised in the occupied Arab territories. The Government of Kuwait rejected the justification put forward by the representative of the Government of Israel and called on the Governing Body to take vigorous action.

Mr. Tiz-Maghz (Government, Islamic Republic of Iran) associated himself with what had been said by the representative of the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya as well as endorsing the letter sent by his own Government to the Director-General regarding the situation in the occupied territories. He called on the Director-General and the Governing Body to consider this matter without any discrimination. Palestinians had a right to use every legitimate means of defending themselves and this could in no way be qualified as terrorism. The Governing Body must take serious decisions to deal with oppression. The speaker took the opportunity to thank the Director-General for his report.

Mr. Eid (Worker, Egypt), after complimenting the Committee on Freedom of Association on the work it had accomplished, said that he felt bound to intervene after listening to the representative of Israel explaining the position of his Government and distorting the truth by saying that the law applied in Gaza was the Egyptian Labour Unions Law. His reply to that was that this law had been amended and updated five times since it was first enacted. If the authorities applied the Egyptian law, why did they not also apply the subsequent amendments? In any case, this law had been violated by Israeli practices. The law prohibited people from standing for election if they had committed a felony such as theft. But here it was a question of defending their own territory and freedom. Secondly, trade unionists throughout the world had recognised the importance of these elections, and if agreement had been reached in advance on the candidates in order to forestall Israeli interference could that be deemed to be unlawful? Mr. Eid himself had travelled to Jordan to attend a training meeting held under ILO auspices; preparations had been well under way when it was announced that the Israeli authorities had arrested all the Palestinian trade unionists invited to participate in this meeting on the eve of its opening. The sad truth was that the occupying authorities did not recognise the rights of the Arab people, and this included the right to belong to a trade union. He had felt impelled to speak out because he did not want it said that it was Egyptian legislation that was being enforced.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia) found it perhaps understandable that there should have been some widening of the discussion beyond the terms of the recommendations of the Committee on Freedom of Association in paragraph 130 of its report. A number of the points made might have been thought to be more appropriate to the discussion of the Director-General's Report at the forthcoming International Labour Conference. In his opinion it would be preferable for the Governing Body to confine itself to the matters referred to in paragraph 130. The ILO had machinery whereby the Government of Israel could respond in writing to any point raised in connection with the Committee's recommendations. It was also relevant to note that any other points raised in the broadened debate which were pertinent to freedom of
association could be brought to the attention of the Committee in the form of legitimate complaints. Since other avenues were open to those who wished to continue this debate, he suggested that the Governing Body now terminate the discussion and decide whether or not to endorse the recommendations in paragraph 130.

Mr. Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan) associated himself with the other speakers who had expressed their appreciation of the work done by the Committee. He endorsed the Committee's recommendations in paragraph 130, which stated, inter alia, that trade union officials should not be deprived of the right to hold elected posts and that apprehension and systematic or arbitrary interrogation of trade union leaders by the police involved a danger of abuse. The Workers looked forward to the full implementation of these recommendations, particularly as regards the matters raised in paragraphs 99 and 127. They rightly expected that the violation of trade union rights would be brought to an end. They appreciated the work done by the Director-General during the mission he had carried out at the Governing Body's request. The theme of the Director-General's Report to this year's Conference - "Human Rights - A Common Responsibility" - was highly relevant to the situation in the occupied Arab territories.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) supported Mr. Poulter's request that the Governing Body proceed with the adoption of paragraph 130, subparagraph (c) of which he considered to be particularly eloquent.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 130 of the report.

Turning to Case No. 1430 (Canada/British Columbia), Mr. Mercier (Worker, Canada) reminded the Governing Body that this was not the first complaint regarding freedom of association in Canada to come before the Committee in recent years. The Committee had already examined complaints relating to the provinces of Newfoundland, Quebec, Ontario and Alberta as well as others involving British Columbia. The Canadian Government was interpreting the country's Constitution in a highly elastic manner as regards the role of the central government and it would no doubt claim that the application of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87) was the responsibility of the provinces. Much harm had been done to Canada's excellent reputation in the past few years by its failure to apply Convention No. 87. As the report showed, two other provincial labour codes were also undergoing examination from this point of view.

Of course, his remarks were not directed at the dedicated and loyal representatives of the Canadian Government who sat on the Governing Body, but were addressed to its elected representatives in Parliament who needed to put their house in order and impose discipline to ensure that the Conventions ratified by the Canadian Government were applied once and for all. Mr. Mercier thanked the Committee once again for the work it had accomplished in this case involving British Columbia.

Mrs. Caron (Government, Canada) said that she had taken careful note of the Committee's conclusions and recommendations as well as of Mr. Mercier's statement and would bring them to the attention of the Government of Canada and, in particular, the Government of British Columbia.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 195 of the report.

Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) referring to Mr. Maier’s statement on Case No. 1402 (Czechoslovakia) that neither the Government nor the complainant had provided the necessary information, pointed out that this statement was not consistent with the conclusions of the Committee and, moreover, it was contrary to the evidence contained in the report itself and in the appendices to it, especially the regulations of the Jazz Section as set out in Appendix II, which showed that that organisation had never had the intention of engaging in trade union activities.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 346 of the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 360 and 382, seriatim.

In accordance with article 5 bis of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the Chairman gave the floor to the representative of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire, to speak on Case No. 1423.

Mr. Vanie-Bi-Tra (Government, Côte d'Ivoire), referring to the Committee's statement that his Government had failed to supply its observations on the case, pointed out that in fact he had come to Geneva in April - well before the specified deadline - to request that the Committee grant him the exceptional favour of allowing him to state his Government's case personally. He had expected to be given a hearing on 19 May 1988, but unfortunately this had not come to pass. The remarks he had been intending to make would therefore be embodied in a memorandum which he hoped would be brought to the Committee's attention before November. Freedom in general, and freedom of association in particular, were held too dear in Côte d'Ivoire to be trampled underfoot. President Houphouët-Boigny was himself a former trade unionist, and he would never attempt to stifle the freedom of association he had fought for so long. Moreover, teachers were held in high esteem in Côte d'Ivoire. Forty per cent of the national budget was spent on education. The wage and promotion structure for teachers was different from that for other public servants. Their salaries were two or three times as high and they were offered free housing.

Case No. 1423 should be analysed from a trade union, legal and political standpoint. This was a case of conflict between trade unionists. Two union congresses ago the method of electing the Secretary-General of the SYNESCI - the union concerned in the case - had been changed in such a way that only the supporters of the current office bearers could take part in the vote. The 14th Congress, in 1985, had been boycotted by 200 delegates in protest. At the 15th Congress, in 1987, the same problem had arisen again; the ruling clique had done everything in its power to maintain the status quo. Rather than walking out as they had done in 1985, the great majority of the teachers present had preferred to occupy the premises. The outgoing Secretary-General and his fellow officers had no alternative but to walk out themselves and decide elsewhere that the Congress was suspended, and that the present incumbents would continue to run the union. The reaction of those who had remained in the hall was to carry on as though nothing had happened and elect a new Secretary-General. Unable to attack their infinitely more numerous comrades who held high posts in the secondary education system, the ousted officers had chosen the easy way out and accused the Government of being the instigator behind the changes in the leadership, on the basis of the flimsiest of presumptions. The Government of Côte d'Ivoire had no need to resort to such unsavoury methods of bringing trade unionists to heel. It would never have interfered with the functioning of the SYNESCI in any way.
As concerns the legal implications, the speaker claimed that, while the dissident majority carried on with the Congress, the outgoing Secretary-General and his two Treasurers had withdrawn all the SYNESCI's assets from its accounts and removed all the technical equipment and official documents from its offices. After the Congress, the newly elected Secretary-General had brought charges against the three persons in question of misappropriation of the union's property. They had admitted taking possession of these assets but claimed that they had used the money to pay the SYNESCI's office staff and meet the expenses of holding the 15th Congress. As for the technical equipment, they said that it had been put in a safe place pending the holding of a new Congress they intended to convene, when it would be handed over to the proper authorities. Later, no doubt on the advice of their counsel, they had spontaneously offered to pay back the 14,700,000 CFA francs they were alleged to have stolen, less the sum claimed to have been used for Congress expenses. On 1 October 1987 the money and the equipment had been formally handed over to the examining magistrate. At their trial on charges of breach of trust and receiving stolen property, they had argued that since the July Congress had been cancelled, the new Secretary-General had not been validly elected and was not qualified to represent the SYNESCI, as well as claiming that since the missing property had been restored the charges could not be proceeded with. However, both the court and the appeal court had dismissed these arguments, the first because they had produced no evidence to substantiate their claims with respect to the election and the second because the return of the stolen property, while deemed to be an attenuating factor, did not eliminate the fact of their fraudulent intent. They had been fined and sentenced to terms of imprisonment. The legal proceedings had been surrounded by full guarantees of due process of law. Copies of the judgement and sentences would be transmitted to the Committee on Freedom of Association.

As concerns the civil action to obtain the annulment of the proceedings of the Congress, the Government could not be held responsible for the fact that it had been initiated too late in a court which was not competent to hear it. However, since the Government was always in favour of dialogue, without wishing to interfere in judicial affairs, it would take steps with a view to inclining the court towards greater leniency provided that the parties had stated their claims properly. From the political standpoint it should be pointed out that while the three persons who had been prosecuted were in prison, the other outgoing union officers, in connivance with certain teachers, had been distributing leaflets insulting the political authorities and inciting teachers and pupils to engage in violence, rebellion and an unlimited strike when the new school and university term started in the autumn of 1987. Faced with such a serious emergency, with violence being unleashed all over the country, what government would not have taken steps to maintain law and order? The leaflets did not refer only to industrial action but called for an uprising by the people and the bringing to a standstill of the state educational system. But even though the persons concerned had committed many offences under the Penal Code, all the disciplinary measures taken against them had been imposed on grounds of professional misconduct under the Civil Service Regulations, and had taken the form of transfers to other parts of Côte d'Ivoire. Some of them had refused to join their new posts for up to six months and it was normal that their pay should be stopped under those conditions. Some had refused to do their teaching work out of solidarity towards their comrades in prison. In accordance with the practice followed for 20 years, it was quite natural that the suspension of the obligation to perform military service that had been granted to some of them should have been revoked and that they should have been sent to perform the statutory period of military service. Calls were being made for their release, but how could they be released when they were not in detention but performing their normal period of military service? Once this was completed they would return.
to their usual civilian occupations. There were no political prisoners in the Côte d'Ivoire.

On a point of order, Mr. Clever (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) asked that consideration be given to a question of principle. Was it in order for a government which had not complied with a request to submit its observations in writing and had thus prevented the Committee from examining the case to be allowed to make up for this omission by means of a lengthy verbal statement to the whole Governing Body? If this practice were to be extended, Governing Body sessions would need to be three times as long.

The Chairman said that he counted on the co-operation of all those present to ensure that the work of the Governing Body could proceed normally and expeditiously.

Mr. Georget (Employer, Niger) pointed out that Mr. Vanie-Bi-Tra, who was the Minister of Labour of Côte d'Ivoire, had travelled to Geneva in the expectation that the Committee would give him a hearing, but this had not been possible. The best way to understand a situation was to know the facts and, out of courtesy, he should not have been interrupted.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) thanked the representative of Côte d'Ivoire for his detailed statement, but pointed out that he could have handed over his text in writing on his arrival in Geneva in April. He could still do so now, so that the Committee could express its opinion on this information at its next meeting.

The Chairman said that he understood that the representative of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire had expressed the intention of doing so, and gave him the floor to complete his statement.

Mr. Vanie-Bi-Tra (Government, Côte d'Ivoire) stated that he had taken cognisance that morning of the recommendations of the Committee on Freedom of Association. He accepted these recommendations and was able to provide all the answers on behalf of his Government. He had telephoned to ask for copies of the judgements requested and they would arrive within a few days. His country had always fulfilled its international obligations. He would hand in the memorandum for submission to the Committee, and it would be followed by annexes to bring out clearly the political aspects to this case.

The Chairman emphasised that the Governing Body, subject to the provisions of its Standing Orders, was open to any statement that any member of the Governing Body or of the Organisation might wish to make, without any distinction whatsoever, the sole aim being to ensure full coverage, freedom and justice in its debates.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) considered it regrettable that, despite the appeals of the Committee, governments did not supply in time documentary information which, as demonstrated by the statement just made by the representative of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire, would have been constructive and useful for their case. Secondly, as concerns what should be done when information was supplied late, he felt that there was no alternative but to follow past practice and ask the Committee to reconsider the case in the light of this new information. Thirdly, he endorsed the view expressed by the representative of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the question of principles and methods. It was not for the Governing Body to take over the functions of the Committee on Freedom of Association. All the information should go to the Committee, which alone had the ability and competence to examine a case from every angle.
Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) felt that the situation was perfectly clear. It was agreed by everybody, including the representative of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire, that the Committee had unfortunately been obliged to proceed with the case in the absence of observations from the Government. The recommendations now before the Governing Body were based on interim conclusions and were accordingly provisional by definition, and the Government had been asked to supply additional information. The representative of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire had now provided verbal explanations and said that all the information in question would be handed in in writing for submission to the Committee, which was exactly what his Government had been asked to do. There was accordingly no reason for the Governing Body to pursue the discussion at this stage. In re-examining the case, the Committee would be able to take into account the additional information supplied, and it would submit its report in due course. The representative of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire had raised no objection to the Committee's conclusions as such, and these should now be approved.

Mr. Ramond (Government, France) was grateful to Mr. Oechslin for clarifying the situation, and thanked the Minister of Labour of Côte d'Ivoire for the explanations and undertakings he had given.

The Chairman proposed that the Governing Body proceed to adopt the recommendations in paragraph 400, without prejudice to the subsequent submission of observations in writing by the Government of Côte d'Ivoire and reconsideration of the case by the Committee in due course in the light of this written information.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 400 of the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 418 of the report, and then the 256th report as a whole.

The sitting closed at 6.20 p.m.
The sitting opened at 10.15 a.m. with Mr. Russomano in the Chair.

FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

TWO-HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH REPORT

The Governing Body adopted paragraph 34 of the report.

TWO-HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHTH REPORT

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), speaking as Reporter of the Committee, stated that the case of Nicaragua was dealt with in a separate report, as it concerned a complaint lodged by a certain number of delegates to the Conference under article 26 of the Constitution and the Governing Body had referred the case to the Committee on Freedom of Association for an opinion. He drew the Governing Body's attention to paragraphs 54 and 55(f) of the report which contained the substance of the Committee's opinion on the matter. As indicated in paragraph 54, just before adopting its report, the Committee had received a communication from the Government of Nicaragua, proposing the dispatch of a study mission along the lines envisaged by the Committee itself. The Committee accordingly recommended that the Governing Body accept this proposal, as it would thus be able, at its next session in November 1988, to take a final decision as to the action to be taken on the complaint lodged under article 26.

In addition, the Committee had entrusted its Chairman with the task of meeting with the Government delegation of Nicaragua and representatives of the complainants during the Conference in order to define the mandate, composition and arrangements of the mission and the guarantees to ensure a thorough and impartial examination of the cases pending.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) observed that the report covered not only the complaint which had been submitted by some Employer delegates at the 73rd (June 1987) Session of the Conference but also some complaints which had been lodged by workers' organisations. The Workers' group also supported the idea of a study mission which, it hoped, would provide the information needed to enable the Governing Body to take a decision on the pending cases in November 1988.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) affirmed that his Government had always collaborated with the Committee on Freedom of Association and was prepared to continue doing so. He pointed out, however, that in paragraph 61 of the previous report submitted by the Committee on Freedom of Association to
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the Governing Body at its February-March 1988 Session, the Committee had concluded that the Government's replies were often in contradiction with the complainants' allegations. Consequently, as far as all those cases were concerned, the Committee was not in a position to arrive at conclusions with regard to the general situation prevailing in Nicaragua in the field of freedom of association. In the light of that paragraph which had been approved by the Governing Body, his Government had requested that paragraph 41 of the document establishing the procedure for consideration of complaints concerning the infringement of freedom of association (GB.228/24/7) be applied; that provision enabled the Committee to conduct hearings of the parties involved in a case in order to obtain more detailed information from the Government and the complainants with a view to clarifying conflicting information so that the Committee could reach a decision. Had that proposal been adopted at the outset, both time and money would have been saved. Nevertheless, the Government of Nicaragua, in keeping with its desire to collaborate with the Organisation and the Committee on Freedom of Association, now requested the setting up of a study mission within the framework of established procedure.

Mr. Gurdian (Employer, Nicaragua) welcomed the request by the Nicaraguan Government for a study mission as giving an opportunity for the employers and workers of Nicaragua to come closer to the Government of their country.

He referred to hostile acts recently committed by the Government against employers and workers: these included an assault on the person of an employer by a Government Minister, a one-week's closure of a radio programme run by the employers' organisation (COSEP) and press censorship. He further indicated that on 15 May the Confederation of Trade Union Unification (CUS) announced that strike action was to take place in the town of San Jacinto. The military then occupied the town and detained several workers. Moreover, the Government did not respect Convention No. 144 since it never consulted employers as regards labour standards. The Government continued to appoint a representative of UNAG as the Employers' delegate to the Conference and not the nominee of COSEP, as had been recommended by the Credentials Committee of the Conference over the past five years.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) noted with surprise that COSEP, which had constantly defended the interests of private employers, was now also defending those of the workers. COSEP had submitted numerous complaints against the present Nicaraguan Government but had never presented any complaint against the previous one. The current sitting of the Governing Body was not an appropriate forum for raising grievances; for that purpose, complainants should continue to use the machinery set up for the purpose by the Organisation, namely the Committee on Freedom of Association. Moreover, there were internal domestic courts in Nicaragua which judged offences committed by citizens and civil servants. The Government of Nicaragua tried to guarantee the freedoms which it had established and continued to adopt a pluralistic approach. Due to the state of war in which the country found itself, certain persons tried to abuse those freedoms. Freedom, however, did not mean lawlessness.

Mr. Gurdian (Employer, Nicaragua) emphasised that repressive legislation against the private sector and the workers had been introduced from the very beginning of the revolution, and not merely after the outbreak of the war.

The Governing Body adopted paragraph 55 of the report.
SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee

FIRST REPORT

The Governing Body adopted paragraph 14 of the report.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 15 to 19 of the report.

Miss Clauwaert (Government, Venezuela) reiterated her Government's reservations regarding the point for decision in paragraph 60, as such a measure would lead to increases in the contributions of member States.

Mr. Salvador (Government, Ecuador) associated himself with the position adopted by the representative of Venezuela, stating that his Government opposed any increase in the Organisation's budget that would involve an increase in its own contributions to the ILO.

Mrs. Pacheco-Egea (Government, Uruguay) stated that the current economic and financial situation in Uruguay did not enable her Government to accept any proposal which implied an increase in its contribution.

Mr. Lawson (Government, United States) said that his Government could not adopt the proposal because constraints in the federal budget were likely to preclude payment of additional assessments. He felt that approval of the proposal would exacerbate the ILO's arrears' problem and make it more difficult for the Organisation to be certain of receiving payment, which was so vital to sound financial management.

Mr. Galer (Government, Argentina) endorsed the statements made by previous speakers and reserved his Government's position on paragraph 60.

Mr. Pecly Moreira (Government, Brazil) also supported the statements of the preceding speakers.

Mr. Martinez Brito (Government, Cuba) associated himself with the previous speakers who had expressed reservations with regard to paragraph 60. Stressing that adjustments to the programme and budget should not be made by cutting basic programmes or reducing the amount allotted to technical co-operation, he reiterated the view expressed by his Government in the Committee that budgetary costs could be reduced by streamlining administrative activities. He requested the Office to include in the study it was to submit in November an in-depth analysis of the ILO's programme of meetings, their frequency, duration and organisation, in the light of the current financial situation.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) stated that he had no objections against fixing the exchange rate at 1.43 Swiss francs to the US dollar. However, such a measure would lead to an increase of 26 million dollars in the budget. When that figure was added to the replenishment of the Working Capital Fund, a total of 41 million dollars would be reached.
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While he was aware that the situation brought about by fluctuations in exchange rates was beyond the control of the Organisation, it would be unrealistic to expect the governments alone to bear the additional financial burden. The Office also had to make its contribution. The Director-General had said during the Committee's meeting that he could further reduce the Working Capital Fund by 5 million dollars. In the speaker's view this did not exhaust the internal reserves of the secretariat which could be drawn upon in order to alleviate the burden on the member States. A number of possible savings had already been identified, some of which could be implemented immediately and others in the next budgetary period.

A solution to the problem of exchange rates had long been sought and he therefore noted with interest the Director-General's proposals concerning the collection of member States' contributions in Swiss francs. Though there were difficulties inherent in that proposal, it was a reasonable one, since 70 per cent of the Organisation's expenses were in Swiss francs. He therefore supported the Committee's decision in this regard and expected the Director-General to submit detailed proposals at the November session of the Governing Body. It would be desirable for any new contribution system to come into effect not later than 1990.

The ILO's financial stability depended largely on the timely payment of contributions by member States. In the light of the difficult financial situation of the Organisation and the real need to support it, the Government of the USSR decided to pay its contributions earlier in 1988. As was known, the first part of the USSR's contribution had been transferred in February and the second, in May.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) observed that during the Committee's discussions the Director-General had calculated that in the first few years of the current decade a profit of approximately 40 million dollars had been made by the Organisation because of positive exchange rate developments, and these amounts had been refunded to governments in accordance with the Financial Regulations. It was therefore merely logical for those who had benefited from such surpluses to assume the responsibility of financing the current deficit. It was not enough to simply say that the Office should bear the costs. The Office was merely a body through which the Organisation's programmes were implemented. It was therefore up to the contributors to take on the additional financial burden. If any savings were to be made at all, a clear indication should be given as to where they were to be made. He cautioned against making savings at the expense of valuable programmes.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden) voiced the Employers' group's support for the point for decision in paragraph 60. As indicated in paragraph 49 of the report, it was clear that the Organisation would have to consider streamlining its programmes, focusing on priorities of particular concern to the ILO and activities adapted to the needs of today.

Referring to the comment made by the United States Government representative, he stated that it was a known fact that the United States Government had requested its legislature to cover only 75 per cent of the contributions due to the United Nations agencies; it was therefore obvious that that Government was not going to pay additional contributions. He welcomed the statements made by the USSR Government representative regarding the proposal for the long-term strategy on exchange rates and the announcement of his country's early payment of contributions.
Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) recalled the reservation which he had expressed during the Committee's discussion on the financial implications of the significant downward revision of the exchange rate. He felt that this burden should be shared between the Organisation and its member States. While governments had already in the past agreed to increases in their contributions, they also had their own constraints. Since they were obliged to accept important economy measures in their countries as well as in the field of international co-operation, it was perfectly justified to ask the Organisation to do the same. A reduction in the Organisation's programmes was not being sought; ways should be found to execute those programmes more efficiently.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) stated that his Government maintained its previous reservation. He requested that the Director-General give the Governing Body an assurance that further revised budgetary proposals would be submitted to the Finance Committee of Government Representatives at the Conference if it was not possible to submit them to the Governing Body at its current session.

Mr. Tiz-Maghr (Government, Islamic Republic of Iran) stated that his Government was firmly opposed to any increase in the contributions of member States and hoped for the Office's co-operation in this matter.

Mr. Ramond (Government, France) reiterated his Government's support for the recommendation and stated that it would, as usual, fulfil its obligations punctually. Nevertheless, he hoped that the Organisation would continue to make efforts to economise. Savings should be made on administrative costs and this should not be detrimental to the Organisation's programmes.

Mr. Nakamura (Government, Japan) indicated that during the Committee's meeting, it had been explained that further cuts in the programmes were difficult because there had been repeated cuts in the past decade. However, in Japan during that same period, cuts had been repeatedly made to keep the size of the budget at zero nominal growth. If no effort was made to introduce further budgetary cuts, his Government could not respond positively to the proposal.

Mr. Shilovich (Government, Byelorussian SSR) also expressed concern at the proposed increase in member States' contributions for the current biennium. It was perfectly fair to ask the Office to reduce the financial burden of member States and this could be achieved by cutting expenses on secondary and ineffective programmes and streamlining administration.

Mr. Yaseen (Government, Kuwait) associated himself with previous speakers in expressing reservations on paragraph 60. The financial burden arising from changes in the exchange rate should be borne by the Office and not by the member States.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia) stated that the facets of the Organisation's financial crisis could not be treated separately. In February the Australian Government had stated that it could not accept the 20 million dollar Working Capital Fund replenishment. At the current session it also could not accept the 26 million dollar increase due to the revaluation of the exchange rate. While appreciating the fact that those who had voted in favour of the budget at the preceding session of the Conference had a collective obligation to accept the consequences of the exchange rate as then fixed, he asked the Office to make expenditure cuts so that the burden would not entirely be borne by member States. As in February his Government reserved its position on those issues until the Conference. He stressed once again that Australia paid its contribution in full on time and therefore expected
all member States to make genuine efforts to fulfil their financial obligations in the light of the current financial crisis.

Mr. Koukiadis (Government, Greece) argued that there were two solutions to the problem: it was necessary either to find additional resources, that is over 40 million dollars, or reduce the expenditure of the Organisation. As the Worker Vice-Chairman had rightly said, one should be precise in determining how this expenditure should be reduced. He considered it advisable to find a solution at the current session, perhaps by setting up a committee for that purpose. For the time being, however, the Governing Body was not in a position to determine whether there were possibilities to make savings or not.

Mr. Malhotra (Government, India) indicated that the weakening of the currencies of developing countries as against the dollar had in any case meant an increase in the contributions of those countries, when expressed in terms of domestic currencies. In addition to that, countries were now being asked to increase their contributions, due to the revaluation of the exchange rate. He conceded that adjustment of the exchange rate was necessary and his Government therefore agreed, even if reluctantly, to the proposal in paragraph 89. Nevertheless, the Office should spare no efforts to reduce its expenditure by streamlining administration, cutting administrative costs, etc. This, however, should not be done at the expense of ILO programmes.

The Director-General noted a general lack of optimism in the views expressed so far, which confirmed the serious concern felt by many governments concerning the size of the budget for 1988-89. However, it was gratifying that in the past two days since the meeting of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, a certain number of governments had paid substantial contributions to the Organisation. These were Austria, the Byelorussian SSR, Côte d'Ivoire, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, the Netherlands, Turkey, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and the United States. These contributions amounted to 17,695,750 dollars. This brought the total amount of contributions received since 1 January to 87,100,000 dollars, that is 53.7 per cent of the contributions as compared to 36.8 per cent at the same time the previous year. This was indeed a marked improvement and the diligence shown by the governments concerned was a reflection of their desire to honour their obligations and, by doing so, support the ILO.

Turning to the document under discussion, in particular the recommendations of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee dealing with the losses due to exchange rate fluctuations, he trusted that the Governing Body would agree that he had no other choice but to inform them, through the Committee, of the problems brought about by the depreciation of the dollar. He had taken the risk of proposing an exchange rate of 1.43 which was considered very optimistic by his colleagues in charge of budgetary matters. Had he chosen the current market rate, that is 1.39 Swiss francs to the dollar, he would have had to propose to the Committee an increase of not 26 million in the programme and budget but of 34 million dollars. During the Committee's discussion he had provided justifications for the increase, stressing at the same time that the Office would in any event continue to make constant efforts to reduce its expenditure to a minimum. Expenditure would always be kept within the limits of the resources available to the Office for executing the programme which the Governing Body and the Conference had instructed it to implement, as Mr. Muhr had rightly recalled. The programme was not simply a brainchild of the Office which it could dispose of at will; it was a set of objectives agreed upon by the Governing Body and the Conference to be pursued by the Organisation in the labour field for the benefit of workers. This deserved to be emphasised because, despite the current period of austerity and financial constraints, a balance must be
struck between the needs of workers and the resources which the Organisation wished to allocate to programmes to satisfy those needs. That was the rationale behind the proposal in paragraph 60.

While being aware of the fact that the reservations which had been made in the Committee had been reiterated in stronger terms in the Governing Body itself, he pointed out — in reply to a question raised by the representative of the Government of Greece — that it was too late at this stage to go back on the programme. The Governing Body could not transform itself into a finance committee, and the following week the financial proposals affecting the programme and budget had to be submitted to the Conference which would take a final decision on the matter. In response to a question raised by the representative of the United Kingdom Government, he said that he would submit the matter for the consideration of the Finance Committee of Government Representatives, which was due to meet as of 6 June, providing them with the most complete information possible. Another issue which had been discussed in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and which appeared to meet with general consensus was the collection of contributions in Swiss francs for the 1990-91 biennium. He hoped that governments would not change their minds, for if such a system were introduced, the Organisation would be protected against fluctuations in exchange rates, and it might then be possible to re-examine the problem of the Working Capital Fund and to reduce its level. He intended to raise all these issues in the Finance Committee of the Conference. If between the current session of the Governing Body and the meeting of the Finance Committee he found it possible to propose further adjustments, then he would do so. However, in all honesty, these adjustments could be only minor because he would be going against his duty if he decided arbitrarily to delete programmes.

There were 18 months left before the end of the biennium and the Organisation would probably be faced with a very fluctuating situation which might depend heavily on the rate and volume of the payment of contributions. In this connection, Mr. Poulter rightly directed yet another appeal for contributions to be paid up as far as possible in their entirety. The current year, like all the years since he had been Director-General, was marked by a treasury shortfall because contributions either had not been paid at all or had been paid late. However, this was nothing new in the life of the Organisation, and in recent years the Governing Body and the Director-General had each year been obliged to make adjustments in order to cope with fluctuating financial situations. The coming year would certainly prove no exception. He was fully aware that, throughout the period of implementation of the next programme, he would have to reduce costs and expenditure, so as not to exceed the budget level which would shortly be approved by the Conference. If the Office found itself in a hopeless situation, it would turn to the Governing Body. However, it would make heroic efforts to try to remain within the confines of the budget allotted to it. In conclusion, he trusted that the Governing Body would adopt the recommendation in paragraph 60, due note being taken of all the reservations expressed.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that he had listened to the discussion and to the Director-General's remarks with interest but with some concern. While he was not opposed to making savings per se, he found it somewhat unrealistic to talk of economising without affecting programmes. In his view, savings to the extent required would inevitably affect programmes or at least the manner in which programmes were implemented. In any event, the programmes of the ILO were the joint responsibility of all the three groups in the Organisation. As everyone was aware, the Finance Committee of the Conference was composed only of Government members who had their own specific point of view, which he perfectly respected. However, they would be called upon to take a certain number of
measures whose nature and significance required tripartite concertation. He was fully aware that there were serious financial problems to be tackled, but he could not sanction the Finance Committee's dealing with them to the exclusion of Workers and Employers.

The Director-General had suggested that the adoption of the proposals submitted to the Governing Body would make it possible to have less recourse to the Working Capital Fund. That was a positive idea in itself. However, the Working Capital Fund was not only a mechanism to correct exchange rate problems; it existed principally to make up for late payment or even the non-payment of contributions. This was not a matter which depended on the Governing Body but on the governments concerned. There again, a number of systems were envisaged and he hoped that they would be implemented soon. His group was certainly in favour of heroism but wanted to be among those involved in the heroic decision-making process.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) fully associated himself with Mr. Oechslin's comments. He stressed that any proposals emerging from a finance committee that was not tripartite would not necessarily obtain the required two-thirds majority votes in the plenary. Therefore, agreement had to be reached among the three groups not only in principle, but also from a practical point of view. It would be advisable for all the groups to be involved in time, so as to be able to give their opinion. Failing that, a vote might be necessary at the Conference and the whole issue might be defeated.

The Chairman noted that, subject to the various reservations and views expressed, which would be recorded in the minutes, there was agreement in favour of adopting paragraph 60 of the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 60 of the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 62 of the report.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman), commenting on the third part of the document, dealing with long-term strategy on exchange rates, greatly welcomed the Director-General's initiative regarding that strategy. Other possibilities had been considered in the past, but unfortunately had met with sometimes unjustified opposition. The outcome of the discussion in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee now showed that there was likely to be a majority in favour of this idea, provided that the Office submitted concrete proposals between the current session and November 1988 and proposed the necessary changes in the Financial Regulations, so as to give a clearer indication as to future trends.

Mr. Pecly Moreira (Government, Brazil) stated that, like practically all other governments, the Brazilian Government recognised the merits of the initiative taken by the Director-General and his staff with a view to finding a solution to the serious problem of exchange rates. However, there remained some unclear aspects in the solution proposed by the Director-General and he considered that the time was not yet ripe for taking a decision. In view of the need for further clarification, his Government could therefore not give its unconditional support to such a decision at this stage. In addition, consideration should be given to the effects that this proposal would have on governments since, as usual, the latter would have to bear its financial consequences. In this connection, he felt that the detailed studies and proposals which the Director-General had promised to submit at the next session should comment on the possible effects of the introduction of a system
of contributions in Swiss francs for countries like his own and many others which had their external accounts calculated totally in terms of US dollars. Those countries already suffered from the negative effects of the constant devaluation of their own currencies against the US dollar and having to pay in Swiss francs would aggravate the problem. In view of that fact and in the light of the arguments put forward by his colleagues in the Committee, he proposed an amendment to paragraph 89 of the report that would better reflect the content of the Committee's discussions, and particularly the Chairman's summing-up in paragraph 88 of the report. The proposed new wording of paragraph 89 would read as follows - "The Committee recommends that the Governing Body endorse in principle the introduction in 1990-91 of a system of Swiss franc assessments combined with forward purchasing of the biennium's dollar requirements and postpone a decision in this regard and requests the Director-General to submit to the Committee at the 241st Session of the Governing Body ...".

Mr. de Rojas (Government, Venezuela) endorsed the arguments put forward by the previous speaker, as his Government shared most of his views. However, the Government of Venezuela had substantial objections to taking a decision, even if only in principle, regarding the introduction of a system of contributions to the ILO in Swiss francs. Such a system could lead to concealed increases in the Organisation's budget, together with a corresponding rise in some member States' contributions when translated into dollars. In Venezuela, as in many other countries, the national budget was expressed in United States dollars and this included sums allotted for contributions to the various international organisations.

Serious problems of external debt-financing had obliged Venezuela to make tremendous efforts to pay the existing contributions and the speaker did not consider it fair to ask it to pay more. The ILO should make special efforts to reduce its own expenditure and, if necessary, make greater efforts than the ones mentioned at the current session. He felt that the cost of adjustment should be distributed more fairly among the Members of the Organisation so that a proportionately greater burden fell on the countries which had not suffered so much from the loss in value of the dollar. In view of that fact, he did not support the adoption of the first part of paragraph 89. Consideration of the entire matter should be deferred until the next session in November when the Governing Body would be in possession of detailed information from the Director-General, including changes to be made to the Financial Regulations of the Organisation.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden) said that he would refrain from commenting on the scale of contributions, which was an entirely different matter falling within the purview of a UN committee in New York. The Employers' group fully supported the recommendation in paragraph 89, and its acceptance of paragraph 62 was conditional on the approval of paragraph 89. It went without saying that cuts in the Working Capital Fund were to be considered in the light of that issue.

One major advantage of the proposed system was that national treasuries would have a precise idea of their contributions for a biennium as soon as the budget was adopted. Several treasuries would not, as was currently the case, have to go back to their legislatures once national budgets were adopted to secure more funds. Admittedly, national currencies fluctuated; however, the fact remained that most of the Organisation's expenses were in Swiss francs. The Employers' and Workers' groups had for a long time urged the establishment of the ILO budget in Swiss francs, like the budgets of the WMO and ITU, other Geneva-based specialised agencies of the United Nations.
Mrs. Pacheco-Egea (Government, Uruguay) congratulated the Director-General and his colleagues on the new and imaginative proposals for the solution of the Organisation's budgetary problems. However, she felt that more time was needed to consider the proposals in depth. She firmly supported the Brazilian Government representative's proposal for the final decision to be deferred until November.

In reply to various comments on budgetary issues, she wished to remind all the members of the Governing Body that the Government members in the Latin American group had always adopted a realistic attitude and had always endeavoured to propose solutions to these problems. In this connection she recalled the fact that the proposal which had been submitted by the Argentinian Government the previous year to establish a tripartite study group had been rejected by the Governing Body.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) also expressed his appreciation to the Office for the efforts it had made to submit proposals to reduce its expenditure to a minimum, while ensuring the continuation of the Organisation's activities. There was no doubt that making the budgetary assessments in Swiss francs would facilitate the book-keeping of the Organisation. However, in view of the arguments put forward by the representative of the Government of Venezuela, which he endorsed entirely, he felt that no decision should be taken on the matter until November, when the governments would have had sufficient time to study the repercussions that the new system would have on the budgets of their own countries.

Mr. Salvador (Government, Ecuador) considered that the adoption of the Swiss franc system of contributions for the 1990-91 biennium at the present session would be somewhat hasty. It was his view that the Governing Body should wait for more detailed information from the Director-General based on the experience of other international organisations which had adopted similar systems and on in-depth studies into the matter. He did not wish to call into question the effectiveness of the system and recognised the major effort which had been made by the financial staff of the Office. However, it should be borne in mind that the adoption of such a system would give rise to general financial problems because the currencies of some countries, such as those in the Latin American group, would experience a twofold devaluation of their currencies, first compared to the United States dollar and second, as against the Swiss franc. Moreover, there would be administrative problems not only for the contributing governments but also for the ILO itself. For those reasons, the Government of Ecuador agreed with the other Latin American governments which had suggested that a decision on the matter be deferred until the November session. He strongly questioned the use of the term "in principle" in paragraph 89 and inquired whether that term implied that measures for putting the system into practice would be applied as soon as the paragraph was adopted.

Mr. Ettarp (Government, Sweden) said that his Government was in favour of the text as it stood in paragraph 89. He considered it flexible enough and felt that there was sufficient time to discuss all the details.

Mr. Martinez Brito (Government, Cuba) expressed support for the proposed amendment to paragraph 89 submitted by the representative of the Government of Brazil and which had been endorsed by other Latin American governments. The new proposal fully reflected the spirit of the discussion in the Committee. As indicated in paragraph 86 of the report, the Director-General himself had expressed regret concerning the late distribution of the documents by the Office, with the result that some members of the Governing Body had not had enough time to study them, and he had promised to submit more detailed documentation in September so that members would have sufficient time to study
it and hold consultations before the November session. Furthermore, in paragraph 88 the Chairman himself had noted that many Committee members had expressed the wish for a final decision on the subject to be postponed until November. At the end of the paragraph reference was made to a suggestion that the decision to be taken at the current session of the Governing Body should be a flexible one in order to take account of more detailed proposals which were to be discussed at the November session.

Mr. Malhotra (Government, India) congratulated the Treasurer on the innovative proposal which had been made and hoped that this would provide a long-term solution to the exchange problems of the Organisation. He recalled that in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, some members wished to postpone a decision on this matter until the November session, as there had not been sufficient time to study the document. He felt that it would perhaps be better for a decision to be taken only after detailed proposals submitted by the Director-General had been carefully examined by the Governing Body. Should that not be the Committee's understanding of the issue, he wished to make it clear that his Government understood paragraph 89 to mean that the decision to be taken at the current session was only a preliminary one which was subject to final approval at the November 1988 session.

The Chairman explained that at the present stage the Governing Body was being requested to adopt the recommendation in paragraph 89 "in principle" — in accordance with Mr. Falchi's proposal in the Committee — as a first step towards a final discussion of the subject in November on the basis of more detailed documentation which would be submitted by the Director-General at a later stage. On that understanding, he proposed that the Governing Body approve paragraph 89, taking due note of the reservations expressed by many Government representatives.

Mr. Pecly Moreira (Government, Brazil) maintained that his own proposal was moderate and realistic and that for the Brazilian Government it was essential for the expression he had suggested to appear in the point for decision.

Mr. Richardson (Government, United States) recalled that there had been a similar discussion in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee. His Government was in favour of the Office proposal and looked forward to receiving a more detailed version thereof. He also recalled that the Director-General had indicated that it would be necessary to take a final decision in November so that the system could be introduced during the following biennium. He therefore suggested that the second part of paragraph 89 be amended to read as follows — "... and agreed that a final decision should be taken at the Governing Body's 241st Session (November 1988) based on more detailed proposals submitted by the Director-General together with consequential changes in the Financial Regulations and Financial Rules".

Mr. Pecly Moreira (Government, Brazil) agreed with the proposal of the United States Government representative.

The Governing Body adopted paragraph 89 of the report, as amended.

Mr. Nik Mohamed Amin (Government, Malaysia), having studied the report of the Special Working Group on Banking Facilities in the ILO with great interest, complimented the Director-General and the Office for their efforts to find a bank which had no links with the South African regime and which could meet the banking needs of the ILO at the same time. He regretted that their efforts had not yielded positive results. It seemed that for the time being the ILO would have to continue to use the services of the Union Bank of
Switzerland (UBS) and he hoped that, as a result of pressure from other agencies, the bank might be persuaded to sever all links with South Africa unless the latter dismantled apartheid. While he agreed with the conclusion of the Special Working Group that the Director-General should continue his efforts in search of a more satisfactory solution, the ILO should not be alone in that task. It was hard to understand why other United Nations agencies had not even given consideration to the problem, as evidenced by their replies to the Director-General's queries. There were a number of United Nations resolutions and decisions concerning apartheid and the South African regime. He proposed that the Director-General refer the matter to the United Nations Committee Against Apartheid in New York, so that there could be a concerted effort which would have a far greater impact. He added that Malaysia was a member of the United Nations Committee Against Apartheid and would pursue the matter further in that Committee should it be taken up there.

Mr. Ali Ibrahim (Worker, Somalia) stated that the problem which the Office faced in implementing the decision of the International Labour Conference was a substantial one. He therefore suggested that the Office and, in particular, the Director-General provide the same wealth of information to the Conference Committee on Apartheid as it had to the Special Working Group. The Treasurer deserved to be congratulated on the openness and frankness which he displayed in explaining to the Special Working Group the difficulties he had encountered in trying to disengage from the UBS. He was confident that, if given the same information, the Conference Committee on Apartheid would be in a better position to instruct the Governing Body as to what course of action should be taken on that sensitive issue.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden) observed that the Employers had also studied the report of the Special Working Group with great interest and came to the conclusion that the Working Group and the Office had done their utmost to fulfil their mandate. Like Mr. Ali Ibrahim, he wished the report to be submitted to the Conference Committee on Apartheid.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) expressed support for the proposal made by the representative of the Government of Malaysia. It was illogical for the ILO to use the services of a bank whose principles were at variance with those of the ILO. While he appreciated the efforts made thus far, the Office should continue its search for a solution to the problem.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) also expressed appreciation of the efforts made by the Office and hoped that those efforts would continue along the same lines to ensure that ultimately the ILO would use the facilities of a bank which had no ties with South Africa. For the time being further efforts should be made, albeit symbolically, to reduce the services which the UBS currently provided to the ILO.

Mr. Malhotra (Government, India) expressed his appreciation of the Organisation's efforts and supported the preceding speaker's statement. He too felt that the report of the Special Working Group should be submitted to the Conference Committee on Apartheid for further guidance in the matter. He also considered that the proposal put forward by the representative of the Government of Malaysia should be studied by that Committee.

Mr. Georget (Employer, Niger) recalled that the issue had originally been raised by the Workers' group at the Conference Committee on Apartheid. A mandate had been entrusted to the Director-General who was to be assisted by a Special Working Group of the Governing Body to find a solution to the problem. He felt that the report which would be submitted to the Conference Committee on Apartheid would show that the Governing Body had explored all the existing possibilities. The Conference Committee on Apartheid would take 9348R/v.4
stock of all that had been undertaken by the Governing Body and the Director-General, and it was up to that Committee to decide on what further action was needed.

The Governing Body took note of the report of the Special Working Group on Banking Facilities.

Mr. Nik Mohamed Amin (Government, Malaysia) stated that since its election to the Governing Body the previous year, the Government of Malaysia had been a member of the Board of the International Centre for Advanced Technical and Vocational Training in Turin. His Government had participated in meetings of the Programme Advisory Committee as well as in the meetings of the Board. It could be generally agreed that the infrastructural facilities at the Centre were underutilised. As he had stated at the last session of the Governing Body, from the Third World's point of view the ILO could and should provide assistance for the industrial and economic development of those States in such areas as skills development, management, training, rural development, etc. He had emphasised the impact which the ILO's technical assistance programmes could have on developing countries.

Foremost in the minds of the governments, employers and workers of developing countries was human resources development. This entailed, in particular, skills development to enhance employability in different sectors of the economy, the development of entrepreneurial talents and skills in order to create self-employment through the establishment of small and medium-sized enterprises as well as the development of managerial skills. These were areas of priority on which the Centre should focus its attention and resources. He expressed disappointment at the fact that although the Turin Centre had a wide variety of activities and programmes, few of those were focused on the actual needs of developing countries. He also observed that some of the Centre's activities duplicated or overlapped with the ILO's. Although it was called a Centre for Advanced Technical and Vocational Training, some of its activities could hardly be described as such. He was aware that the Centre's resources were provided mainly by the Italian Government; however, he felt that those resources could be used more prudently for skills development in the true sense of the word.

In that connection, he had read with interest the paper submitted by the consultant of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor. While that paper was no panacea for the ills of the Centre, it nevertheless contained some useful suggestions that could be followed up profitably. There were some suggestions, however, with which he did not agree. For instance, he was opposed to the establishment of a centre for labour laws and practice at the Turin Centre for the simple reason that adequate work was already being carried out by the ILO, which had the necessary expertise and competence. The involvement of the Turin Centre in that area would be a duplication and wastage of the Centre's resources. Referring to the consultant's call for an inventory of global training programmes, he recalled that at previous meetings of the Board, members had called for the establishment of an international directory of national training centres and research institutes and for the possibility of such centres being linked to the Turin Centre to further strengthen the development of advanced skills and vocations.

As regards lack of follow-up in the assessment of the impact of training provided by the Turin Centre, one possible way of improving on this could be to include training provided by the Turin Centre in evaluation exercises which were periodically carried out by Governing Body delegations on ILO programmes in the field with little or no additional cost to the Centre. In that connection, APSDEP and other similar regional teams should be able to carry
out follow-up action. That was perhaps yet another means of further merging the activities of the ILO with those of the Centre. It was ironical that while there were excellent facilities available at the Turin Centre to turn out trainees with advanced skills, the Centre's underutilisation was being bemoaned. He was convinced that the Turin Centre could meet the needs of developing countries more effectively through a restructuring of the courses offered and by improving further the competency and efficiency of the Centre. He agreed with the suggestion that the training provided need not be totally free. In his own country, large numbers of young people spent a lifetime of savings to acquire training in various skills. He was sure that the Centre could provide training in those skills at perhaps one-third of the cost. Finally, he appealed to all concerned to make serious efforts to turn the Turin Centre into a truly outstanding international centre which would meet the industrial and economic development needs of the developing countries and be geared to the demands of markets and industries.

The Governing Body adopted paragraphs 104 and 106 of the report seriatim.

Mr. Nik Mohamed Amin (Government, Malaysia), commenting on paragraphs 107 to 108 of the report, dealing with recognition of the jurisdiction of the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO by the International Criminal Police Organisation (INTERPOL), supported the point for decision. The fact that an increasing number of international organisations had come to accept the decisions of the ILO's Administrative Tribunal was a clear recognition of the high esteem in which the Tribunal was held; the latest acceptance of the Tribunal's jurisdiction by INTERPOL was yet another example of that recognition. The registrar of the Tribunal and his staff should be complimented for ensuring that the cases that came before the Tribunal were acted upon early and for generally contributing to its efficient working. Finally, the Director-General and his colleagues should also be given credit for having built up the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO over the years to the status that it currently enjoyed amongst various United Nations agencies and other international organisations.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 108 of the report.

The sitting closed at 1 p.m.
THIRD SITTING
(Friday, 27 May 1988, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.15 p.m. with Mr. Russomano in the Chair.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee (concl.)

SECOND REPORT: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 2 to 8 of the report.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 9 to 16 of the report.

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Industrial Activities Committee

Mr. Hertel (Government, German Democratic Republic), as Chairman of the Committee, introduced the report. The first item discussed by the Committee related to requests for the establishment of new Industrial and analogous Committees and Joint Committees. At the Committee's meeting in November 1987, agreement had been reached to postpone the seventh general review of the membership of Industrial and analogous Committees until November 1989 so as to enable the various requests for the establishment of new committees to be examined thoroughly beforehand. This matter had been discussed at some length in the Committee and the issues raised had proved to be of such fundamental significance for the ILO's industrial activities in the future that the Committee had agreed to revert to the previous practice of setting up a working party to examine all the relevant issues in depth prior to the seventh review. Following consultations and bearing in mind the Organisation's financial situation, the Committee proposed that the working party meet during the November 1988 Session of the Governing Body. As regards the size and composition of the working party, further consultations would take place. On the programme of industrial meetings, the Committee had reached consensus concerning the major and smaller meetings to take place during the 1990-91 biennium in order to enable the Office to make timely arrangements for these meetings. The relevant points for decision were contained in paragraphs 45 and 47 of the report.

With regard to the Tripartite Meeting on Salaried Authors and Inventors, as indicated in section IV of the report, it had not been possible to overcome

---

1 See also second sitting.

2 See also fifth sitting.
differences of opinion at the meeting itself. The Industrial Activities Committee had also been unable to reconcile those views and, as a result, the point for decision in paragraph 115 was put to the vote. The contentious issue was that the Employers felt that their position should have been expressed more clearly in the report.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the Employers, stated that he could agree with all the points for decision in the report, with the exception of paragraph 115. In view of the financial difficulties experienced by the Organisation for some time and which were likely to increase in the future, he did not consider it expedient to advocate the establishment of further Industrial Committees. There were already thirteen standing Industrial Committees as well as two standing Joint Committees, and if the requests for the setting up of an additional five Industrial Committees and three further Joint Committees were all granted, there would be a total of 23 standing bodies. Even if one considered merging some of the committees or replacing some of them by ad hoc technical meetings, this was not a realistic prospect. His group therefore felt that there should be a discussion on the means of rationalising the existing system and a rethinking of the whole idea of having standing committees, giving consideration to possible alternatives. There had been many changes in the world and in economic structures since the system of standing Industrial Committees had been established in the 1940s. The Employers were open to all possible solutions and were quite prepared to accept the working party which had been proposed; they suggested, however, that its composition be kept small for the sake of efficiency. The Employers would submit their nominations for the working party in due course. They hoped that the Office would prepare a document setting forth practical alternatives which could be used as a basis for discussion.

As regards section IV of the report, concerning the Tripartite Meeting on Salaried Authors and Inventors, the Employers' group had some critical comments to make. In their view, the meeting had failed to achieve the purposes for which it had been convened. Firstly, it had not fulfilled its terms of reference which were, according to paragraph 2 of the introduction to the meeting's report, "to adopt conclusions on principles that would be applied in order to protect the rights of salaried authors and inventors, having due regard to the interests of employers". Secondly, it had not lived up to the expectations of the representative of the Director-General and Secretary-General of the meeting and those of the Worker Vice-Chairman who had all emphasised the need for the conclusions of the meeting to be arrived at by tripartite consensus. This was apparently also the first time in the history of the ILO's tripartite industrial meetings that an entire group had objected to the conclusions of a meeting. As a result, only paragraphs 1 to 4 of the conclusions had been adopted by consensus, whereas paragraphs 5 to 15 had been accepted by the Workers' group unanimously and the majority of governments, but had been rejected by the Employers' group unanimously and by the Government representative of the United States.

In addition, no rules of procedure existed for this kind of meeting and, as was shown by that particular Tripartite Meeting, such rules were urgently needed.

Though the Employers' views were reflected in several parts of the report, the report as a whole did not give a coherent picture of that group's position. As it was important to place on record the views of the Employers regarding the paragraphs of the conclusions which had not been accepted by consensus at the meeting, he read out the following text:
Economic rights

In the employment context, inventions and works are usually the product of the activities of employees of the enterprise or public institution. The birth and exploitation of an invention are frequently made possible because the private enterprise or public institution has invested material and financial resources, sometimes on a large scale, and thus has taken the risks. This is most often the case with respect to the works of salaried authors.

National law and practice and collective and individual agreements may provide for rights of ownership, use, exploitation and authorisation within the framework of the employment relationship.

The existence of "performers' rights" in their performance has not been recognised as a generally applicable principle.

In order to limit the risk of disputes, it is preferable for the scope of mutual commitments arising from the employment relationship to be specified in the employment contract.

Pecuniary rights

Generally the salary paid to an employee is adequate compensation for an invention by that employee. Some national laws provide for additional remuneration under specified conditions. A salaried author is employed for the purpose of authoring a copyright work and therefore the salary is equitable compensation for the work. Likewise, the salary paid to a performer is equitable compensation for the performance. In each case, the salary is determined by the marketplace and therefore is equitable.

Moral rights

It is agreed that this meeting was not the forum for determining moral rights. However, it was generally recognised through law and practice that all inventors are named on the patent and the patent application.

In conclusion, he requested that an excerpt of the minutes of the present Governing Body session be communicated to the recipients of the report of the meeting. This would not be a novel procedure because, for example, in November 1981, when some governments had differed on one of the conclusions of the Second Tripartite Technical Meeting for the Clothing Industry, the Governing Body had agreed that the relevant extract of the minutes of that session be sent to all those who were to receive the report.

Mr. Morton (Worker, United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Workers, first expressed support for all the points for decision in the document under consideration. The Workers supported and, in fact, had advocated the establishment of a working party. The report of the meeting indicated some differences of opinion between Employers' and Workers' groups concerning the objectives of the working party. However, his group had great faith in the virtues of debate and compromise and therefore expected constructive results to emanate from the working party.

As reflected in the report, the Workers held the view that the structure of Industrial Committees should not only be adapted to economic changes, but
should also take account of factors such as trade union and employer structures and social issues. The Workers saw the need for the establishment of a committee dealing with the electrical and electronic industry, and had also advocated convening a session of the Advisory Committee for Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, a meeting for teachers and a tripartite meeting for performers.

As the Committee's report showed, the subject had been discussed in a spirit of compromise and an agreement had been reached, which the Workers intended to observe. While realising that the establishment of a working party might delay the general review for a further year until 1990, they felt that no harm would result provided that the final outcome was constructive. The Workers' group already had four nominees for the working party but was ready to engage in further discussion about its precise size and composition.

Turning to the matter raised by Mr. Lindner concerning the Tripartite Meeting on Salaried Authors and Inventors, the speaker stated that if the Governing Body wished, as a matter of principle, to alter the results of meetings retroactively, the Constitution would have to be amended in that respect. Until such time, the rights and responsibilities of both ad hoc and standing committees should be respected.

Having attended the meeting himself, he was in a good position to assess its outcome and he did not share Mr. Lindner's view that the meeting had been a failure. Moreover, the Employer spokeswoman at the meeting had herself commented that the meeting had been successful to some extent because of the effort which had been put into it and also because of the benefit derived by participants, through their exposure to so many concepts concerning salaried inventors, authors and performers. Moreover, the meeting's conclusions which had been supported by the majority and the presentation of the Employers' version of the conclusions had been unanimously adopted by the Committee, as a result of lengthy negotiations to arrive at a compromise. The whole issue as to whether the Employers' views were adequately reported was discussed in the Industrial Activities Committee. In a conciliatory gesture, the Workers' group had agreed to include in the covering letter transmitting the report, a paragraph which had been proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom Government. This, however, had been rejected by Mr. Lindner, on behalf of the Employers' group. The matter had then been put to a vote and the Workers' group and all the Government representatives had voted in favour of the points for decision. The Employers were now making inordinate demands by proposing that the decision of the Tripartite Meeting be modified and by seeking to override the specific decision of the Industrial Activities Committee on that very point. In addition, Mr. Lindner's suggestion presented some practical difficulties as the minutes of the present session of the Governing Body would be formally approved by the Governing Body only in November 1988, and this meant that, if the Governing Body went along with that suggestion, the report of the meeting, with the accompanying text, could not be circulated before December. He shared the view expressed by Mr. Poulter in paragraph 108 of the report that it was unwise to emphasise differences between the groups at tripartite meetings. It would not be desirable for the very partial text submitted by Mr. Lindner, which had not secured the support of the majority during the meeting, to be given special status in the circulation of the meeting's report. Moreover, if that concession were granted to the Employers in this particular instance, it would only be fair to allow the Workers' and Government groups to express their opinions on the text, thereby further delaying consideration of the matter. This might set a precedent which would encourage any group to adopt a similar approach at future meetings.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 2 to 23 of the report.
Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) indicated that the priorities of the Workers regarding the major industrial meetings to be held in the 1990-91 biennium were expressed in paragraph 32 of the report. He noted that the Employer spokesman had suggested that the Tenth Session of the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers be postponed until the 1992-93 biennium, in view of the fact that that Committee had not at its last session adopted any resolution asking that it be reconvened within a short interval. This was regrettable because, by 1990, roughly 75 per cent of the labour force of major industrialised countries would fall within the category of workers covered by the Advisory Committee.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 45, 47, 49, 56, 59, 68, 72, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92 and 94, seriatim.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), replying to the comments made by Mr. Morton concerning the Tripartite Meeting on Salaried Authors and Inventors, pointed out that the Employers' intention was not to interpret or alter the results of the Tripartite Meeting, but to clarify the views of the Employers with regard to those conclusions which had not been adopted by consensus at the meeting. Although the Employers attending the meeting had agreed to the way in which those conclusions were to be presented in the report, they had unanimously voiced strong objections to the substance of those conclusions and these were not adequately reflected. Hence, the Employers now requested that an extract of the minutes of the present sitting be communicated along with the report.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) objected to that request on grounds of principle, for the same reasons that had led the Governments and Workers to vote against a similar proposal in the Industrial Activities Committee. The Employers were entitled to express their views on the meeting itself in the Governing Body, and they would be duly reflected in the minutes. However, the Workers' group could not accept that the report of an industrial meeting could be amended or supplemented after the meeting had taken place. The Governing Body and its groups were not the guardians of Industrial Committees or technical meetings. The decisions taken by them, even if only by a majority vote, were reflected in their reports, whereas the views expressed subsequently in the Governing Body were duly recorded in its minutes. It was inappropriate to combine these two distinct elements for, otherwise, in future any group which was not satisfied with the conclusions reached at a meeting could delay the communication of a report by insisting that it be supplemented by extracts from the minutes of the Governing Body.

Ms. Houstoun (Government, United States) associated her Government with the views expressed by Mr. Lindner. The United States Government had participated in the Tripartite Meeting and had shared the minority position taken by the Employers. The suggestion put forward by Mr. Lindner on the basis of a precedent should be accepted, given the very unusual lack of consensus at the meeting and the fact that the minority group did not request that the results of the meeting be changed, but was simply asking that note be taken of the absence of a consensus which had been sought by all.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the procedure advocated by Mr. Lindner was not a new one. Apart from the already mentioned case of the Second Tripartite Technical Meeting for the Clothing Industry, for which the Director-General himself had proposed to communicate the conclusions to governments and employers' organisations by a covering letter which accompanied the report of the meeting, the same procedure had been applied by the Governing Body when considering the record of the Ninth Asian Regional Conference in March 1981 and there might have been other
similar cases in the past. The Industrial Committees, like meetings of experts, were bodies which had been established by the Governing Body and the latter was perfectly entitled to express its viewpoint on the work of those bodies. A meeting of experts was not a legislative body, but a body which studied a given problem and should give a precise account of its discussions and the different opinions expressed.

The Employers agreed that since the report of the Tripartite Meeting on Salaried Authors and Inventors had been adopted by the Meeting itself, no change whatsoever could be made to it. The opinion of the majority had been given the emphasis it deserved in the report. However, he felt that it would be in the interest of those who would use the texts in future, namely governments and employers' and workers' organisations, to be aware that there had been considerable differences of opinion at the Meeting and to be precisely informed of the nature of those differences. In that connection, the statements made by Mr. Lindner, Mr. Morton, Mr. Muhr and the United States Government representative and any others who might wish to take the floor on this issue should be considered part of the record. That was precisely what Mr. Lindner wished to propose and he considered Mr. Lindner's proposal a reasonable one, which was in no way unusual, because, as far as he knew, all requests made by a group in similar circumstances had always been granted in the past. He was therefore surprised that the proposal had met with opposition.

Mr. Morton (Worker, United Kingdom) drew attention to paragraphs 185 and 186 of the report of the Tripartite Meeting on Salaried Authors and Inventors, which showed clearly that it was incorrect to claim that the report had merely expounded the majority's point of view and had overlooked the opinion of the minority. The participants at the meeting had not only agreed that the report had very fairly reflected the opinions of all parties; they had also unanimously agreed on the manner in which the contested points were to be presented. The clear intention of the Tripartite Meeting, therefore, had been to communicate to all concerned the report on its deliberations in the form agreed upon. Though Mr. Lindner and Mr. Oechslin had said that they were not seeking changes, issuing a supplementary document was tantamount to change. In addition, there were practical difficulties involved in the suggestion that the relevant part of the Governing Body minutes should be appended to the report. In that event, the Workers' group would require some time to be able to comment on the text read out by Mr. Lindner on behalf of the Employers' group, which was highly partial and controversial and therefore needed to be rebutted. However, to continue the debate on the substance would be an abuse of the time of the Governing Body, of the entire procedure and of the mandate of the Tripartite Meeting which had been set up to look into the matter. For those reasons, he hoped that the Governing Body would reject the suggestion of the Employers' group.

Mr. Cano (Government, Colombia), referring to paragraph 113 of the report, pointed out that, in reply to a request by the representative of the Government of Colombia for a clarification of the legal situation with regard to the issue under discussion, the representative of the Office had stated that though reservations had frequently been expressed when reports came before the Governing Body, to his knowledge, there had been no precedents in the form of additional papers attached to reports. The Office should clarify the situation once and for all.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General) stated that the reply given to the Government representative of Colombia by the member of the Office staff had been correct. There had never been additional papers appended to reports. There had, however, been cases in which the minutes of the Governing Body's discussion on the report of
a particular meeting had been attached to the covering letter of the Director-General transmitting the report.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) reminded the Governing Body that the Employers' group had made a specific proposal through its spokesman Mr. Lindner; that proposal had been supported by the Employers' group and the United States Government representative and opposed by the Workers. While not insisting on a vote, he requested that it be clearly recorded in the minutes that the Employers' group had made a proposal which had not secured acceptance, failing which they were not prepared to agree to the adoption of paragraph 115.

The Chairman proposed that, it being understood that the dissenting opinion expressed by the Employers' group and the representative of the Government of the United States and the proposal made by Mr. Lindner on behalf of the Employers' group would be duly reflected in the minutes, the Governing Body should proceed to adopt paragraph 115 of the report.

On that basis, the Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 115 of the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 116 and 130 of the report, seriatim.

EIGHTH 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 6 of the report.

ELEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Discrimination

Mr. Danielsson (Government, Sweden), in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee, introduced the report. The Committee on Discrimination had met on 23 May mainly to discuss items related to the ILO's work against apartheid. The Committee had considered the information supplied by governments and employers' and workers' organisations on the action they had taken against apartheid, and this had led to a request that the Office should identify ways of assisting governments to prepare their replies on the subject, in view of the deplorable fact that more than 50 governments had not answered the ILO's request to provide information.

The preliminary discussion which had taken place concerning the results of the Tripartite Conference on Action against Apartheid held in Harare at the beginning of May 1988, showed that there was a general agreement that the conference had duly fulfilled the tasks which had been entrusted to it. The complete report of the Harare Conference would be submitted directly to the International Labour Conference the following month. The Committee was,
however, already now recommending that the Governing Body request the Director-General to convey its gratitude to the Government, employers and workers of Zimbabwe for ably hosting the Conference.

In addition, the situation of the workers in the occupied Arab territories had been raised and the discussion on that subject was duly reflected in the report. There would be a further opportunity during the International Labour Conference to discuss this question, on the basis of the Director-General's Report on the subject.

Mr. Sumbwe (Employer, Zambia), on behalf of the Employers' group, associated himself with the comments made by the Chairman of the Committee on Discrimination. He expressed his support for the point for decision in paragraph 14.

Mr. Ali Ibrahim (Worker, Somalia), speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, confirmed the position which the Workers had taken at the meeting of the Committee on Discrimination. It was regrettable to note the inadequacy, both in number and in content, of the replies submitted by the constituents of the Organisation to the Director-General's requests for information on action taken against apartheid. Whereas the number of replies received from employers' and workers' organisations had slightly risen, those of the governments continued to decrease. Moreover, from a perusal of the Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration Concerning the Policy of Apartheid, it was disappointing to note that the information provided by States which were known to have strong possibilities of exerting pressure on South Africa side-stepped key issues such as disinvestment, oil, arms and coal embargoes, the imposition of comprehensive sanctions on South Africa and the implementation of resolution No. 435 for the independence of Namibia as well as the severance of all links, including diplomatic ones, with the apartheid regime. He hoped, nevertheless, that in future the Organisation would obtain concrete and clear replies from the governments concerned. It was no secret that, while some governments had courageously imposed selective sanctions on the apartheid regime, others had taken advantage of the situation. Not only did those governments replace the ones which had imposed sanctions as regards trade links with South Africa, they were also increasing their collaboration with the apartheid regime in other areas. That situation was quite unacceptable, as it undermined ongoing efforts of the international community to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions on the South African regime. The Workers hoped that the Conference Committee on Apartheid would deal with the grave situation and exert more pressure on governments which broke sanctions.

The Workers' group commended the excellent atmosphere of mutual understanding and co-operation which had prevailed during the Tripartite Conference on Action Against Apartheid which had led to remarkably successful conclusions. The Updated Declaration on Action Against Apartheid would no doubt greatly contribute to the speeding up of the process of independence for Namibia and the liberation of South Africa. The Workers' group expressed the wish that, in future, the Office would give more publicity to such a conference before, during and after the event, so that it could receive wider media coverage throughout the member States of the Organisation.

The Workers especially wished to thank the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Faisal Abdel Rahman, and the Office team for the efficient manner in which they had discharged their duties, thus contributing to the success of the Conference. They also appreciated the remarkable work done by Mr. Danielsson, Rapporteur of the Conference. Finally, they wished to express their gratitude to the host country for the warm hospitality which had been extended to all participants and for the excellent facilities which had been
provided for the smooth running of the conference. The Director-General should be asked to convey the gratitude of the Governing Body not only to the Government, but also to the workers and employers of Zimbabwe.

The Workers' group supported paragraph 14 of the report, but wished to make one small correction to the 14th line of paragraph 3 of the corrigendum to the report, which should now read "The Worker Vice-Chairman also stressed that there was a need to reinforce international action against apartheid including economic sanctions and the embargo on oil exports to South Africa and on coal imports from it".

Miss Hak (Employer, Netherlands), raising a point of procedure concerning the Harare Conference, recalled that the ILO was well known for its adherence to sound procedures. In March the Governing Body had decided on who should attend this special conference and, as in the case of the earlier two conferences which had been held in front-line States, invitations had been addressed to a restricted group of persons and organisations. She was therefore surprised to note that one organisation which had not been invited at that time had nevertheless registered at the meeting and taken part in its discussions. She urged that when the Governing Body took decisions, they should be respected and cautioned that failure to observe such decisions might give rise to problems.

Mr. Al-Jassem (Employer, Kuwait), recalling that Kuwait had always advocated a total boycott of the South African regime, expressed gratitude to the Committee for its valuable report.

Referring to paragraph 17, he disagreed with the view Miss Hak had expressed during the meeting of the Committee regarding the need to avoid associating the situation in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories with that deriving from apartheid. It was not necessary to probe into United Nations resolutions to assert that the practices of the occupying authorities in those territories were of a discriminatory nature. As this was clearly a matter of discrimination, he considered that the Committee should have allotted some time to consider the proposal put forward by the Government representative of Kuwait. He hoped that in future the matter would be given consideration by the Committee.

The Director-General stated that, having not personally been able to attend the Harare meeting, he had been represented by a team headed by Mr. Abdel Rahman and which had included Mr. Pierre Adossama, Director of the Promotion of Equality Department. He was sensitive to the complimentary remarks which had been made concerning that meeting. Judging from the calibre of the discussions and the importance of the conclusions, his original impression, which had been confirmed at the present Governing Body session, was that the meeting had fulfilled all the hopes that had been placed in it. The conference had taken place approximately one month before the International Labour Conference, at which the Conference Committee on Apartheid would be able to work not only on the basis of his own Report on the subject, but also on the basis of the conclusions of the Harare meeting.

As regards the list of persons and organisations originally invited to participate in the conference, he did not question the accuracy of Miss Hak's statement. However, he was convinced that the Officers of the conference, the spokesmen of the groups and all those who had been in charge of organising the meeting had made the necessary arrangements not only for the conference to achieve positive results, but also to avoid a certain number of difficulties which were likely to arise at any conference, and even more so at one which dealt with such a burning issue as apartheid. There were cases in which decisions had to be taken on the spot, in order to deal with situations which
could not be foreseen at the time when the Governing Body made arrangements for the conference. On reading the report he had received immediately after the conference, he had had the impression that the arrangements made on the spot seemed to be perfectly in keeping with the objective of focusing the conference's activities and discussions strictly on the items which the Governing Body had assigned to it, without entering into extraneous matters. The decisions taken on the eve of the conference appeared to be wise and based on good sense.

Miss Clauwaert (Government, Venezuela) expressed her Government's satisfaction at the positive outcome of the Harare Conference. Her Government's representative had made a statement in the Committee on Discrimination, which unfortunately was not reflected in the report. Venezuela had been one of the Government members chosen to participate in the tripartite conference. Unfortunately, the person appointed to represent Venezuela had been unable to travel from Nigeria, his duty station, to Zimbabwe to attend the conference. In any event, she supported the point for decision in paragraph 14 of the document.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 14 of the report.

THIRTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Symposia, seminars and similar meetings

First paper

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated that the Workers' group was in favour of considering this document at the present sitting of the Governing Body, rather than at the post-Conference sitting in June because it referred to a number of meetings that would be taking place in the very near future.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) indicated that his group was prepared to endorse this document which was purely for information.

The Governing Body took note of the paper.

---

1 See also fourth sitting.
FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General (cont.)\(^1\)

Second Supplementary Report

First report of the Officers of the Governing Body:
Requests from non-governmental international organisations
wishing to be represented at the 75th (1988)
Session of the Conference

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the
Employers' group had no objections to the point for decision in this report.
It was their understanding that this decision would be implemented in
accordance not only with the letter but also with the spirit of article 56,
paragraph 9, of the Standing Orders of the Conference which laid down the
rights and possibilities of representatives of non-governmental international
organisations.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 7 of the
report.

* * *

OTHER QUESTIONS

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated that the
Governing Body was fortunate to have Mr. Zimba, Worker member
from Zambia, back in its midst. As the Governing Body was aware, Mr. Zimba
had been absent from several recent sessions and Mr. Chiluba, also from
Zambia, had also been prevented from attending ILO tripartite meetings. The
Workers' group wished not only to express its satisfaction but also its thanks
to the Deputy Director-General, Mr. Bolin, for his efforts to secure the
return of Mr. Zimba to their group.

The Chairman associated himself with Mr. Muhr's comments.

Mr. Diop (Worker, Senegal) recalled that the Workers' group had made
several appeals on Mr. Zimba's behalf. Thanks to the action of the
Director-General and the Governing Body, Mr. Zimba had been released and was
now able to attend the Governing Body and the Conference under normal
conditions. The Office should convey the gratitude of the Workers' group to
the Government of Zambia for having released their colleague.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the
Employers' group had endorsed and welcomed all the steps taken to enable
Mr. Zimba to be able to participate in the work of the Governing Body. He
associated himself with Mr. Muhr's statement and congratulated Mr. Bolin on
his success in bringing about this welcome result.

1 See also first and fourth sittings.
Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia), speaking on behalf of the Government members, also welcomed Mr. Zimba back and thanked Mr. Bolin and the other ILO officials concerned for their assistance in bringing Mr. Zimba once again to a forum in which he made substantial contributions.

Mr. Zimba (Worker, Zambia) expressed his heartfelt gratitude to the members of the Governing Body and the Office as a whole for their efforts which had made it possible for him to attend the Governing Body session and for his Worker colleague from Zambia to attend the Conference very shortly. From the very outset, they had been informed of the efforts made by the Governing Body and had been deeply touched by the sagacious manner in which a world body such as the ILO had sought to find a solution to the problem.

As a member of the Committee on Freedom of Association, he was impressed by the proposal put forward by the representative of the Government of Nicaragua for the Organisation to examine areas of conflict in that country, as an example of how one could contribute to a positive reconciliation of the differences between the parties concerned. He directed an appeal to trade union leaders and their organisations, stating that although they often suffered from oppression, they should work in a spirit of constructive co-operation with employers in order to minimise conflict.

He was most grateful for the kind words expressed by members of the Governing Body and hoped that when the Head of State of Zambia would receive the ILO's communication, he would reflect upon it, as a man who was well known for fighting injustices and who held the deep conviction that all men had the right to enjoy freedom.

The sitting closed at 5.10 p.m.
FOURTH SITTING
(Thursday, 23 June 1988, morning)

The sitting opened at 10 a.m. with Mr. Russomano in the Chair.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 3, 4 and 7 of the Office paper.

Mr. Ettarp (Government, Sweden), referring to the Tripartite Symposium on Working Time Issues in Industrialised Countries, regretted that only one woman had been included among the nominations made by the Employers' and Workers' groups, and then only as a substitute. This was particularly inappropriate in a field such as working time, for women faced particular problems in this respect. He hoped that this discrepancy would be overcome by governments when they came to appoint their representatives to participate in the symposium.

Mr. Hertel (Government, German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the Governments of the socialist countries, drew attention to the inclusion among the Workers' nominations for the Tripartite Symposium on Working Time Issues in Industrialised Countries of Mr. Bogdan Lis as a representative of NSZZ Solidarnosc. Without wishing to interfere in the internal affairs of the Workers' group, he emphasised that the organisation in question no longer officially existed in Poland, and the inclusion of Mr. Lis could hardly be reconciled with the spirit of dialogue that had developed with the resumption of participation by Poland in the ILO. In order to further that dialogue, which had received valuable fresh impetus at the Conference over the previous month, he appealed for this nomination to be reconsidered or postponed.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated that the Workers' group had already been made aware of the fact that the organisation to which Mr. Lis belonged no longer officially existed. His nomination had been made on the basis of a proposal from the ICFTU in accordance with the group's usual procedures, and the Workers' group did not wish to question that arrangement. It should be realised, however, that the Workers' and Employers' representatives were nominated not as representatives of countries or organisations, but as representatives of the workers and employers of the world who as members of Conference delegations elected the Workers' and Employers' members of the Governing Body. There were hence no doubts regarding the propriety of Mr. Lis's nomination, and due account had been taken of the statements regarding the status of the organisation to which he belonged.

Mr. Timmer (Worker, Hungary) stated that he did not agree with the majority view within the Workers' group. Solidarnosc did not officially exist in Poland.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) supported Mr. Muhr's statement: participants in meetings of this kind were nominated as individuals, and not as representatives of organisations, consideration being
given foremost to their personal competence. In this regard, due note was taken also of Mr. Ettarp's comment regarding the composition of the symposium.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) emphasised that persons nominated by the Workers' group should be regarded as representatives of the labour movement as a whole, and not of countries or organisations. It was in any case inappropriate for members of other groups to interfere in an internal affair of the Workers' group. Referring to Mr. Hertel's statement, he stressed that Mr. Lis's appointment would provide an opportunity for the Polish Government to demonstrate its desire to improve its relations with the ILO by ensuring that there were no obstacles to his participation in the symposium.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 9 of the paper.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy), referring to the Fourth Session of the Joint Committee on the Public Service, observed that his own country had a sizeable public service, yet had never participated in any session of the Joint Committee. He would be grateful if consideration could be given to Italy's participation in future sessions.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 12 of the paper.

THIRTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Symposia, seminars and similar meetings (concl.)

Second paper

The Governing Body took note of the paper.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

Third Supplementary Report

Expulsion of foreign workers by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 5 of the report.

1 See also third sitting.

2 See also below and first and third sittings.
Fourth Supplementary Report

Complaint submitted by the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) against the Government of the Republic of South Africa

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) emphasised the seriousness of the allegations in the complaint. Whatever body eventually dealt with the complaint should receive the full support of the Governing Body. The procedure of referral involved was a mere formality.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the Employers supported the proposal in the report, which was the only one possible in the circumstances. While the Office should be ready to provide its expertise, it was for ECOSOC to decide on the effect to be given to the complaint.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 4 of the report.

FIFTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Programme of meetings

The Governing Body approved the programme of meetings.

SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies

Seventh African Regional Conference
(Harare, 29 November-7 December 1988)

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Western European Government members, observed that no representative of a Western European Government had served in a Governing Body delegation to any regional conference since before 1980, and that since 1980 the Asian region had provided the Government members of two Governing Body delegations. It was important to share out such appointments among the regions so as to ensure balanced representation of the industrialised and the developing countries. In the present case it was understood that the Asian region was anxious to provide the Government representative, and while the Western European Government group wished to propose a candidate, it would refrain from doing so in order to achieve a consensus on the decision taken. The Governing Body should however bear in mind this principle of balanced representation among the various regions.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia), speaking on behalf of the Asian Government members, thanked the Western European Governments for their co-operation.
In addition to its Chairman, the Governing Body appointed the following delegation:

Government member: Mr. Nik Mohamed Amin (Malaysia);
Employer member: Mr. Lindner;
Worker member: Sir Frank Walcott.

Tenth Session of the Chemical Industries Committee
(Geneva, 5-13 October 1988)

The Governing Body appointed the following delegation:

Government member (and Chairman of the Committee): Mr. Falchi (Italy);
Employer member: Mr. Arbesser-Rastburg;
Worker member: Mr. Muhr.

Fourth Session of the Joint Committee on the Public Service
(Geneva, 23 November-1 December 1988)

The Governing Body appointed the following delegation:

Government member (and Chairman of the Committee): Mr. Ndiwane Mushili (Cameroon);
Employer member: Mr. Decosterd;
Worker member: Mr. Baldassini.

Twelfth Session of the Metal Trades Committee
(Geneva, 7-15 December 1988)

The Governing Body appointed the following delegation:

Government member (and Chairman of the Committee): Mr. Elmiger (Switzerland);
Employer member: Miss Hak;
Worker member: Mr. Sudono.
SEVENTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Questions arising out of the 75th (1988) Session of the International Labour Conference

The Governing Body noted that there was no document before it under this item on its agenda.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General (concl.)

Fifth Supplementary Report

Report of the Committee set up to examine the representation made by the Federation of Egyptian Trade Unions under article 24 of the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949 (No. 95) and of the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)

Mr. Ali Ibrahim (Worker, Somalia) informed the Governing Body that a number of valuable contacts had been established at the regional level through the Organisation of African Trade Union Unity in order to find a solution to the problem forming the basis of the representation. In view of these contacts, which involved the complainant organisation and Libyan workers, he proposed that the Governing Body defer consideration of the report to its next session.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) noted this development with satisfaction. It was perhaps advisable to wait until November to allow time for an agreement to be reached.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that, in the light of the explanations given, the Employers agreed to the proposal to defer the matter to November.

Mr. Abuzeid (Worker, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) supported the proposal to defer consideration of the report.

Mr. Eid (Worker, Egypt) thanked the OATUU for its efforts to deal with the situation. He was confident that the contacts would bring an acceptable solution.

Mr. Burwin (Government, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) welcomed the initiative taken by the OATUU and accepted the proposal.


1 See also above first and third sittings.
EIGHTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Action to be taken regarding the appointment of the Director-General

Report of the Officers of the Governing Body

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) considered it evident that decisions had to be taken regarding the procedure for the election of the Director-General. These decisions could no longer be deferred. The Workers' group unanimously supported the proposals in the report, including the rules governing the election set out in the Appendix.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) emphasised the importance of the question for the Organisation as a whole. The great majority of the Employers' group approved all the proposals in the paper, including the rules set out in the Appendix. Many were of the opinion that the rules should have been decided at an earlier stage as in the past, but there was now no alternative to their adoption at the present session. Most of the members of the group attached major importance to the concept of an absolute majority. While other members of the Employers' group having reservations on certain points might wish to express their own opinion, the group as a whole agreed that the proposals now before the Governing Body provided an acceptable basis for electing the next Director-General of the ILO.

The Chairman stated that it was necessary to proceed logically in the consideration of the various points. He therefore proposed that the Governing Body should deal first with the term of office of the Director-General, then with the rules governing the election, and finally the date of the election.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) pointed out that, as had been stated in the meeting of the Government group the previous day, many governments felt that the document had appeared too late to be considered. Many of them had felt that it was inappropriate to depart from the rules that had been used at previous elections, and a number had questioned the advisability of setting the date of the election only 13 days before the term of office of the newly elected Director-General was due to begin. If it was intended to change the rules, then the document should have been issued one year earlier. For the moment, considerably more time was needed to reflect on its contents before it was considered by the Governing Body.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) asked whether Mr. Vargas was proposing that consideration of the document be postponed.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) was perplexed by the terms Mr. Vargas had used. It was not proposed to change the rules, for none existed hitherto. It was now clearly necessary to decide on some rules, and these had to be laid down before the election date was set.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) confirmed that he was proposing to postpone examination of the report to the Governing Body's next session. As regards the question of rules, the election of previous Directors-General had

---

1 See also fifth sitting.
presumably taken place in accordance with certain rules, which therefore existed in some form and had evidently been found satisfactory in the past.

The Chairman observed that, according to article 15 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, only regular members, or deputy members occupying the seat of a regular member may propose resolutions, amendments or motions, which must be submitted in writing and handed to the Chairman.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) pointed out that the inclusion of the item on the agenda had been known for some time. Furthermore, it was clear that both the non-governmental groups were opposed to the proposal to defer consideration of this question.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) could not support any proposal for postponement: in view of the circumstances, it would be irresponsible to postpone consideration of the rules. Nor was it true that the report was proposing a change in the rules. In the past the Governing Body had always proceeded according to the needs of the occasion, deciding in turn on eligibility for candidature, the deadline for submissions, and the term of office. No Director-General had ever been elected without obtaining an absolute majority in the election. It was therefore difficult to see how the rules were being changed in the present instance. What was happening was that they were simply being put down in writing and thereby confirmed. A departure from the Staff Regulations was involved, but this was of minor importance and referred only to the statutory term of office, which had in practice for many years been set at five years.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia) observed that at its meeting the previous day, the Government group had discussed the paper extensively and had listened to replies given by the Chairman of the Governing Body to certain questions put by members of the group, but it had not adopted any unified group position on the proposals.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) felt that the Governing Body was likely to waste a great deal of time on debating about whether to discuss the paper or not. In order to remove any misunderstandings on this procedural point, he proposed that the Governing Body should without further discussion take a decision to complete its consideration of the report at its present session.

Mr. Yaseen (Government, Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the West Asian Arab Government members, supported the idea that precise and clear rules governing the election of the Director-General should be laid down. However, it was difficult to understand why it was now proposed to adopt such rules hastily, for they surely required careful examination. It was not clear how the proposals compared with previous practice. Clearly, the term of office and the date of the election were linked, but the amendments to the ILO Constitution adopted in 1986 would presumably come into force shortly, and this needed to be taken into account in framing the rules. He therefore endorsed the proposal made by Mr. Vargas to postpone consideration of the report so as to allow time to examine the proposed rules thoroughly. In the meantime, the Office should provide information on the procedures followed in previous elections.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) pointed out that it was illogical to continue discussion on the substance without first deciding on whether to examine the question at the present session. He therefore requested that a vote be taken immediately on his proposal.
Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) considered that it was illogical to request postponement of consideration of the report, as this would leave even less time to take a decision on the matter. If the question was deferred to November, the discussion was likely to be more confused and less serene.

Miss Venson (Government, Botswana) stated that, while there were differences of opinion on the proposal itself within the Government group, the African group had been sure that the report would be discussed at the present session.

In a vote by a show of hands on Mr. Muhr's proposal to complete consideration of the report at the 240th Session, there were 37 votes in favour, 0 against and 11 abstentions.

Mr. Burwin (Government, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) requested that the proposal be put to a roll call vote.

In a roll call vote, the Governing Body decided by 36 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions, to complete its consideration of the report at its 240th Session.

Mr. Galer (Government, Argentina) requested that, at the afternoon sitting, the Office should provide the Governing Body with information on the results of all previous elections to the post of Director-General of the ILO. Such information should include the results of the vote and the size and type of the majority involved.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) requested, in addition, that information be provided on how long in advance previous Directors-General had been elected and that copies of document GB.205/2/1 should be distributed to members of the Governing Body.

The sitting closed at 1.10 p.m.

---

1 See Appendix.
APPENDIX

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MR. MUHR'S PROPOSAL THAT THE GOVERNING BODY
COMPLETE ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT
AT ITS 240TH SESSION

For (36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governments</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Mr. Georget</td>
<td>Mr. Adiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Mr. von Holten</td>
<td>Mr. Ahmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Mr. Katz</td>
<td>(replacing Mr. Mukherjee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mr. Lindner</td>
<td>Mr. Ali Ibrahim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Miss Mackie</td>
<td>Mr. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, Federal</td>
<td>Mr. Oechslin</td>
<td>Mr. Crean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Greece</td>
<td>Mr. Owuor</td>
<td>Mr. Delpino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Mrs. Santos Neves</td>
<td>Mr. Diop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>(replacing Mr. Eurnekian)</td>
<td>Mr. Maier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Mr. de Silva</td>
<td>Mr. Maruyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>(replacing Mr. Tata)</td>
<td>Mr. Muhr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tsujino</td>
<td>Mr. Sanchez Madariaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Svenningsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Timmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(replacing Mr. Yanaev)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Walcott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(replacing Mr. Mercier)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Against (0)

Abstentions (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governments</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Mr. Al-Jassem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>(replacing Mr. Periquet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Mr. Nasr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Mr. Said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania, United</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of USSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIFTH SITTING

(Thursday, 23 June 1988, afternoon and evening)

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

EIGHTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Action to be taken regarding the appointment of the Director-General (concl.)

The Clerk of the Governing Body provided the following information requested at the previous sitting concerning the election of previous Directors-General:

At its First Session in November 1919 the Governing Body, then composed of 24 members (12 Government, 6 Employer and 6 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 13 votes, elected Mr. Albert Thomas as Provisional Director by 11 votes to 9. The other candidate was Mr. Harold Butler. At its Second Session in January 1920 the Governing Body unanimously and by acclamation confirmed Mr. Thomas as Director.

Following the death of Mr. Thomas in May 1932, at its 59th Session in July 1932 the Governing Body, then composed of 32 members (16 Government, 8 Employer and 8 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 17 votes, elected Mr. Harold Butler as Director by 21 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions. The appointment took effect immediately.

Following the resignation of Mr. Butler in May 1938, at its 84th Session in June 1938 the Governing Body, then composed of 32 members (16 Government, 8 Employer and 8 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 17 votes, elected Mr. John Winant as Director by 28 votes to 0, with 2 blank ballots.

At its 90th Session in October 1941 the Governing Body appointed Mr. Edward Phelan as Acting Director without a vote. Mr. Phelan was later unanimously appointed Director by the Governing Body at its 99th Session in September 1946, with retroactive effect from 1941.

At its 105th Session in June 1948 the Governing Body, then composed of 32 members (16 Government, 8 Employer and 8 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 17 votes, elected Mr. David Morse as Director by 30 votes to 0, with 2 blank papers. The appointment took effect in September 1948, for a period of 10 years.

At its 135th Session in June 1957, some 15 months before the expiry of the term of office of Mr. Morse, the Governing Body, then composed of 40 members (20 Government, 10 Employer and 10 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 21 votes, in a secret ballot reappointed Mr. Morse as Director for a further five-year period by 40 votes to 0, with no abstentions.

1 See also fourth sitting.
At its 151st Session in March 1962, some 18 months before the expiry of the term of office of Mr. Morse, the Governing Body, then composed of 40 members (20 Government, 10 Employer and 10 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 21 votes, in a secret ballot again reappointed Mr. Morse as Director for a further five-year period by 37 votes to 0, with 3 blank papers.

At its 168th Session in March 1967, some 18 months before the expiry of the term of office of Mr. Morse, the Governing Body, then composed of 48 members (24 Government, 12 Employer and 12 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 25 votes, reappointed Mr. Morse as Director for a further five-year period in a secret ballot, the result of which was 47 votes to 0, with no abstentions.

Following the resignation of Mr. Morse, which was due to take effect at the end of May 1970, at its 179th (Special) Session in May 1970 the Governing Body, then composed of 48 members (24 Government, 12 Employer and 12 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 25 votes, elected Mr. Wilfred Jenks as Director-General by 25 votes to 23 for the other candidate, Mr. Francis Blanchard. The appointment took effect immediately.

Following the death of Mr. Jenks in September 1973, at its 192nd Session in February-March 1974 the Governing Body, then composed of 48 members (24 Government, 12 Employer and 12 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 25 votes, elected Mr. Francis Blanchard as Director-General by 33 votes to 14 for the other candidate, Mr. Albert Tévoédjré. The appointment took effect immediately for a period of 5 years.

At its 205th Session in March 1978, some 12 months before the expiry of the term of office of Mr. Blanchard, the Governing Body, then composed of 56 members (28 Government, 14 Employer and 14 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 29 votes, reappointed Mr. Blanchard as Director-General for a further five-year period by 51 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

At its 222nd Session in March 1983, some 12 months before the expiry of the term of office of Mr. Blanchard, the Governing Body, then composed of 56 members (28 Government, 14 Employer and 14 Worker members), when the absolute majority would have been 29 votes, reappointed Mr. Blanchard as Director-General for a further five-year period by 46 votes to 0, with 8 abstentions and 1 blank paper.

The Chairman invited the Governing Body first to consider document GB.240/18/24/D.1.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on behalf of the African Government members, stated that they had considered all aspects of the question, but had unfortunately been unable to reach a definitive decision on the subject on account of the relatively brief amount of time available to study the report. They therefore felt that more time was necessary to consider such an important issue, particularly in view of the fact that for the first time the Governing Body was being asked to lay down specific rules governing the election of the Director-General. As stated in paragraph 6, until now no need had been felt for detailed rules. The African group did not think that it was now the appropriate time to consider new rules, and felt strongly that existing traditions should be maintained with full regard for the flexibility normally accorded to the Governing Body in the organisation of its own work. They were quite prepared to hear the views of
other members, and trusted that those other members would show understanding for their position.

Mr. Cano (Government, Colombia) thought it inappropriate to change the rules when the period leading up to the election had already begun, particularly in view of the fact that the existing system had functioned adequately in the past.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the Employers supported the proposal in paragraph 5.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) pointed out that it was incorrect to state that there was no need to change the rules on the grounds that they functioned adequately at present. They had not in fact been applied for decades. No Director-General had been elected to office for a ten-year period for many years, and as precedent held great value in the ILO, it seemed appropriate to adjust the Staff Regulations accordingly.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) made a distinction between those questions which called for an immediate decision, i.e. the date of the election and the period of office of the Director-General and those calling for greater reflection, namely the rules that would govern the elections in the years to come. While it would have been preferable to have more time available for consultations before examining the detailed proposals made by the Officers of the Governing Body, he welcomed the efforts made to prepare written rules. He could agree to the proposed reduction of the statutory term of office of the Director-General to five years, as this would correspond to practice in other specialised agencies in the United Nations system. On the other hand, it seemed illogical to keep Governing Body members waiting until after the closing date for the submission of candidatures before informing them of the candidates involved. He therefore proposed that paragraph 3 of section A of the Rules should be amended to read as follows: "Candidatures submitted in accordance with the above-mentioned conditions shall be made known to the members of the Governing Body by the Chairman immediately after they have been received." Other problems arose in connection with paragraph 8. The Governing Body should therefore limit its decisions at the present sitting to those necessary to enable the election to take place on schedule.

Mr. Galer (Government, Argentina) emphasised the importance of the issue for the future of the Organisation. That importance was reflected in the amount of time that had gone into the preparation of the paper now before the Governing Body, which had been based on an in-depth study conducted by the Legal Adviser on practice in other international organisations. However, every government and every employers' and workers' organisation had their own legal advisers, and the relatively late submission of the paper to the Governing Body had made it impossible for them to consult with those advisers. The representative of the USSR Government had indicated that he was ready to take decisions on certain matters but not on others, and the African Government group had also expressed reservations regarding its participation in decision-making on this item. Furthermore, it could be observed that in its 70 years of existence the Organisation had, without any written rules, enjoyed a long succession of excellent Directors-General.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that at its previous sitting the Governing Body had decided by a large majority to complete its consideration of the report at the present session. It was necessary to respect such a majority decision.
Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) agreed with this view.

Mr. Galer (Government, Argentina) thought that there had been a misunderstanding. The decision taken at the previous sitting had been to consider the document submitted by the Officers of the Governing Body, but not necessarily to take any decisions thereon. It seemed clear from the two earlier statements he had mentioned that there were other members of the Governing Body who felt that decisions should not be taken hastily on such a crucial and highly complex issue. The Governing Body should either devote more time to considering its position on the question, or should agree that such matters would be decided by consensus rather than by vote.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) stated that it had been his understanding that the Governing Body had in the morning simply decided not to postpone its consideration of the paper. That did not oblige it to take a decision upon it at the present session. If the proposals it contained were to be adopted, then they should be adopted by consensus so as to avoid dividing the Governing Body on an important issue. Although unwritten, the rules had worked well for the past 40 years and had resulted in the election of Directors-General whose tenure had greatly benefited the Organisation. It seemed difficult to justify the haste to adopt a document that had been submitted late and which governments had not had adequate opportunity to study properly.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) found some inconsistency in the argument that no action should be taken in view of the late submission of the report. On the contrary, in view of the short time now remaining until the election, every effort should be made to expedite taking the necessary decisions. Responsibility for the lateness of the report lay with every member of the Governing Body, for no one had requested it at an earlier stage, and the Officers of the Governing Body should therefore be thanked for their initiative. The present circumstances, involving the election of a new Director-General, were relatively rare in the recent history of the Organisation. There was a considerable difference between considering the reappointment of an incumbent or the election of a high ranking official who was familiar to the Governing Body and what amounted to a political choice between several candidates who were not all necessarily known to the Governing Body. Hence, it was desirable to lay down precise rules at this stage. Those who advocated strict adherence to past practice should realise that the custom over the past 30 years had been to appoint Directors-General only for five-year periods. In view of the relatively advanced age of the likely candidates, an initial ten-year term of office seemed excessive. In any case, if the new incumbent proved successful, he would undoubtedly be re-elected for another term. He therefore appealed to others to help achieve a consensus on the main points requiring decision.

The Chairman explained that, as a result of the decision taken at the previous sitting, the Governing Body was required to adopt or reject the document, either in whole or in part.

Mr. Ilisastegui (Government, Cuba) emphasised the importance of examining carefully all aspects of the election of the Director-General. He fully endorsed the statements made by Mr. Mtango and Mr. Galer, agreeing in particular that such decisions should not be rushed and that it was vital to reach a consensus on such an important issue.

Mr. Cano (Government, Colombia) stated that, in his view, not only should the term of office be reduced to five years, but limits should also be set on the possibilities of re-election.
Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) understood that the proposed change referred to the forthcoming election. While the African Government members had strong reservations on the changing of the rules, in a spirit of compromise they were prepared to accept the proposal to reduce the term of office, and trusted that others would show equal understanding towards the African Government members' views on other points.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) accepted that, whatever was decided, it would in effect apply only to the forthcoming election since the Governing Body would always be free to change the rules thereafter as it wished.

Mr. Sharma (Government, India) felt that it was necessary to consider the rules in their entirety rather than make piecemeal changes in some of them. For example, in the light of past practice, there did not seem to be any urgent need to change the rule concerning the term of office of the Director-General. More time was necessary to study the full implications of the proposals. Even if they were not adopted, this would in no way hinder a successful election process. The principles which had governed the election of previous Directors-General had worked well and no need had earlier been felt for detailed rules. In particular, the emphasis placed on the need for a candidate to obtain the positive vote of an absolute majority of the members of the Governing Body was difficult to understand; on the other hand, several other aspects seemed to have been overlooked, such as age limits upon appointment and extension. The adoption of the rules should therefore be postponed.

The Chairman reiterated that, as a result of the decision taken by the Governing Body at its previous sitting, he was unable to consider any proposal to postpone consideration of the report.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) found it difficult to understand the objections to the proposal concerning the term of office of the Director-General, which simply confirmed past practice. Nor had anyone made any alternative proposal concerning the term of office. In the absence of opposition to this proposal, he therefore suggested that the Governing Body adopt it and move on to consider the next proposal.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) emphasised the importance of confirming past practice in the Staff Regulations. This was necessary in order to avoid possible sources of dispute.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia) considered that the confusion that had arisen in the debate confirmed the need to adopt clear rules governing the election in advance. He therefore proposed that the Governing Body should consider the document paragraph by paragraph, which would enable everyone to raise specific points in a rational order. He supported the proposal to set the term of office at five years, and endorsed Mr. Muhr's view that the rules now being adopted would not necessarily bind the Governing Body in subsequent elections.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) accepted the proposal made by Mr. Oechslin.

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) supported the proposal by Mr. Poulter regarding the procedure to be followed.
The Governing Body decided to amend the first sentence of article 4.6(a) of the Staff Regulations, so as to read "The Director-General shall be appointed for a period of five years.", the rest of the text of article 4.6(a) remaining unchanged.

The Chairman invited the Governing Body to turn its attention to the proposed Rules for the election of the Director-General set out in the Appendix to the report.

The Governing Body approved the text of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Rules.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) proposed that paragraph 3 should be amended so as to provide for the notification of candidatures to members of the Governing Body "immediately after they had been received".

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) found the proposal acceptable. It should be borne in mind, however, that some candidatures might be subsequently withdrawn.

The Governing Body adopted the text of paragraph 3 of the Rules as amended by Mr. Kostine.

Mr. Cano (Government, Colombia) proposed that paragraph 4 should be amended to read: "To be elected a candidate must receive the votes of one-half plus one of the members of the Governing Body present and voting".

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) proposed that paragraph 4 should be amended to read: "To be elected, a candidate must receive the votes of at least one-half plus one of the members of the Governing Body voting."

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) could not accept any proposal which left open the possibility of election by a relative majority. The Employers' group was strongly attached to the idea of an absolute majority.

Mr. Galer (Government, Argentina) felt that the requirement that a candidate obtain one-half plus one of the votes was inadequate in view of the tripartite composition of the Governing Body. It would be more appropriate to set this requirement at two-thirds of the votes, that is, at 37 votes. Figures concerning previous elections had shown that nearly all the Directors-General had in the past been elected by considerable majorities, in some cases approaching unanimous decisions by the Governing Body. However, as it was not possible to discuss the matter to the extent necessary for such an important issue, this was not a point that he wished to place formally before the Governing Body for decision. The Governing Body might, however, reflect on it in the future. The haste with which certain members were attempting to obtain the adoption of the paper made it impossible to discuss the subject adequately.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) thought that the omission of the words "at least" from the formula proposed by Mr. Cano would create a curious situation whereby the winning candidate would have to obtain exactly 29 votes, no more, no less. As regards the question of the majority required, Mr. Galer's proposal seemed unsuited to a situation in which there were two excellent candidates. On the other hand the proposal to dispense with the need for an absolute majority could lead to absurd results, for example, in a case where none of the candidates enjoyed broad support and there were many abstentions. For these reasons, the proposal in the paper seemed the most logical and the one most likely to produce a competent
Director-General enjoying the necessary degree of support in the Governing Body.

Mr. Clever (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) asked Mr. Mtango to explain the reasons behind his proposed amendment.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) emphasised that it was important to agree on the principle underlying the majority required: provided that the wording conveyed that principle accurately, he had no particular preference regarding the drafting. The incoming Director-General had to be assured of the greatest possible support among members of the Governing Body, and more generally among member States and employers' and workers' organisations. The majority necessary for election could be placed as high as was wished, but in no case could it be lower than 29 votes. There was a subtle distinction between what was desirable and what was practicable, and while a two-thirds majority was clearly preferable, a simple majority would nevertheless be obtainable only on the basis of adequate support in each of the Governing Body's groups. However, it was vital to insist on the obtainment of an absolute majority, particularly since, until the constitutional amendments came into force, the Governing Body had the final say in the matter.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) stated in reply to Mr. Clever that the rule concerning the majority proposed by the Officers would in most cases lead to an impasse and that the African group favoured a simple majority. Unanimity was rare, and democratic principles, such as those applied in elections throughout the world, underlay the proposal he had made. He appealed to the understanding of the other members of the Governing Body to accept the compromise being made by the African group.

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) considered that there was merit in Mr. Galer's proposal to impose a two-thirds majority requirement, which would ensure that the Director-General would enjoy the authority he needed. On the other hand, that made by Mr. Mtango, despite its democratic motivations, overlooked the obvious need for an absolute majority. The proposal by the Officers of the Governing Body was a useful compromise between these two positions, and he therefore supported it.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) reiterated that the amendment proposed by Mr. Mtango involved an unacceptable degree of risk concerning participation in the vote. He therefore stressed the need to accept the Officers' proposal.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) believed that in such an important election all members would wish to take part and that, in accordance with the principles of democracy, the will of the majority would prevail.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) observed that there could be a variety of reasons why members of the Governing Body might not take part in one or other of the ballots, including other commitments or meteorological conditions such as those experienced in a recent past. In the interests of genuine democracy he therefore proposed that the rule suggested by the Officers should be adopted.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) explained that, should it be obvious when the vote was taken that many Governing Body members were unavoidably absent, the vote would surely not be taken.
Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) pointed out that there might be a large number of abstentions in the case of an election involving a number of relatively unknown candidates. No candidate could seriously expect to function well as Director-General if he did not enjoy the support of at least half of the Governing Body. He therefore again emphasised the practicality of the proposal made by the Officers.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) considered that the proposal of the Officers was perfectly democratic and corresponded to the practice followed in his own country and organisation, where a candidate for the presidency needed to obtain the support of at least half of those entitled to vote in order to be elected to office. The amendment proposed by the representative of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania was inconsistent with that minimum requirement and gave no guarantee that the incoming Director-General would enjoy the necessary confidence of the Governing Body. Any proposal other than that made by the Officers would be unduly complicated.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) reiterated that in most cases his amendment would lead to election by absolute majority.

The Chairman pointed out that, while Mr. Mtango's amendment did not exclude election by absolute majority, it was based on the idea of a simple majority and was therefore distinct from the Officers' proposal. He therefore put the amendment of the representative of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania to the vote.

In a vote by show of hands, the Governing Body rejected the amendment by 32 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.

Mr. Galer (Government, Argentina), explaining his vote, stated that he had abstained because his Government had not yet taken a final position on this matter.

The Chairman invited the Governing Body to turn its attention to the amendment proposed by Mr. Cano, representative of the Government of Colombia.

The Legal Adviser explained that the amendment proposed by Mr. Cano could be unfortunately interpreted to mean that a candidate could only win the election if he received a number of votes exactly equal to one-half plus one of the members of the Governing Body entitled to vote, no more, no less. This was the effect of excluding the words "at least". If it was wished to improve on the wording suggested by the Officers, then the best solution might be to refer to the votes of "more than" one-half of the members of the Governing Body entitled to vote.

Mr. Mensah (Government, Benin) asked whether the figure of one-half of the regular members of the Governing Body, which normally stood at 28, would be affected in cases where certain members of the Governing Body were for some reason not entitled to vote.

The Chairman confirmed that this was so: it would apply, for example, in the case of a Government member whose arrears of contributions to the Organisation totalled more than two years' contributions.

Mr. Cano (Government, Colombia) explained that his proposal was based on the idea that, in order to be elected, a candidate must receive the votes of one-half plus one of members of the Governing Body present and voting.
The Chairman stated that if the text proposed by Mr. Cano referred to the members of the Governing Body "present and voting", then the proposal would have to be deemed rejected by the vote just taken by Mr. Mtango's amendment for it was in effect based on the same concept.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) stated that he had understood Mr. Cano's proposal to amount to one of the variants suggested by the Legal Adviser. He asked for that wording to be repeated.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) emphasised that the Governing Body's wishes on the principle involved were now clear, and it was simply a matter of choosing the preferred wording.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) echoed this view. The main intention behind Mr. Cano's proposal had been to delete the words "at least" in the text proposed by the Officers of the Governing Body, which he had considered ambiguous. Mr. Oechslin and the Legal Adviser had subsequently reflected this in their interpretations of the proposal.

The Legal Adviser stated that this was correct. The text of paragraph 4 as now proposed to the Governing Body, would read as follows: "To be elected, a candidate must receive the votes of more than one-half of the members of the Governing Body entitled to vote."

The Governing Body approved the text of paragraph 4 of the Rules as amended.

The Chairman then invited the Governing Body to consider the Rules concerning the election procedure in paragraphs 5 to 8.

The Governing Body approved the text of paragraph 5 of the Rules.

The Governing Body approved the text of paragraph 6(i) of the Rules.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) observed that paragraph 6(ii) would be unfair in a situation where, in a vote involving three candidates, two candidates received simultaneously the lower number of votes.

Miss Venson (Government, Botswana) considered it important to dispel any possible ambiguity.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia) stated that this anomaly was reinforced by the wording of paragraph 7, which referred to "the last two remaining candidates". In the example given by Mr. Vargas, the winning candidate would not necessarily have received more than one-half of the votes.

The Legal Adviser explained that, after successive elimination of candidates receiving the lowest number of votes, there would still remain one or two candidates. In the case of two candidates, paragraph 7 would still apply. If only one remained, then paragraph 8 would apply in so far as it referred to "the last candidate", who would still have to secure the majority required by paragraph 4.

Miss Venson (Government, Botswana) considered that some ambiguity still remained, as paragraphs 7 and 8 both referred to "the last two remaining candidates", whereas paragraph 6(ii) could have the effect of leaving only one candidate.
The Legal Adviser stated in reply that, should paragraph 6(ii) result in only one candidate remaining, then that situation was in effect covered by paragraph 8.

Miss Venson (Government, Botswana) considered that the text was still unclear. She therefore proposed that the first sentence of paragraph 7 be amended to read "If in the ballot between the remaining candidates ...". It seemed unnecessary to specify the number.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) agreed with this view. A new wording would help clarify matters.

The Chairman explained that, as the Governing Body had decided that an absolute majority was required for election, in the case of only one candidate remaining after successive ballots, there would still have to be a further ballot to determine whether that candidate received an absolute majority of the votes.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) agreed that the matter was not entirely clear - the English and French texts did not coincide. It would perhaps be preferable to spell out the requirement for the absolute majority in a separate paragraph to cover the eventuality referred to by Miss Venson.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) supported this view.

The Legal Adviser explained that paragraph 6 was designed to eliminate candidates, while paragraph 7 was intended to cover the selection of the winning candidate, who in any case would need to secure the absolute majority required under paragraph 4.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) considered that the wording of paragraph 7 could still be improved. The text should avoid referring to a ballot between "two" remaining candidates, as there could in fact be a situation in which only one candidate remained, as a result of the simultaneous elimination of two or more candidates having received the same lower number of votes.

Miss Venson (Government, Botswana) supported this statement. The elimination procedure should show more clearly how one arrived at the last candidate.

Mr. Crean (Worker, Australia) felt that the final paragraph should spell out clearly the circumstances in which, as a result of a deadlock or the absence of the required majority, the Governing Body might have to postpone the election.

Mr. Koukiadis (Government, Greece) proposed that, in order to cover a case in which it was difficult to arrive at precisely two remaining candidates, paragraph 7 should be amended to refer to "the last remaining candidate or candidates".

Mrs. Caron (Government, Canada) supported this proposal.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) also supported the proposal.

The Legal Adviser pointed out that such an amendment would make the paragraph as a whole difficult to understand.
Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) therefore proposed that the beginning of the sentence be replaced by the words "if after the ballot there remain one or two candidates ...".

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) considered that the proposal made by Mr. Koukiadis was not practicable. The simpler solution was that proposed earlier, consisting in simply deleting the words "last two".

Ms. Houstoun (Government, United States) proposed that paragraph 7 be eliminated altogether, and that paragraph 8 be amended in the way originally proposed for paragraph 7. This would mean that its first line would read "If in the ballot between the remaining candidates they receive the ...".

The Legal Adviser stated that this would be acceptable, provided it was understood that the principle of the absolute majority was retained. Paragraph 7 in effect added little to paragraphs 6 and 8, in view of the principle established in paragraph 4.

Mrs. Molkova (Government, Czechoslovakia) considered that paragraph 7 had value in making it possible to declare a successful end to the election procedure before the possibility of postponement came into play.

The Legal Adviser proposed a new draft for paragraph 8, in the following terms:

If in the ballot between the last remaining candidates, they receive the same number of votes and a further ballot still does not produce a majority for one of them, or if the last remaining candidate does not obtain the majority required by Rule 4 above in a further ballot in which his name is submitted to the Governing Body for a final vote, the Governing Body may postpone the election and freely set a new deadline for the submission of candidatures.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) asked who would be in charge of the Office in the event of the postponement of such an election in view of the fact that the present Director-General's term of office expired on 26 February 1989.

The Chairman stated that such a decision would lie with the Governing Body.

Miss Venson (Government, Botswana) pointed out that, in the phrase "the last remaining", the word "last" was redundant.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) requested that this text be circulated in writing.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated that the new text now proposed by the Legal Adviser was based on the assumption that paragraph 7 had been deleted. However, until the text was settled, it was logical to consider both paragraphs 7 and 8. The original proposal simply to delete the words "last two" might have been simpler.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) pointed out that, grammatically speaking, the text as a whole only envisaged male candidates. It should also cover female candidates.
Ms. Houstoun (Government, United States) observed that her amendment had covered both the deletion of paragraph 7 and the deletion of the words "last two" in paragraph 8. She therefore requested the Legal Adviser to reread the text.

The Legal Adviser read out the proposed text of the new paragraph 7 that would replace the former paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Rules, as follows:

If, in the ballot between the remaining candidates, they receive the same number of votes and a further ballot still does not produce a majority for one of them, or if one candidate remains but does not obtain the majority required by Rule 4 above in a further ballot in which his or her name is submitted to the Governing Body for a final vote, the Governing Body may postpone the election and freely set a new deadline for the submission of candidatures.

Mr. Cano (Government, Colombia) thought that a postponement of the election would create an undesirable situation whereby the Office would be left without a Director-General. The Rules should be extended to cover this eventuality so as to provide for some form of negotiation that would avoid having to postpone the election. In addition, what kind of majority would be required to agree on the postponement of the election? The rules could state that the incumbent Director-General should remain in office until a new election could be arranged.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) recalled the Chairman's answer to a similar question asked by Mr. Vargas. It should be assumed that the Governing Body would proceed to elect a new Director-General on the election day, but if that proved impossible, the Governing Body would have to take a decision in the light of the circumstances. The period of appointment of the Director-General and of any extensions was governed by the Staff Regulations, and it seemed pointless to cover this eventuality at present.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) supported this view. A situation similar to that described by Mr. Cano had arisen in the unfortunate circumstances of Mr. Jenks' death and the problem had been resolved without any major difficulty. It was for the Governing Body to consider the problem in the terms in which it arose. Paragraph 8 was intended to cover the situation in which no candidate achieved an absolute majority. It would then be for the Governing Body to decide when to organise a further election. It was impossible to foresee the situation that would arise in such circumstances, and the problem should be left to the discretion of the Governing Body as and when it arose.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) supported Mr. Cano's query: a decision to postpone the election should require the same majority as that necessary for the election of the Director-General himself.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated in reply to Mr. Vargas that a decision on the manner in which to proceed in the event of an unsuccessful ballot procedure would have to be taken on the basis of the circumstances prevailing. It was impossible to foresee what the terms of that decision might be. The Workers' group accepted the text proposed by the Legal Adviser.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) proposed that the Governing Body adopt the text proposed by the Legal Adviser.
The Governing Body approved the proposed text of the new paragraph 7 of the Rules as read out by the Legal Adviser.

The Chairman invited the Governing Body to consider the proposal made in paragraph 2 of the covering report concerning the election date.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the vast majority of his group was in favour of the proposed date of 13 February 1989.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated that the Workers' group also supported the proposed date.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) asked for what reason the election was planned so close to the date on which the Director-General's term of office was due to expire. In the past the intervening period had varied between 12 and 18 months.

The Chairman replied that, in the cases to which Mr. Vargas seemed to be referring, the decisions involved extensions of mandates and not the election of new Directors-General.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) found the question asked by Mr. Vargas somewhat confusing. He had asked in effect why the Governing Body had not taken a decision earlier on the arrangements for the election. It was equally legitimate to ask why no member of the Governing Body, including Mr. Vargas, had suggested that this should be done, since everyone was well aware of the date on which Mr. Blanchard's term of office would expire. Such discussions seemed pointless.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) pointed out that Mr. Vargas had that very morning proposed that the document be postponed to November, in which case the Governing Body would have had no other choice than to set the date of the election in February 1989. His present question therefore seemed inconsistent.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) asked whether there was any reason why the election could not be held in November.

The Chairman replied that the Governing Body was free to decide on the matter as it thought fit.

Mr. Clever (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) observed that there might well be some merit in holding the election in November so as to allow the incoming Director-General time in which to familiarise himself with the Office, including the difficult financial problems confronting it. It would, however, be useful to hear the arguments in favour of a February election.

The Chairman stated in reply that his personal support for the February date had been based on his view that this would allow the maximum time for the submission and consideration of all possible candidatures. This would enable the Governing Body to take a decision on the broadest possible basis. For this reason he thought that the February date would be in the best interests of the Organisation as a whole.

Mr. Clever (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) considered that a November election could easily produce a Director-General with the necessary experience. Potential candidates for the post of Director-General had known when it would become vacant for a number of years, and several months were still left for further nominations. He therefore proposed that the election
be held on the last day of the forthcoming November session of the Governing Body.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) supported the Chairman's views. Whatever the differences of views that had prevailed at the present sitting, it was generally agreed that it was necessary to select a candidate enjoying the broadest possible degree of support. Only time could ensure that such support was available. It should also be borne in mind that Employer and Worker members of the Governing Body were not represented in Geneva or in diplomatic circles, whereas governments had the network of diplomatic contacts at their disposal to consider such matters. The non-governmental groups of the Governing Body would also therefore benefit from a February election.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) supported the views of the other Officers. No serious candidate would wait until 13 January 1989 to submit his candidature, but time would be extremely valuable for all members of the Governing Body to collect information on the candidates. As for the suggestion that the incoming Director-General would require time to familiarise himself with the Office, he observed that any candidate who would await until being elected to begin familiarising himself with the work of the ILO would be an inappropriate candidate.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) stated that some candidatures, including that proposed by the African group, were perhaps still unknown to members of the Governing Body, and the proposal made by the Officers might well have been made in ignorance of certain candidatures. On behalf of the African Government members, he supported Mr. Clever's proposal that the election be held in November 1988.

The Director-General observed that his term of office expired on 26 February 1989, and that until that date he would continue to discharge his duties as Director-General fully. The suggestion by Mr. Clever concerning a period of familiarisation would in effect mean that the Office would have two Directors-General, and this was not acceptable to him personally. The needs of the Organisation were of paramount importance in the matter, and here it should be borne in mind that the ILO was facing a financial situation that would call for the most delicate internal consultations in connection with the forthcoming programme and budget proposals. It was his duty to supervise personally those consultations, for they would be particularly difficult. Any candidate possessing the necessary qualities to be elected Director-General would be capable of stepping into his new functions immediately.

Mr. Al-Jassem (Employer, Kuwait) stated that he was among those who, in the Employers' group, were opposed to the date of 13 February for the election, as he thought that a mere two weeks was insufficient time for the incoming Director-General to take over the reins. A period of familiarisation was inevitable. In view of the financial difficulties that the ILO now faced it was particularly important to settle the matter in advance of the date suggested.

Mr. Clever (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) stated, in order to remove any regrettable misunderstanding, that it was the full wish of his Government that Mr. Blanchard should continue to exercise his duties until the very last day of his term of office. However, Mr. Blanchard had himself referred to the difficult financial situation now facing the Organisation, and it should be borne in mind that it would be his successor who would have to implement the decisions taken by the Governing Body concerning the programme and budget. The election of a new Director-General in November would make it possible to develop the relationship between them and to prepare the new
Director-General for what promised to be an extremely difficult task. There were no real grounds for fear regarding the role of the incoming Director-General during the period of overlap.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), referring to the comments by Mr. Mtango, stated that, as Chairman of the Employers' group, he had met all the hitherto known candidates personally. They were persons of high standing, and it was an honour for the Organisation that they were interested in the post of Director-General. In this regard, his own preference for the February date could in no way be interpreted as intended to exclude any of the candidates. Nor was it detrimental to those candidates' interest in the post to have a longer period of reflection. That delay would allow the maximum possible time for a consensus to come about on the choice of candidate so as to facilitate the whole exercise.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia) stated that his preference was for the date suggested by the Officers, and this for two reasons. First, it seemed clear that the Employers' and Workers' groups supported the proposal. Secondly, and more important, the grave financial difficulties now facing the ILO were far from being the ideal circumstances in which to overburden the Director-General with the somewhat complicated situation that might arise in the case of a new Director-General being on the scene as from November. The new Director-General would naturally want to put his own stamp on the Organisation, and he would have plenty of opportunity to do so during his term of office. However, in the present circumstances it was essential for the Director-General to be able to give his undivided attention to the formulation of the programme and budget proposals. Mr. Blanchard should be given every support by the Governing Body to ensure that, on completing his term of office, he left the Organisation in the best financial and operational state possible in the present circumstances. Divided loyalties would seriously compromise the likelihood of this happening.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) supported this view. Mr. Blanchard was not due to leave the Office until 26 February 1989, and until that date nothing should prevent him, in the present difficult circumstances, from performing his duties to the best of his ability. It seemed pointless to continue the discussion of the matter any further, particularly in view of the statement by the Director-General, and the arguments and motivations were well known. He therefore proposed that the matter be put to a vote. He would support the date proposed by the Officers.

In a vote by show of hands, the Governing Body decided, by 41 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions, to adopt the proposal made by the Officers in paragraph 2 of the report.

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Industrial Activities Committee (concl.)

Mr. Hertel (Government, German Democratic Republic), Chairman of the Industrial Activities Committee, announced that, following consultations among the members of the Committee since its meeting in May, it had been agreed that

---

1 See also third sitting.
the Working Party set up to examine the requests for the establishment of new Industrial and analogous Committees and joint committees would have the following composition:

**Government members:** Australia, Federal Republic of Germany, United States, Uganda.

**Employer members:** Miss Hak, Mr. Lindner, Mr. Said, Mr. Tsujino.

**Substitutes:** Mr. Arbesser-Rastburg, Mr. Santos Neves, Mr. Williams

**Worker members:** Mr. Ahmed, Mr. Diop, Mr. Morton, Mr. Timmer.

**NINETY-THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA**

**Election of the Officers of the Governing Body for 1988-89**

**Election of the Chairman**

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on behalf of the African Government group, nominated Mr. Nathanaël G. Mensah, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs of Benin and representative of the Government of Benin on the Governing Body for the chairmanship of the Governing Body for the period 1988-89. Mr. Mensah had outstanding academic and professional qualifications for the post, having worked as a teacher and researcher and written books and studies on labour law and public service law. He had also held a number of high offices in his own country in academic circles and in the Government. As Minister of Labour he had contributed to the promotion of tripartism and dialogue between the social partners. He was well known for his open-mindedness and unfailing courtesy, which had won him the admiration of many members of the Governing Body.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia), speaking on behalf of the Government group, seconded the nomination of Mr. Mensah. In particular, Mr. Mensah was a man of great patience, which was a highly useful quality in a Chairman.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) supported the nomination of Mr. Mensah. Mr. Mensah's personal qualities would ensure him a fruitful term of office.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) was pleased to support the nomination of Mr. Mensah. He was convinced that he would make an excellent and active Chairman, and he wished him every success during his term of office, pledging him the full support of the Workers' group.

Mr. Hertel (Government, German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the governments of the socialist countries, likewise supported the nomination of Mr. Mensah, who was eminently qualified to hold the office. The socialist countries would give him their full support.

Mr. Hilburn (Government, United States), speaking on behalf of the American Government members, was pleased to join those who had supported Mr. Mensah's nomination. His outstanding educational and professional background would be extremely valuable to him in his important new office.
Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Western European Government members, expressed pleasure in supporting the nomination of Mr. Mensah as Chairman of the Governing Body. He was sure to live up to the high standards already set by previous chairmen.

Mr. Li Boyang (Government, China), speaking on behalf of the Government members from the Asia and Pacific region, also supported the nomination of Mr. Mensah, whose work at the International Labour Conference had on many occasions earned him great respect and admiration. The Asian and Pacific Government members would give him their full co-operation and support during his term of office. He also expressed their thanks and best wishes of happiness and health to the outgoing Chairman, Mr. Russomano.

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) was pleased to join previous speakers in seconding the nomination of Mr. Mensah.

Mr. Georget (Employer, Niger), speaking as an Employer member from the African region, was proud to second the nomination of Mr. Mensah, who had played an outstanding role in the region. As a man of integrity, he was likely to serve the whole Governing Body well.

Mr. Adiko (Worker, Côte d'Ivoire) was convinced that Mr. Mensah would make an excellent Chairman of the Governing Body, and supported his nomination.


(Mr. Mensah took the Chair.)

The Chairman (Mr. Mensah) expressed his appreciation to the members of the Governing Body for the confidence they had shown in him by electing him as their Chairman, thus paying tribute not only to him personally, but also to his country, Benin, and to the continent of Africa as a whole. Special thanks were due to Mr. Mtango, Co-ordinator of the African Group, for having submitted his candidature to the Governing Body. He was also grateful to Mr. Poulter, Chairman of the Government group, Mr. Muhr, Chairman of the Workers' group and Mr. Oechslin, Chairman of the Employers' group for their kindness and support.

He paid tribute to the outgoing Chairman, Mr. Russomano, whose sagacity and patience he greatly admired. It was those qualities which had guided Mr. Russomano in his remarkably efficient conduct of the sessions of the Governing Body since his election in June 1987 to the current session.

He expressed his admiration and gratitude to Mr. Blanchard, Director-General, for his daily efforts to ensure the smooth and harmonious running of the great service enterprise that was the ILO. He was also appreciative of the work done by the regional co-ordinators.

Deeply attached to the principles of tripartism and constructive dialogue, he was prepared to face with all the members of the Governing Body the difficult situations which were likely to arise in the months to come. The Governing Body was no doubt aware of the Organisation's difficult economic situation, which was characterised by fluctuating currencies due to the economic crisis and which was compounded by the non-payment of contributions by certain member States. Those contributions were vital to the fulfilment of the socio-economic objectives of the Organisation which, by its scope and tripartite structure, was one of the most efficient institutions of the United Nations system. The members of the ILO should not passively witness the 9359R/v.4
collapse of the Organisation, which was considered one of the most valuable achievements of the twentieth century.

In view of this, he was deeply convinced that, through solidarity and co-operation among member States, the Organisation could be extricated from the financial abyss into which it seemed to be gradually sinking. He therefore appealed to all member States from the developing world to make the necessary arrangements to pay up their current contributions and arrears, since neglecting to do so would make them subject to the provisions of article 13, paragraph 4, of the ILO Constitution concerning the loss of voting rights of member States. There was no doubt that the international economic crisis had severely weakened the economies of several developing countries. However, it was important to bear in mind that it was the contributions of member States that enabled the Director-General to enhance and promote the activities of the ILO in developing countries, since those countries, being the most needy, were the most important beneficiaries. He solemnly launched a further appeal to those highly developed member States who were behind in their contributions to pay up their debts to the Organisation, so that they could continue to contribute to the fulfilment of the socio-economic objectives of the ILO.

The second challenge that the Governing Body would have to face during the coming year was the election of the Director-General of the ILO. It was well-known that the election of the Director-General was an event of great historical significance and any action taken in that regard should be taken in full knowledge of the situation, with proper judgement and in a responsible manner. This action should enable the Organisation to respond positively to the social and economic challenges arising towards the close of the millennium. Mankind, as was well-known, was threatened with destruction, not only in the form of an excessive arms build-up and nuclear disaster, but also in the form of social insecurity and the persistent disarray which were the lot of the unemployed, small farmers and rural workers. These farmers and rural workers were adversely affected by drought, the devastating attacks of desert locusts, the derisory prices of agricultural products on the world market, and the social repercussions of structural adjustment policies implemented as a result of the indebtedness of their states. The ILO, as the social conscience of the world, should not simply reveal these problems, but should endeavour to solve them. This could be achieved by the Organisation through technical co-operation, which should be intensified and consolidated. Moreover, technical co-operation required sufficient financial resources; hence the need for all member States to pay up their contributions in full and on time.

He was confident that, through the dynamics of tripartism, the Governing Body would overcome the problems which it faced. During his mandate he would endeavour to be impartial and respect the interests of all the various groups which made up the Governing Body. Before concluding, he asked the Director-General of the ILO to convey to all the members of the Office staff his great admiration for the manner in which they conducted their work. He trusted that during his term of office, he would be able to count on their competence, friendship, efficiency and the spirit of abnegation which they had displayed in their relations with his predecessors. He hoped that during his mandate the Governing Body would help the Office to make a greater contribution to the safeguarding of peace in the world, to the respect for human rights and to the establishment of an era of prosperity for all the peoples of the world.

Miss Venson (Government, Botswana) warmly congratulated Mr. Mensah on his election as Chairman of the Governing Body. His task would be a difficult one since, as was demonstrated at the current session, the Governing Body was not
always able to reach its decisions unanimously. She wished him good luck in
his new office.

She paid tribute to Mr. Russomano for his able chairmanship of the
Governing Body during the previous year and, specifically, for the outstanding
manner in which he had conducted that day's session, a particularly trying
one. In addition to his firmness and fairness, he had contributed his legal
experience to the sessions of the Governing Body. She commended Professor
Russomano's sense of sympathy and solidarity in issues affecting Africa and
the entire Third World; this was not surprising, as he was also a true
representative of the Third World. In conclusion, she wished him continued
good health and success.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that
Mr. Russomano's chairmanship of that day's protracted and delicate session
bore testimony to the fact that he would go down in the history of the
Governing Body as one of its truly outstanding Chairman, due to his patience,
natural authority and sound legal knowledge. Personally, he would always
remember the particularly cordial atmosphere in the Governing Body under
Mr. Russomano's chairmanship, as well as his understanding of problems and of
persons. His year in office had been a difficult one, one which signified a
turning point in the life of the Organisation. Speaking both personally and
on behalf of the Employers' group, he thanked Mr. Russomano for the work he
had accomplished. He hoped that Mr. Russomano would remain a member of the
Governing Body for some time and that the Employers would continue to have the
pleasure of working with him and benefiting from his courtesy and knowledge of
law which was an essential requirement of the post of Chairman of the
Governing Body of the ILO.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman),
speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, offered his hearty congratulations
to Mr. Mensah on his unanimous election to the chairmanship of the Governing
Body. The Workers' group looked forward to working with him and hoped to give
concrete proof of their co-operation on many occasions in the future.

As regards the outgoing Chairman, it was difficult after such a year of
fruitful co-operation and effective work to find words to describe Professor
Russomano's chairmanship of the Governing Body. Professor Russomano was a man
of great sensitivity and understanding, and one who had the great merit, as he
had shown at the current session, of being able to guide the Governing Body
through a difficult situation and helping it to arrive at a solution which
could be accepted, if not unanimously, at least by a large majority. In
various restricted meetings involving the speaker and the outgoing Chairman,
the latter had always been ready to discuss matters in a spirit of
understanding and mutual co-operation. The Workers wished to thank Professor
Russomano and hoped that he would continue to represent his country for many
more years on the Governing Body and that they would be able to co-operate
with him as they had done in the past.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia) extended his heartiest
congratulations to Mr. Mensah on his election.

On behalf of the Government group, he thanked Professor Russomano for his
unfailing courtesy, patience, independence of mind and his integrity in the
conduct of the business of the Governing Body. He was particularly grateful
to the outgoing Chairman for having personally accepted the invitation to
address the Government group and for having explained to that group how the
Governing Body operated on its behalf. He hoped that this was a precedent
which would be followed by his successor. The Government group looked forward
to having Professor Russomano once again in its ranks, when he would be able
to share with the Government members the wealth of experience he had acquired during his term of office as Chairman of the Governing Body.

Mr. Hilburn (Government, United States) was pleased to echo the satisfaction expressed by previous speakers concerning Mr. Mensah's election.

Speaking as regional co-ordinator of the Americas Government group, he expressed his region's most sincere gratitude to Professor Russomano for his outstanding chairmanship of the Governing Body during the previous year. Guided by his deep attachment to the fundamental ILO principles of tripartism, dialogue and human rights in the field of labour, Professor Russomano had led the deliberations of the Governing Body with wisdom, understanding and efficiency. The Americas Government group took pride in the honour that the chairmanship of a fellow member of that group had brought to the region. His group looked forward to many years of further collaboration with Professor Russomano and wished him all the best. The speaker had known the outgoing Chairman for several years and had always valued his sound advice, which he hoped he would be able to count on in the future.

Mr. Hertel (Government, German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the socialist governments of Eastern Europe, wholeheartedly associated them with the good wishes expressed to the Chairman on his unanimous election.

He also thanked Professor Russomano for the excellent job he had done as Chairman of the Governing Body. Professor Russomano had been a skilful Chairman, especially in complicated situations, and had always helped the Governing Body to achieve positive and productive results.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Western European Governments, first congratulated the new Chairman on his election.

He fully concurred with the statements made by previous speakers in appreciation of the outstanding contribution which Professor Russomano had made to the Governing Body's proceedings, through his courtesy, patience, fairness and kindness. His group highly appreciated the clear and illuminating explanations which he had given on the very complex issues which had arisen during his term of office and he had thus contributed immensely to the success the Governing Body had achieved during the previous year.

Mr. Mtango (Government, United Republic of Tanzania) expressed his personal pride and satisfaction at Mr. Mensah's election; in so doing, he believed that he reflected the general feeling in the African group.

On behalf of the African group he sincerely complimented Professor Russomano on the manner in which he had conducted the business of the Governing Body during his mandate.

The Director-General first of all congratulated Mr. Mensah on his unanimous election to the chairmanship of the Governing Body and wished him every success during his term of office. As the new Chairman had himself already mentioned, the Governing Body would have to deal successively with a number of complex issues during the coming year. He assured the Chairman that he could rely on his support and that of his colleagues in the accomplishment of his difficult tasks.

As regards Professor Russomano, he echoed all the comments which had been made concerning his chairmanship. He had had the privilege of working with Professor Russomano not only in the course of the previous year, but for some time before that and he as well as his colleagues had always benefited from
the outgoing Chairman's sound advice, his great wisdom, his desire to understand problems and to help to solve them. Professor Russomano had skilfully demonstrated those qualities not only throughout the previous year, but in particular at the current session, when the Governing Body had had to come to grips with difficult problems which required a mastery of law and very precise judgement. Moreover, Professor Russomano had always presided over the Governing Body's sessions with utmost courtesy.

He was pleased to present Professor Russomano with the traditional gavel, recalling the year during which he had been Chairman of the Governing Body.

Mr. Russomano (Government, Brazil) first expressed his heartfelt appreciation to all those who had paid tribute to him. He especially thanked the Director-General for the symbolic gavel which had been presented to him. The gavel was a symbol of authority, which, if used in a violent manner, became an instrument of dictatorship, but if used in the name of the law, it became an instrument of justice. He hoped to be able to use it at all times as a symbol of understanding, tolerance and concern for the welfare of others. Secondly, he congratulated Mr. Mensah on his election and wished him every success in carrying out his duties. It was well known that Brazil was a country of diverse ethnic origins, many of which could be traced back to the African continent and to Benin in particular. As a Brazilian and former student of Afro-Brazilian culture, it was a great pleasure to have as his successor the Minister of Labour of Benin.

Thirdly, he thanked all the members of the Governing Body for their support, co-operation and understanding. Special thanks were due to Mr. Oechslin and Mr. Muhr, Employer Vice-Chairman and Worker Vice-Chairman respectively, for having supported and assisted him in his duties.

From his term of office he would take with him unforgettable memories. It was his belief that solidarity, understanding and peace in the international community would be attained more easily if peoples, States and organisations followed the example of tolerance and mutual effort for the common good which had always been displayed in the ILO and which, he was convinced, would remain the cornerstone of the Organisation.

Election of the Vice-Chairmen

Miss Mackie (Employer, United Kingdom), after congratulating the Chairman on his election, announced that the Employers' group were once again unanimously proposing as Employer Vice-Chairman, Mr. Jean-Jacques Oechslin, who had held that position for several years. She was confident that Mr. Oechslin would have very wide support on the Governing Body and that he would be of great assistance to the Chairman.

The Governing Body unanimously elected Mr. Oechslin as Employer Vice-Chairman.

Mr. Sanchez Madariaga (Worker, Mexico) began by congratulating the Chairman on his election and wishing him much success in his highly responsible post. On behalf of the Workers, he proposed the re-election of Mr. Gerd Muhr, who had for several years distinguished himself as Worker Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body through his seriousness and his sense of responsibility.

The Governing Body unanimously elected Mr. Muhr as Worker Vice-Chairman.
Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) extended his congratulations to the Chairman on his election. The speaker had represented his Government on the Governing Body for 11 years. He was now about to retire and return to Moscow; however, he could not do so without warmly thanking the members of the Governing Body and the Office staff, in particular those with whom he had had frequent contacts; he wished them success, happiness and good health in their work and life.

Mr. Poulter (Government, Australia), speaking on behalf of the Government group, complimented Mr. Kostine on the able manner in which he had represented his Government and for having facilitated the work of the Governing Body, due to his ability to co-operate with other governments in arriving at a consensus, even where opinions had differed.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) regretted that Mr. Kostine had to leave the Governing Body after only 11 years. He had greatly appreciated working with him, despite occasional differences of opinion, and had admired the courtesy which Mr. Kostine had always displayed in his participation in the deliberations of the Governing Body. He wished Mr. Kostine much happiness and satisfaction in the new phase of his life which was about to begin.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) said that the news of Mr. Kostine's departure had come as a surprise to the Workers, who had been unaware that he had reached the age of retirement. Mr. Kostine had always displayed a youthful enthusiasm for the affairs of the Governing Body. Working with him had been a pleasure for the Workers, who had often received his support. Understandably, due to his position, Mr. Kostine had not always been able to support the stand taken by the Workers, but had always treated them with great courtesy. He hoped that his successor would collaborate with the Workers' group in the same manner. He wished Mr. Kostine many years of happiness and good health and looked forward to seeing him again in Geneva, where he would always be a welcome guest.

The Director-General, speaking on behalf of his colleagues in the Office, wished Mr. Kostine a very active retirement. He had been told by Mr. Kostine that he would be undertaking some very interesting tasks, including teaching assignments. First and foremost, he thanked Mr. Kostine for the courtesy he had shown in his relations with the speaker himself and with his colleagues in the Office. He would cherish pleasant memories of the many contacts he had had with Mr. Kostine, during which he had always admired the latter's competence, knowledge of issues and his desire to carry them through. In this regard, he recalled the last meeting with Mr. Kostine a month previously in Moscow where he had held in-depth discussions with him.

The Director-General then announced that Mr. Nakatani, Assistant Director-General, would shortly be retiring from the Office. Mr. Nakatani was in charge of the ILO's regional programme for Asia, a highly responsible post which he had occupied with great competence, seriousness and distinction for several years. He felt sure that he was echoing the general feelings of the Governing Body in wishing Mr. Nakatani an active retirement and assuring him that he could return to his native Japan with the memory of the friendship and high esteem of the members of the Governing Body.

The 240th Session closed at 10.55 p.m.
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ARRIAZOLA, Armando, Sr., tercero secretario, Misión Permanente de México en Ginebra (México).

BAAH-DUODU, Kwabena, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ghana in Geneva (Ghana).

BAKER, James, Mr. (United States), European Representative of the AFL-CIO.

BALDASSINI, R.A., Sr. (Argentina), Consejo Directivo, Confederación General del Trabajo.

BARANYAI, E., Mrs., Head, International Department, Hungarian National Council of Trade Unions; accompanying Mr. Timmer.
BARNOUIN, Jack P., Mr., Geneva Office (International Monetary Fund).

BATISTA, Mary, Sra., Directora de la Oficina de relaciones internacionales y enlace con la OIT en Venezuela (Venezuela).

BECKER, J. Peter, Mr., Deputy Director for Industrial and Communications Programs, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State (United States).

BEELAERTS VAN BLOKLAND, Willem, Mr., Policy Adviser for Budgetary Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Netherlands).

BEKELE, Maaza, Dr., Chief, Collaboration with the United Nations System, Nongovernmental and other Organizations (World Health Organization).

BERDOU, Viviana, Sra., segundo secretario, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra (Argentina).

BIHI, Fatuma I., H.E. Mrs., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Somalia in Geneva (Somalia).

BISKUP, Eckehard, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany in Geneva (Federal Republic of Germany).

BLEUX, F., M. (Belgique), Secrétaire général adjoint, Confédération mondiale du Travail.

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

BONDEV, Evlogui, Mr., Principal Officer, External Relations, UNDP European Office (United Nations Development Programme).

BORCHERT, Hans-Joachim, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic in Geneva (German Democratic Republic).

BRILLINGER, Ray H., Mr. (Canada), Director, Industrial Relations, Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

BRINKMANN, Gisbert, Mr., Deputy Head of Division, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Federal Republic of Germany).

BRUGGEMANN, Ingar, Mrs., Director, Programme for External Coordination (World Health Organization).

BURWIN, Nasser, Mr., Head, Foreign Relations and Technical Co-operation Division, Secretariat of Public Service (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

CANO, Juan Manuel, Sr., tercer secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra (Colombia).

CARON, Lucille, Mrs., Executive Director, Bureau of International Affairs, Ministry of Labour, Representative of the Government of Canada on the Governing Body (Canada).
GCT  CARTIER, Jean-Louis, M., sous-directeur, chef de la Division des Relations internationales, ministère des Affaires sociales et de l'Emploi (France).

GAS  CASTELLON DUARTE, Mario, Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente de Nicaragua en Ginebra (Nicaragua).

GNM  CAUSERO, Diego, Mgr., Conseiller, Mission permanente du Saint-Siège, Genève (Saint-Siège).

G  CHARRY SAMPER, Héctor, S.E. Sr., Embajador, representante permanente de Colombia en Ginebra; representante del Gobierno de Colombia ante el Consejo de Administración (Colombia).

TA  CHIROMA, Ali, Mr. (Nigeria), President, Nigeria Labour Congress.

G  CHOTARD, Yvon, M., Président de Groupe au Conseil économique et social; représentant du gouvernement de la France au Conseil d'administration (France).

GCT  CHUBURU, Daniel, Sr., Segundo Secretario de Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra (Argentina).

GACT  CLAUWAERT, Jenny, Srta., segundo secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra (Venezuela).


GCT  COOPER, A., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva (United Kingdom).

T  CREAN, Simon, Mr. (Australia), President, Australian Council of Trade Unions.

GNM  DAHL, Linn, Mrs., Senior Executive Officer, Ministry of Local Government and Labour (Norway).

GAS  DANIELSSON, Lars, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Sweden in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Sweden on the Governing Body (Sweden).

G  DARBY, Abdelhafid, Mr., Technical Adviser, General People's Committee of Public Service (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).


GCT  DE JONG, Bill, Mr., Principal Adviser, International and Policy Co-ordination Branch, Legislation and Review Division, Department of Industrial Relations (Australia).

EA  DECOSTERD, R., M. (Suisse), Conseiller en affaires sociales de Nestlé SA.
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GAS DEMIRALP, Oguz, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Turkey in Geneva (Turkey).

T DIOP, M., Mr., secrétaire général, Confédération nationale des travailleur du Sénégal.

OI DJERMAKOVE, A., Mrs., External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs Officer (United Nations).

OI DUFOUR, C., Mr., Attaché, member of the Delegation in Geneva (Commission of the European Communities).

GS DUPONT, G., Sr., Ministro Plenipotenciario, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra (Argentina).

GS DUQUE, Kylia de, Sra., consejero, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra (Colombia).

TA EID, H.M., Mr. (Egypt), Secretary of International Relations, Egyptian Trade Union Federation.

GNM EKRA KOUASSI, Florent, M., conseiller, mission permanente à Genève (Côte d'Ivoire).

OI EL HAJJE, Osman, M., attaché (affaires juridiques et sociales), délégation permanente à Genève (Ligue des Etats arabes).

GNM EL-HENDAWI, Soliman, Mr., Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva (Egypt).

OI EL-TELAWI, Adnan Khalil, M., chef, délégation permanente à Genève (Organisation arabe du travail).

GNM ELARABY, Nabil, H.E., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva (Egypt).

GA ELMIGER, Jean-Jacques, M., chef du Service des affaires internationales, Office fédéral de l'industrie, des arts et métiers et du travail (OFIAMT); représentant du gouvernement de la Suisse au Conseil d'administration (Suisse).

E ESCOBAR PADRON, Jairo, Sr. (Colombia), vicepresidente (Asuntos Sociales y Laborales), Asociación Nacional de Industriales.

GA ETTARP, Lars, Mr., Assistant Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Sweden on the Governing Body (Sweden).

GAS EYAMBE, William, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Cameroun à Genève (Cameroun).

G FALCHI, Giovanni, S.E.M., Ambassadeur; représentant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration (Italie).

TA FANG, Jiade, Mr. (China), Secretary, All-China Federation of Trade Unions.

OI FARAG, Aziz, Mr., Senior Counsellor (Labour Affairs), Permanent Delegation in Geneva (Organisation of African Unity).
ONG FAUCHERE, Béatrice, Mme, bureau de Genève (Confédération mondiale du travail).

GS FIORE, Nicola, M., chef adjoint du Cabinet, ministère du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration (Italie).

GS FOTHERINGHAM, R., Mr., Assistant Secretary, International and Policy Co-ordination Branch, Legislation and Review Division, Department of Industrial Relations (Australia).

G GALER, Julio A., Sr., Subsecretario de Trabajo y Seguridad Social, Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social; representante del Gobierno de la República Argentina ante el Consejo de Administración (Argentina).

EA GAZARIN, A., Mr. (Egypt), President, Federation of Egyptian Industries.

GA GAZI, M.S.A., Mr., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Manpower (Bangladesh).

E GEORGET, Henri, M. (Niger), entrepreneur.

ONG GEORGET, Henri, M., Président (Confédération Panafricaine des Employeurs).

GNM GETACHEW, G.M., Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia in Geneva (Ethiopia).

GACT CHARA GOUZLOO, Hassan, Mr., Adviser (Islamic Republic of Iran).

ES GLADE, Brian J., Mr., Director, International Labor Affairs, United States Council for International Business; personal substitute for Mr. Katz.

GCT GOMES PIRAS, J.A., Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente del Brasil en Ginebra (Brasil).

GS GUERBOV, U.M., M., expert au ministère des Affaires étrangères de l'URSS (URSS).

EA GURDIAN, Ramiro, Sr. (Nicaragua), Vice-Presidente, Consejo Superior Empresa privada de Nicaragua; Presidente, Unión de Productores Agropecuarios de Nicaragua.

OI HABENICHT, H., Mr., Director, Department of Planning, Liaison and Research (Intergovernmental Committee for Migration).

GNM HAGEN, Kees, Mr., Deputy Chief, International Social Affairs Division, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (Netherlands).

EA HAK, Cornelie, Miss (Netherlands), Chief, International Social Affairs Division, Netherlands Council of Employers' Federations.

GA HAKKOU, Mahmoud, M., chef de la Division du travail, ministère de l'emploi; représentant du gouvernement du Maroc au Conseil d'Administration (Maroc).
HALFAOUI, Mustafa, M., deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente du Royaume du Maroc à Genève; représentant suppléant du gouvernement du Maroc au Conseil d'Administration (Maroc).

HAMADAH, Rimah, Mlle, premier secrétaire, délégation permanente à Genève (Ligue des États arabes).

HAMERNIK, Emilian, M., chef du Département pour les relations avec les Nations Unies (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

HAMMOND, Thomas C., Mr., Minister, Deputy Permanent Representative of Canada in Geneva (Canada).

HAMZAOUI, Abdelaziz, S.E., M., Ambassadeur, représentant permanent de la Mission permanente de la Tunisie à Genève (Tunisie).

HANBERRY, Bertie, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of Ireland in Geneva (Ireland).

HARALAMPIEV, Raytcho, M., ministre plénipotentiaire, Mission permanente de la Bulgarie à Genève (Bulgarie).


HAYASHIBARA, Michiko, Mrs.; accompanying Mr. Maruyama.

HEREDIA PEREZ, Julio, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Cuba en Ginebra (Cuba).

HERNANDEZ, Ana Esther, Sra., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra (Venezuela).

HERTEL, Lothar, Mr., Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic in Geneva; substitute representative of the German Democratic Republic on the Governing Body (German Democratic Republic).

HEWITT, G.W., Mr., Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva (United Kingdom).

HILBURN, Paul, Mr., Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva (United States).

HOLTEN von, Johan, Mr. (Sweden), Director, Swedish Employers' Confederation.

HOSSAIN, Motahar, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh In Geneva (Bangladesh).

HOUSTOUN, Marion F., Ms., Director, Office of International Organizations, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor; substitute representative of the Government of the United States on the Governing Body (United States).

HYNES, Ross, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Canada in Geneva (Canada).

ILISASTEGUI, Héctor, Sr., segundo secretario, Misión Permanente de Cuba en Ginebra (Cuba).
GS JAYASINGHE, C.R. Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka in Geneva (Sri Lanka).

GS JOUKOV, A.D., M., ministre plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent adjoint de l'URSS à Genève (URSS).

GACT KAAHWIA, Ivan M.R., Mr., Principal Labour Officer, International Labour Affairs, Ministry of Labour (Uganda).

GACT KALELI, B., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Turkey in Geneva (Turkey).

GNM KAMIL, Wafik Zaher, Mr., Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva (Egypt).

ONG KAPARTIS, Costas, Mr., Deputy Secretary-General (International Organisation of Employers).

GCT KASHINO, Hiroshi, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva (Japan).

E KATZ, A., Mr. (United States), President, United States Council for International Business.

GNM KHAN, M.A., Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan in Geneva (Pakistan).

GS KIRUBANATHAN, J.D., Mr., Counsellor (Labour Affairs), Permanent Mission of Malaysia in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Malaysia on the Governing Body (Malaysia).


GCT KITANI, Masato Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva (Japan).


G KOUKIADIS, Jean, M., professeur à la Faculté de droit à l'Université de Salonique; représentant du gouvernement de la Grèce au Conseil d'administration (Grèce).

GS KOUNINIOITIS, Nicolas, M., premier conseiller, représentant permanent adjoint de la Grèce à Genève; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la Grèce au Conseil d'administration (Grèce).

GCT KRASILNIKOV, S., M., attaché, Mission permanente de l'URSS à Genève (URSS).

OI KRONENBERG, Roger P., Mr., Geneva Office (International Monetary Fund).

GCT KRUGLAK, Gregory, Mr., Manpower Development Adviser, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor (United States).

GA LABAT, José Pedro, Sr., Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social (Uruguay).
ONG LABRUNE, Lucien, M., représentant permanent à Genève (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

EA LACASA ASO, José María, Sr. (España), Director del Departamento de Relaciones Internacionales, Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales (CEOE).

GCT LADSOUS, Hervé, M., conseiller des Affaires étrangères, deuxième conseiller, Mission permanente de la France à Genève (France).

ES LAFONT, Thierry, M., adjoint au directeur des questions sociales internationales au CNPF; suppléant personnel de M. Oechslin.

ONG LAGASSE, R., Mr., Secretary-General (International Organisation of Employers).

ONG LAURIJSSEN, E., Mr., Assistant Director, Geneva Office (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions).

G LAWSON, Eugene K., Mr., Department of Labor; representative of the Government of the United States on the Governing Body (United States).

GCT LEBANG, Thembo, Mr., Deputy Commissioner of Labour and Social Security (Botswana).

G LECHUGA HEVIA, Carlos, Sr., Embajador; representante permanente en Ginebra (23.6.88) (Cuba).

GA LEORO, Galo, Sr., Embajador, representante permanente del Ecuador en Ginebra (Ecuador).

GCT LEYVA CRAIB, Albio, Sr., Director, Dirección de Relaciones Internacionales Comité Estatal de Trabajo y Seguridad Social (23.6.88) (Cuba).

G LI, Boyong, Mr., Vice-Minister of Labour; Government Representative, Governing Body of the ILO (23.6.88) (China).

TACT LIANG, Renyan, Mr., Deputy Division Chief, International Liaison Department ACFTU; accompanying Mr. Fang Jiade.

GNM LILLIS, Michael, H.E. Mr., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Ireland in Geneva (Ireland).

E LINDNER, Wolf Dieter, Mr. (Federal Republic of Germany), International Social Policy Branch, Confederation of German Employers' Associations.

GCT LIU, Jingchang, Mr., Deputy Division Chief, Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Personnel (China).

EA LOUNIS KHODJA, M.A., M. (Algérie), directeur général de la SOELK.

GCT LUKINDO, Julian, Mr., Ministry of Labour and Manpower Development (United Republic of Tanzania).

GCT LUNA, Luis Alberto, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra (Colombia).

GNM LYNAM, Carmen, Sra., consejero, Misión Permanente de Chile en Ginebra (Chile).
TA MABUMO, E.N., Mr. (Mozambique), Organizaao dos Trabalhadores de Mocambique (OTM).

E MACKIE, Anne M., Miss (United Kingdom), OBE, Employee Relations Adviser, National Personnel Department, Unilever.

TA MAIER, H., Mr. (Austria), Adviser, Austrian Confederation of Trade Unions.

G MALHOTRA, Ajai, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva (India).

GCT MANN, S., Miss, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva (United Kingdom).

GNM MARTINEK, Oswin, Mr., Director-General of Social Policy and Labour Law Department, Federal Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs (Austria).

G MARTINEZ BRITO, Héctor, Sr., Vicepresidente, Comité Estatal del Trabajo y Seguridad Social (26-27.5.88) (Cuba).

T MARUYAMA, Yasuo, Mr. (Japan), Vice-President, General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (Sohyo).

OI MEHDI, Hayat, Mr., Director, Liaison Office, Geneva (United Nations Industrial Development Organisation).

GNM MELAS, Heinz-Michael, Mr., Director, Federal Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs (Austria).

TA MENDOZA, D.T., Mr. (Philippines), President, Trade Union Congress of the Philippines.

G MENSAY, Nathanaël G., M., ministre du Travail et des Affaires sociales; représentant gouvernemental au Conseil d'administration du BIT (Bénin).

T MERCIER, Richard, Mr. (Canada), Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Labour Congress.

ONG MITIAIEV, Ivan I., M., représentant permanent à Genève (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

GCT MOGLIA, A. Sra., segundo secretario, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra (Argentina).

GNM MOKADDEM, Youssef, M., représentant permanent adjoint de la Mission permanente de la Tunisie à Genève (Tunisie).

GNM MONTEMAYOR CANTU, Vicente, Sr., Ministro, Mision Permanente de México en Ginebra (México).

EA MOPHETHE, M.L., Mr., Acting Principal Secretary, Ministry of Employment, Social Welfare and Pensions (Lesotho).

T MORTON, John, Mr. (United Kingdom), General Secretary, Musicians' Union.

EA MOUKOKO KINGUE, F., M. (Cameroun), président de l'Union des syndicats professionnels du Cameroun.
GS MTANGO, E.E.E., Mr., Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the United Republic of Tanzania in Geneva (United Republic of Tanzania).

T MUHR, Gerd, Mr. (Federal Republic of Germany), Vice-President, German Confederation of Trade Unions (DGB); Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body.

T MUKHERJEE, Ananda Gopal, MP, Mr. (India), Chairman, INTUC Parliamentary Wing, Deputy President, Indian National Metal Workers' Federation.

G NAHIMANA, Balthazar, M., Ambassadeur, extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent à Genève (Burundi).

GS NAKAMURA, Mitsuhiro, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body (Japan).

G NAKAMURA, Tadashi, Mr., Assistant Minister for International Labour Affairs, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body (Japan).

EA NAMATA, J.A., Mr. (United Republic of Tanzania), Executive Director, Association of Tanzania Employers.

E NASR, M., Mr. (Lebanon), Association of Lebanese Industrialists.

GACT NDIWANE MUSHILI, Samuel, M., Secrétaire général, ministère du Travail (Cameroun).

GNM NETO, Liliana, Mme, troisième secrétaire, ministère des Affaires étrangères (Portugal).

GA NGOUBEYOU, François-Xavier, S.E.M., Ambassadeur, représentant permanent du Cameroun à Genève (Cameroun).

G NIK MOHAMED AMIN, Mr., Secretary-General, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Malaysia on the Governing Body (Malaysia).

GA NOACK, Ingolf, Mr., Deputy Secretary of State for Labour and Wages; representative of the Government of the German Democratic Republic on the Governing Body (German Democratic Republic).

GCT NOCITO, Alfio, M., attaché, Mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève (Italie).

GNM NOVELO von GLUMER, Gastón, Sr., Asesor en asuntos internacionales, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social (México).

E OECHSLIN, Jean-Jacques, M. (France), directeur des questions sociales internationales, Conseil national du patronat français; Vice-président du Conseil d'administration.

EA OKOGWU, Gabriel Chike, Mr. (Nigeria), Executive Director, Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association.
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OL OPELZ, Merle S., Ms., Head, IAEA Office in Geneva (International Atomic Energy Agency).

OL OREIBI, Misbah, M., observateur permanent adjoint, délégation permanente à Genève (Ligue des Etats arabes).

OL ORNATSKI, I., Mr., Deputy Executive Secretary, ECE (United Nations).

GAS PACHECO-EGEA, Susana, Sra., consejero, Misión Permanente del Uruguay en Ginebra (Uruguay).

GNM PALACIOS, J., Sr., Consejero de Embajada, Misión Permanente de España en Ginebra (España).

GA PAYAKANITI, Supratra, Mrs., Director, International Labour Affairs Division, Department of Labour, Ministry of the Interior (Thailand).

GS PECLY MOREIRA, Walter, Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente del Brasil en Ginebra (Brasil).

GAS PEKIN, Hüseyin, Mr., Counsellor (Labour Affairs), Permanent Mission of Turkey in Geneva (Turkey).

OL PEREZ-ARGUELLO, Guillermo, Mr., External Relations Officer, UNDP European Office (United Nations Development Programme).

GA PESHKOV, V.I., Mr., Permanent Representative of the Byelorussian SSR in Geneva (Byelorussian SSR).

TCT POTAPOV, A.M., M., chef de service au Département des relations internationales, Conseil central des syndicats de l'URSS, accompagnant M. Yanaev.

G POULTER, Douglas G., Mr., Minister (Special Labour Adviser), Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva; representative of the Government of Australia on the Governing Body (Australia).

OL PREMONT, Daniel, Mr., Human Rights Consultant, Centre for Human Rights (United Nations).

GCT PRIGIONI, Giulio, M., conseiller, Mission permanente d'Italie à Genève (Italie).

OL PURCELL, A., Mr., Economist, Geneva Office (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations).

G QIAN Jiadong, H.E. Mr., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China in Geneva.


OL RAFFRAY, A., Mr., Head, Liaison Office in Geneva (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation).

GS RAMOND, Maurice, M., inspecteur général des Affaires sociales; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la France au Conseil d'administration (France).
OI REGE, M., Mr., Inter-Agency Co-ordination Officer (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

E REGIL GOMEZ de, J., Mr. (Mexico).

ONG RETUREAU, Daniel, M., conseiller (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

GCT RICHARDSON, Joseph P., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva (United States).

GAS RIVADENEIRA, Rubén, Sr., Ministro, Misión Permanente del Ecuador en Ginebra (Ecuador).

ONG ROBEL, Blaise, M., représentant permanent (Confédération mondiale du travail).

G ROBINSON, W.R.B., Mr., Under-Secretary, Head of Overseas Division, Department of Employment, representative of the Government of the United Kingdom on the Governing Body (United Kingdom).

GCT ROBSON, C, Miss, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva (United Kingdom).

ES RODIE, Raymond Y., M., représentant de la Confédération générale des petites et moyennes entreprises; suppléant personnel de M. Oechslin.

GAS ROJAS, Oscar de, S.E. Embajador; representante permanente adjunto de Venezuela en Ginebra (Venezuela).

GCT ROTUNDO, Giuseppe, M., Mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève (Italie).

EA ROWE, J.M., Mr. (New Zealand), Director-General, New Zealand Employers' Federation.

G RUSSOMANO, Mozart Victor, Sr., profesor, representante del Gobierno del Brasil ante el Consejo de Administración; Presidente del Consejo de Administración (Brasil).

ONG RYS, Vladimir, M., secrétaire général (Association internationale de la sécurité sociale).

GNM SAAVEDRA, Mirta, Sra., Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente de Panamá en Ginebra (Panama).

E SAID, Najib, M. (Tunisie), conseiller juridique, directeur, UTICA.

GACT SALVADOR, Iñigo, Sr., Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente del Ecuador (Ecuador).

T SANCHEZ MADARIAGA, Alfonso, Sr. (México), Secretario de Relaciones Internacionales, Confederación de Trabajadores de México.

EA SASSO-MAZZUFFERI, Lucia, Mme (Italie), chef du bureau international, Direction centrale pour les rapports syndicaux, CONFINDEUSTRIA.

GAS SHILOVICH, S.N., Mr., First Secretary, Department of International Economic Organisations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Byelorussian SSR).

GNM SHOOGUFAN, A.M., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Afghanistan (Afghanistan).
GA  SIDIBE, Mansa Moussa, M., Directeur général adjoint du travail, ministère chargé des questions du travail (Guinée).

GNM  SIIKI, Pertti, Mr., Government Secretary, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (Finland).

G  SIKTANC, Josef, Mr., Director of Department, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Czechoslovakia).

GCT  SIRETT, R.G., Mr., Principal, Overseas Division, Department of Employment (United Kingdom).

GCT  SIZOV, A.P., M., économiste, Comité d'Etat de l'URSS du travail et des questions sociales (URSS).

GCT  SMITH, Mike, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva (Australia).

GNM  SOENEN, Julien, M., directeur d'administration, Relations internationales, ministère de l'Emploi et du Travail (Belgique).

TCT  SOMOGYI, Paul, Mr., Assistant Director, Department of International Affairs AFL-CIO.; accompanying Mr. Baker.

GCT  STAUNER, Gabriele, Mrs., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany in Geneva (Federal Republic of Germany).

GNM  STAUR, Carsten, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Denmark in Geneva (Denmark).

G  STENNEK, Zvonimir, Mr., Member of the Executive Council of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina; representative of the Government of Yugoslavia on the Governing Body (Yugoslavia).

GCT  STRATAKIS, Emmanuel, M., attaché (Travail), Ambassade de la Grèce à Berne (Grèce).

GNM  STUB, Sverre, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Norway in Geneva (Norway).

TA  SUDONO, A., Mr. (Indonesia), Member of Parliament; President, Indonesian Workers' Co-operative Alliance (INKOPKAR); President, Automotive, Machine and Workshop Workers' Union (SBAMP).

GS  SUGAMA, Tadao, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body (Japan).

E  SUMBWE, F.C., Mr. (Zambia)

ONG  SUNMONO, Hassan A., Mr., Secretary-General (Organisation of African Trade Union Unity).

ES  SUZUKI, Toshio, Mr., Director, International Division, Japan Federation of Employers' Associations; personal substitute for Mr. Tsujino.

T  SVENNINGSEN, John, Mr. (Denmark), International Adviser, Danish Federation of Trade Unions.
GNM  SZEKERES, Márton, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Hungary in 
       Geneva (Hungary).

E  TATA, Naval, Mr. (India), Deputy Chairman, Tata Industries Ltd.

GCT  TATE, Paul-Louis, M., conseiller des affaires étrangères, Direction des 
       Nations Unies et des organisations internationales, ministère des 
       Affaires étrangères (France).

GA  TAYLHARDAT, Adolfo R., S.E. Sr., Embajador; representante permanente de 
       Venezuela en Ginebra (Venezuela).

GNM  TENKORANG, K.A., Mr. First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ghana in 
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