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MINUTES OF THE 255TH SESSION

The 255th Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva from Monday, 1 March at 3 p.m. to Thursday, 4 March 1993, under the chairmanship of Mr. VARGAS CAMPOS (Mexico).

The list of persons who attended the session of the Governing Body is appended.
FIRST SITTING
(Monday, 1 March 1993, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.05 p.m. with Mr. Vargas Campos in the Chair.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

In opening the session, the Chairman welcomed those present and thanked everyone in advance for their contribution towards the smooth running of the session. In this connection, he drew attention to the tentative order of business (document GB.255/TOB), which had been drawn up with the help of the secretariat and in consultation with the Employers' and Workers' groups and the regional coordinators of the Government group.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE GOVERNMENT GROUP

Mr. Rhenan Segura (Government, Costa Rica), speaking as Chairman of the Government group, informed the Governing Body that, following the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic on 31 December 1992, the Government deputy member seat to which that State had been elected had become vacant. The Czech Republic, which had become a Member of the ILO on 5 February 1993, had requested, with the support of the Slovak Republic — which had also become a Member of the ILO as from 22 January 1993 — and the subregional group concerned, to be appointed in replacement of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic to the vacancy thus created. Bearing in mind the specific circumstances of this case, the Government group considered it appropriate to give effect to this request, proceeding by analogy with the provisions applicable to the replacement of titular members, and had appointed the Czech Republic to replace the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic as a deputy member of the Governing Body until the renewal of the membership of the Governing Body at the next session of the Conference. He requested the Governing Body to take note of this appointment and to notify the International Labour Conference accordingly.

The Governing Body took note of the appointment by the Government group of the Czech Republic as a Government deputy member of the Governing Body.

FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Approval of the minutes of the 254th Session

Subject to the corrections received, the Governing Body approved the minutes of its 254th Session.
FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Fifteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians

(Geneva, 19–28 January 1993)

Mr. Noakes (Government, Australia) believed that the Conference had been useful and had produced positive results. It had adopted three resolutions, of which he welcomed in particular the one on statistics of strikes, lockouts and other action due to labour disputes. The extension of that resolution to encompass all forms of action taken during labour disputes rather than merely strikes and lockouts should result in a better appreciation of the effects of labour disputes and of the need for procedures to be adopted to deal with, prevent and resolve such disputes.

The second resolution concerned statistics of employment in the informal sector. It would encourage the collection of important information and would result in a greater degree of recognition of that sector. The speaker recalled that this was the first completely new topic discussed by the Conference of Labour Statisticians since 1949.

The Conference had had difficulty in reaching a definitive position or the third resolution concerning the revision of the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE). The difficulty essentially concerned the treatment of members of producers' cooperatives. Consequently, the preamble to the resolution indicated certain doubts about the classifications adopted, and it suggested that further thought should be given to the conceptual basis of the ICSE. The speaker considered this somewhat unfortunate and hoped that the Office would wait to see whether any operational difficulties developed in relation to the classifications before devoting extensive resources to further technical studies in that area. With this reservation he welcomed the conclusions and resolutions of the Conference.

Mr. Tapiola (Worker, Finland), speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, agreed that it had been a useful Conference and supported the recommendation in paragraph 6 of the Office paper. He recalled that at the Conference the Worker participants had proposed that the first resolution cover also statistics on methods of settlement of strikes. Although this proposal had been supported by the Employer participants, the Conference had not accepted it. The Workers regretted this decision because they felt that the settlement of strikes should have been included as a core question. They hoped that the next Conference, in five years' time, would take up this question.

The Workers shared the concern expressed by the previous speaker with regard to the third resolution and regretted its interim nature. The classifications, as outlined in the resolution, were acceptable to the Workers.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) regretted that, during the discussion of the Programme and Budget proposals for 1994–95 in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, the very tight time-schedule had prevented her Government from expressing its appreciation of the ILO's work on statistics. It recognized the International Conference of Labour Statisticians as the lead body in determining the framework of labour statistics throughout the world. Its constituent working groups provided a sound professional forum to the discussion of labour statistics. The labour statisticians of the United Kingdom were pleased to contribute to the Conference.
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The Government of the United Kingdom considered that the Conference had been well organized and had been instructive and beneficial. It had been attended by some 215 participants from 76 member States, including governmental, employer and worker experts and representatives of a dozen or more international economic and statistical organizations. The statisticians from the United Kingdom found the opportunity to meet such a variety of people extremely stimulating and useful. The Government of the United Kingdom would examine the resolutions in a positive way and was awaiting with great interest the preparation and publication of the relevant manuals.

Mr. Maassen (Government, Germany) welcomed the results of the Fifteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians, which provided the Bureau of Statistics with a comprehensive programme. He encouraged the Office to give particular attention to questions relating to employment and unemployment statistics. He stated the willingness of the Government of Germany to share its experience in developing a well-structured set of statistics at the next Conference.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 6 of the Office paper.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

OBITUARY

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) paid tribute to two recently deceased prominent members of the Employers' group. Mr. Chanaiwa had been present at the last session of the Governing Body but his health had already then given rise to concern. Although his death was not entirely unexpected, it was very much regretted by the Employers' group. Mr. Chanaiwa had been still quite young. After a brilliant academic career, he had become, for a short period, an official of the new, independent Government of Zimbabwe and later the Director of the Employers' Confederation of Zimbabwe. It was in this capacity that he had participated at several sessions of the Governing Body, where he had been remarked for his strong convictions, in particular in the Committee on Discrimination. Mr. Chanaiwa had made a historical contribution to the cause of the African employers through the role which he had played in conjunction with Zimbabwe's big neighbour, South Africa. As the situation in that country had opened up the hope that the discriminatory regime would be abolished, Mr. Chanaiwa had pursued the objective of creating a multi-racial employers' organization in South Africa. The speaker recalled his own participation, together with Mr. Chanaiwa and other Employer members of the Governing Body, in the seminar that had been held in Harare, Zimbabwe, in January 1992 with a view to laying down the first foundations of such an organization in collaboration with the representatives of various employers' organizations of South Africa. This idea had advanced in the meantime, and the employers of South Africa, of all races, were in the process of creating an organization which corresponded to the ideals of Mr. Chanaiwa. Although he had not lived to see the result of his work, those who worked in that field recognized how much his gift in the art of persuasion, his natural generosity and his deep knowledge of social questions, contributed to the creation of

1 See also second, sixth (private), seventh and eighth sittings.
that organization, which would enable the establishment of tripartite relations in that part of the world. This last activity of Mr. Chanaïwa would not be forgotten either by the South Africans of all races or by those who had had the honour to contribute to this work.

Mr. Williams, another African Employer, had been a lawyer and the Director of the Ghana Employers' Association. It was in this capacity that he had participated at several sessions of the Governing Body, where he was much appreciated. The Employer members of the Governing Body were sad to note his death before he had had the time to complete his task.

The speaker also took the opportunity to announce the death of Mr. Mitsos, Honorary President of the Federation of Greek Industries, who had served during a long period as the Employers' delegate to the International Labour Conference and who had had many friends among the Employers.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) extended the condolences of the Workers to the Employers' group. It was always a tremendous loss when two or three very capable members of a group, who had made a very significant contribution over the past years, passed away at the same time. The Workers' group had greatly appreciated working together with them and joined in expressing condolences to the families and friends of the deceased and to the employers' organizations concerned.

The Governing Body observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Chanaïwa and Mr. Williams.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 8 of the report.

II. COMPOSITION OF THE ORGANIZATION

III. COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

The Clerk of the Governing Body, recalling the decision taken by the Government group to appoint the Czech Republic to replace the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic as a Government deputy member of the Governing Body, announced that Mr. Miroslav Fuchs, Deputy Director of the International Department of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic had been appointed by the Government of the Czech Republic as its titular representative on the Governing Body.

The Chairman noted from the report that Mr. Cesar Mayoral of Argentina and Mr. G. Brehoi of Romania had recently been appointed as their Governments' titular representative on the Governing Body and congratulated them, along with Mr. Fuchs, on their appointment.

IV. PROGRESS OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR LEGISLATION

The Clerk of the Governing Body indicated that the reference in paragraph 16 of the report to the authorization of the ratification of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), by Guatemala should be deleted in view of the fact that the ratification procedure had not yet been fully formalized.
Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) expressed the satisfaction of the Workers concerning the ratifications that had been announced. She was particularly pleased that Turkey would be ratifying several Conventions, especially the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948 (No. 87), since a number of cases concerning Turkey had been before the Committee on Freedom of Association in recent years. She was convinced that the pressure exerted on Turkey by the ILO had contributed to this development, and hoped that Turkey would live up to its commitments and would apply the standards it ratified.

1. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE SOCIAL SECURITY OF RHINE BOATMEN (Revised)

VI. PUBLICATIONS AND DOCUMENTS

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

First Supplementary Report

World Summit for Social Development

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) found the Office paper very useful. The Governing Body needed to give some thought to a number of issues relating to the World Summit. The first concerned the relationship between the ILO and the United Nations, and more specifically the role of the ILO in this initiative which emanated from the United Nations. The second concern, which was internal to the ILO, related to defining the ILO's message at the World Summit for Social Development. The third concerned the necessary practical arrangements.

He observed that the objectives set for the World Summit were almost identical to those which the ILO had set for its own activities in the fields of social integration, the alleviation of poverty and employment creation. The ILO should therefore obviously play a central role in that event. Unfortunately the ILO was only listed as one of nine organizations which were being asked to make a contribution. Paragraph 9 of the Office paper stated that, while the resolution adopted by the General Assembly did not explicitly call upon the ILO to play a "central role" in the preparation of the Summit, it did, in fact, give the ILO the opportunity to play such a role. The Employers were, however, not reassured by this statement. It was still apparent that the United Nations was reluctant to recognize the central role of the ILO in this field. The Employers therefore fully agreed with the statement that whether the ILO could play such a role would depend on the quality of its contribution and on the effectiveness of its relations with the United Nations. In the speaker's view, this was the most fundamental aspect of the question.

Since the World Summit for Social Development was likely to be an essentially intergovernmental event, the ILO had to convince governments of the quality of its work. The Employers were in favour of ILO collaboration...

---

1 See also eighth sitting.
with the United Nations in this exercise, and urged that a date be found which would not coincide with the International Labour Conference, as that would virtually amount to provocation. The quality of the ILO's contribution would greatly depend on its tripartite nature, and it would be desirable for there to be a tripartite presentation of the ILO's views at the World Summit. This could take the form of statements by representatives coming from all three groups of the Governing Body who would present a tripartite message. This message might not be as homogeneous as one prepared only by the Office, but it would reflect the thinking of the Government, Employers' and Workers' groups. It was essential to ensure the relevance of this message in addressing the social problems which arose in the world today, or were likely to arise in the future. The speaker felt that the three points listed in paragraph 5 of the Office paper summed up adequately the problems which were faced by most countries. He expressed satisfaction at the Office's decision to entrust this delicate task of coordinating the ILO preparations for this Summit to Mr. J.P. Martin, in particular in view of the interdepartmental nature of the desired contribution.

At this point, however, the Governing Body was chiefly concerned with its own input. While the Conference would be called to take a position, the main task of elaborating the ILO's contribution to the World Summit fell upon the Governing Body. The Office paper indicated rightly that the Committee on Employment and the International Organizations Committee were the bodies most directly involved. This did not, however, preclude other committees, such as the Committee on Discrimination, from making their contribution. The alleviation and reduction of poverty necessitated operational activities besides standards and principles. The two above-mentioned Committees should, of course, play the leading role in cooperation with each other and without any rivalry. The speaker was not convinced of the need to set up a new working party. The Officers of those two Committees could be convened even when the Committees were not meeting, and hold informal contacts with other in order to enable the Governing Body to monitor the preparations for the World Summit in the least bureaucratic manner. The speaker recalled that very little time was left and the various committees should therefore engage themselves immediately in defining the ILO's contribution to the World Summit for Social Development. If the ILO and the social partners were not actively present at the World Summit, it would risk becoming a purely rhetorical exercise on social problems and this would undermine the credibility of the UN system. The Employers, for their part, were ready to play their role in these preparations.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) expressed concern that the United Nations had not given higher priority to cooperation with the ILO in preparing the World Summit. There could be no successful World Summit for Social Development without the presence of workers, employers and governments. Consequently, the ILO, with its tripartite structure, should insist on receiving greater recognition. The Workers' group attached the greatest importance to the World Summit and considered that the ILO and its constituents should play a central role in it. It noted the action taken by the Director-General in bringing the concerns expressed by the Governing Body in November 1992 to the attention of the Secretary-General, but was concerned however, about the extent of the ILO's contribution to the World Summit and could not accept the marginalization of the Organization in respect of the Summit any more than within the United Nations system. She urged the Director-General to insist energetically on the legitimate role of the ILO and asked the governments who were represented on the Governing Body to ensure that their representatives in New York and elsewhere supported the position of the ILO.
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She suggested that, in order to optimize the ILO input to the Summit and in view of the fact that the subject cut across the competence of several committees, the Governing Body should set up a small working party, as proposed in paragraph 14 of the Office paper, whose membership should be limited to three per group.

As regards the content of the ILO's contribution, all three core issues identified by the General Assembly were interrelated and fell within the competence of the ILO. It was therefore vital that the views of the ILO be heard clearly and that the message it conveyed was a distinctive and clear statement of the principles fostered by the ILO. The ILO should not adhere to the values promoted by the IMF and the World Bank, which tended to consider ILO standards rather as obstacles to development. The Workers' group attached importance to addressing at the World Summit the overall need for relaunching the world economy and the social aspects of structural adjustment. There was also an obvious need to address the question of women and the rural poor, as well as the question of child labour, within the framework of the Summit's core objectives. While it was appropriate that employment be a major issue at the Summit, the ILO should ensure that the discussion would also include the protection of workers and international labour standards.

The Workers' group was most concerned about the question of the representation of the ILO's tripartite constituency at the Summit because it considered the steps taken to promote tripartite representation in national delegations and the possible contribution of NGOs having consultative status with ECOSOC to be insufficient. While it was true that the Summit itself could not be a fully tripartite event, the ILO should urge the United Nations to strengthen considerably the mechanisms for tripartite participation at the Summit. If the Summit were to be allowed to become a purely intergovernmental event, it would represent a serious setback to the principle of tripartism as the basis of social policy-making and a blow to what the ILO stood for. The Workers' group trusted that its comments would be taken up both by the Director-General and also the small working party which it was proposed to set up to prepare the ILO contribution to the Summit.

As to the dates of the Summit, the Workers' group found it difficult to understand why the United Nations ignored the fact that, since its foundation, the International Labour Conference had always met in the month of June. This was a serious concern which needed to be addressed. The speaker concluded by expressing the hope that the ILO would have an important role to play and that its message would be heard at the Summit.

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) recalled that this was the second occasion on which this question was being discussed, and that decisions had to be taken on the basis of the proposals that were now before the Governing Body. He felt some apprehension in the light of the bad experience of the World Conference on Environment and Development, and hoped that that experience would not be repeated at the World Summit for Social Development. In his opinion, the ILO should avoid harbouring either a superiority complex or an inferiority complex in this respect. While it was true that the United Nations had not yet given sufficient recognition to the role of the ILO, it was a matter for concern that it had not replied to the question raised by the ILO concerning the dates of the World Summit, the ILO should not yield to an inferiority complex but should work actively to have its role duly acknowledged. On the other hand, notwithstanding its long history and unique tripartite structure, the ILO should avoid claiming exclusivity in dealing with the subjects proposed for the World Summit because they also concerned other organizations.
He drew attention to the fact that the ILO would celebrate its 75th anniversary in 1994, and that this event would provide it with an opportunity to have its work recognized in the member States. Should the ILO succeed in this respect, the United Nations would have to give it greater recognition, for it was too simple to claim recognition without making a sufficient effort to make the Organization recognized by others. He agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairman that the subjects treated by the Summit were important, but he disagreed with his suggestion that the Officers of the Committee on Employment and the International Organizations Committee be entrusted with the elaboration of the ILO's contribution. Rather, he favoured the idea of setting up a working group which should consist of six members.

Mr. Gopalan (Government, India) pointed out that equity and social justice had declined all over the world, in spite of economic growth. This fact alone called for an important ILO contribution to the World Summit. The ILO had no reason for displaying a self-deprecatory attitude, for its past performance had been quite commendable both in setting standards and in creating projects for employment generation. While raising the question as to whether the World Summit was worth all the efforts, he felt that the ILO should take this opportunity to help promote equity and social justice, and he congratulated the Director-General for the steps that had been taken.

As to the mechanism to be set up for the elaboration of the ILO contribution, he supported the suggestion of setting up a working party which would consist of five members from each group. The ILO officials servicing the relevant Governing Body committees could serve as the secretariat of the working group, which should meet at each Governing Body session, in order not to incur any additional expenditure.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) was grateful to the Director-General for having raised the question of the World Summit in his paper. At the 254th (November 1992) Session of the Governing Body the speaker had expressed some impatience because he believed that the ILO had, by reason of its unique tripartite structure, both a technical and a political competence in the field of social development and consequently he had wished to see the ILO play major role at the Summit. The fact that within the ILO the Workers and Employers were not merely observers, as was the case in other organizations, endowed the Workers with certain rights, which they were asserting. In the meantime, some progress had been made and the ILO had been invited to participate. He disagreed with the idea that the ILO still had to prove itself, and did not share the view of the representative of the Government of France that the ILO's 75th anniversary celebrations were necessary in order to obtain the desired recognition of the ILO's role. The competence of the ILO in this field was an established fact, and this was not merely a technical competence but was derived from its tripartite structure and the principles it represented. He pleaded for upholding the cause of the ILO, and suggested that the representative of the UN Secretary-General entrusted with preparing the Summit be invited to a session of the Governing Body or to a meeting of the proposed working party, if the United Nations was not ready to listen to the ILO otherwise.

He asked Mr. Chotard, as the representative of the Government of France to request his Government to support the cause of the ILO before the United Nations. He was convinced that the voice of the ILO would be heard if all the governments represented on the Governing Body adopted the same position. At the same time, he was aware that governments could always invoke financial difficulties as a pretext for not including Worker or Employer representative in their delegations to the Summit. It would, however, be particularly dangerous to allow the arguments of institutions such as the IMF or the World Bank to prevail. This would call into question the work that had been
undertaken by the ILO during many years in the field of social clauses and the application of standards, which were essential for social development.

Mr. Maassen (Government, Germany) stated the interest of the Government of Germany in involving the ILO actively in the preparations for the World Summit. The ILO could offer the benefit of its vast experience derived in particular from its tripartite structure. He agreed that the core issues selected for the World Summit were very close to the objectives of the ILO. In the opinion of his Government, high preference should be given to the question of employment policy in view of its important contribution to social development. Without such specific contributions the Summit could turn into a forum for recriminations or disputes. The ILO had the potential to make a contribution which would lead to real progress, the preparatory work for which should be entrusted to a tripartite working party. He felt that this working party should consist of at least nine members.

The Chairman recalled that a working party consisting of five members from each group, i.e. a total of 15 members, had been suggested to ensure equal representation of all regions.

Mr. Mayoral (Government, Argentina) supported the paper submitted by the Director-General, and was pleased with the prominence it gave to the International Organizations Committee. He believed that the ILO had a fundamental role to play in the World Summit, which consisted of creating international awareness of the need to balance economic efficiency and social justice. The history of the ILO made it particularly suitable for this role. He was pleased with the appointment of Mr. Martin to assume central responsibility in the Office for the ILO's participation in the preparatory work for the Summit and, in view of the interdepartmental nature of the subject, he suggested that officials from other departments could also be entrusted with this task. He requested the Director-General to insist on the participation of employers' and workers' organizations at the Summit. As to the composition of the working party, he agreed that it should consist of five members from each group.

Mr. Hashim (Government, Nigeria) thanked the Director-General for the information provided on the subject. He agreed that the Summit would provide the ILO with a major opportunity and challenge, including the opportunity to assert its principle of tripartism, despite the fact that the ILO was being laced on a lower pedestal. In this context he agreed with the representative of the Government of France on the need for the ILO to avoid both a superiority and an inferiority complex. The participation of the ILO in the preparatory processes was of particular importance, given the issues to be addressed by the Summit, such as the expansion of productive employment and the alleviation and reduction of poverty.

He supported the establishment of a working party, consisting of not more than five members of each group, which should consider the inputs made by the International Organizations Committee, the Committee on Employment and the committee on Discrimination. The working party should meet at every session of the Governing Body and should report to it regularly. While expressing a certain scepticism about the work of some task forces or working parties, he pointed out that some of them had come up with extremely useful reports, such as the Working Party on Improvements in the Functioning of the International Labour Conference which had since been entrusted with reviewing the functioning of the Governing Body.

Mrs. Cabrera (Government, Venezuela) remarked that the cooperation between the organizations of the UN system implied a strong ILO presence at the World Summit for Social Development, especially in view of the subjects
outlined in paragraph 5 of the Office paper, which fell clearly within the competence of the ILO. The question of social integration was a sine qua non of the ILO's activities in favour of the marginalized segments of the population, and the issue of poverty alleviation had been one of the fundamental elements of the Declaration of Philadelphia, of which the ILO would soon celebrate the 50th anniversary. Already at that time it had been recognized that poverty prevented the attainment of both social peace and social development. All items on the agenda of the Summit, including that on expansion of productive employment, fell within the competence of the ILO without being its exclusive property. This meant that the ILO had to ensure a tripartite presence at the World Summit, especially in view of the fact that the governments were not in a position to solve the social problems without the legitimate participation of the social partners. She requested both the Director-General and the UN Secretary-General to take the views expressed by the Governing Body into consideration. She supported the idea of setting up a working party consisting of five members from each group, and pleaded that the Summit be held during a month other than June.

Ms. Zhang (Government, China) noted and supported the action of the Director-General, which was based on a decision taken at the 254th (November 1992) Session of the Governing Body concerning the preparations for the World Summit. She called for close collaboration between the Director-General and the Secretary-General in preparing the World Summit, and requested that the Governing Body be kept abreast of all related developments.

With regard to setting up an appropriate mechanism for the elaboration of the ILO contribution, she supported the establishment of a working party with adequate geographical representation. In addition, the relevant Governing Body Committees should make a contribution within the framework of their respective competence. The International Organizations Committee should follow the preparatory activities of the United Nations, whereas the Committee on Employment should prepare studies and information documents, and should submit them to the Governing Body at the latest at its 260th (May–June 1994 Session. She concurred with the statement in paragraph 9 of the Office paper according to which the Summit presented the ILO with the challenge of producing contributions of the highest possible quality for consideration by the Summit and of ensuring that its views were effectively reflected in the preparatory work for the Summit, as well as the Summit itself. She truste that the quality of the focal points would enable the ILO to play a central role.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) acknowledged that, at the outset, the Government of the United Kingdom had not been enthusiastic about the idea of the Summit because there were too many international conferences which did not lead to concrete results. Now that the decision had been taken it was important to ensure that the preparatory work was carried out by existing structures without duplicating activities and without bypassing existing expertise.

The ILO was not the only agency having competence in the field of social development; other agencies had the potential of making important contributions as well. The insistence of the social partners on the primacy of the ILO was understandable because it was the only tripartite organization. However, the representative of the Government of France was right in pointing out that the question of leadership was not an essential one. The United Nations might have wanted to avoid appointing a lead agency precisely because it was seeking cooperation between the agencies on an equal footing.
In that context, the speaker expressed concern about the fact that most of the previous statements had concentrated on the importance of the ILO, on the question of its participation and on the status that the ILO might gain as a result of its participation, rather than on the purpose or outcome of the Summit and the contribution of the ILO. She felt that it was dangerous to take the quality of the ILO's contribution for granted.

With regard to the core issues chosen for the Summit, she gave particular importance to the question of expansion of productive employment. The Office had a number of important and useful ideas about that theme, such as the need for economic growth to go hand in hand and indeed, to some extent, precede employment growth, the need to help disadvantaged groups or the importance of training and social safety nets at a time of industrial restructuring.

As regards the mechanism for preparing the ILO's contribution to the Summit, she recalled that the committee structure of the Governing Body itself was currently under review, and that any changes made in that structure would have to be taken into account. She was ready to accept the setting up of a working party if it could be scheduled and financed without much difficulty, and noted that it would not be easy for the Government group to participate if the working party consisted of less than five members from each group. She concluded by asking the Governing Body to concentrate on the purpose of the Summit rather than on the status to be gained through participation in it.

Mr. Farid (Government, Bangladesh) endorsed the proposals outlined in the Office paper, and pointed to the relationship between the core themes of the Summit and the objectives that had been spelled out for the next biennium by the Director-General, namely the promotion of democracy, fighting poverty and the improvement of working conditions. He agreed that the working party to be set up should consist of five members of each group.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) noted the interest expressed by many speakers in establishing a working party consisting of five members from each group. He pointed out that the ILO had only four geographical regions and that the division into five regions was a particularity of the Government group. He expressed concern about the tendency of setting up a relatively large and formal body. His own proposal to work on the basis of existing committees was intended precisely to give an informal and cooperative character to the preparatory processes. He was somewhat preoccupied with setting up a quasi-permanent body at a time when the working party which had been set up to review the methods of work of the Governing Body was endeavouring to reduce the number of committees. More importantly, the Office paper lacked any precise definition of the working party's mandate. It was not sufficient to say that its purpose was to provide the Office with guidance in preparing its contribution to the Summit. It was also necessary to define what the working party should not do, for example, hold long discussions on poverty alleviation or employment promotion. The working party should also coordinate the work of the committees involved in the preparations for the Summit because these committees would continue preparing their input within the framework of their own competence. It should therefore be clearly specified that the functions of the working party would be confined to guiding and coordinating the preparatory activities. He suggested that the Office provide a brief outline of the tasks assigned to the working group.

Mr. Kazmi (Government, Pakistan) remarked that, in spite of the wish expressed by the Governing Body, the United Nations had not granted the International Labour Organization the central role in the preparation of the World Summit. The ILO now had to act within the given context as one of several agencies requested to make a contribution and should prepare the best...
possible input. It would be through this input that the ILO would impress upon the other international agencies the importance of the role that it played in social development.

Concerning the mechanism for the preparation of the ILO contribution, he favoured the setting up of a working party because he doubted that two independent committees, however alike their views might be, could come up with the desired input. This working party, the composition of which could be either six, nine or 15, should prepare an input, which should be presented to the Governing Body for consideration. In this way, the final decision would remain with the Governing Body.

Addressing the question of the ILO's tripartite participation at the World Summit, the speaker pointed out that, whatever form its representation might take, the message of the ILO should be a tripartite one. This did not mean that one message should come from the Employers, one from the Workers and one from the Governments. It was rather an internal task of the ILO to ensure that there would be one message only and that it would be a tripartite one. Whoever would represent the ILO at the Summit would represent the ILO as a whole and not any particular group, and the message delivered would be a tripartite one because it would be framed through the deliberations of the Organization's three main components.

Mr. Mbila (Government, Cameroon), speaking on behalf of the Governments, believed that when operative paragraph 15 of the General Assembly resolution invited the International Labour Organization as one of the agencies requested to contribute fully to the preparations for the Summit, this made it clear that the ILO would participate in the preparation of the event as a specialized agency of a tripartite nature with all its competence derived from its tripartite constituency of governments, employers and workers. The same resolution invited the governments to appoint high-level participants, and it would be up to the governments to ensure the inclusion of the social partners, in particular because the Summit in question dealt with social development. As to the working party, he suggested that it be composed of five members from each group. Given the fact that the composition of the Governing Body would be renewed in June 1993, the African Government group would propose for membership in the working party one titular and one deputy member in case one of them would not continue to be a member of the Governing Body after June 1993.

Mr. Krasilnikov (Government, Russian Federation) supported the intensive work that was carried out by the ILO in preparation for the World Summit. He agreed that it was the quality of the ILO's input which would determine whether the Organization played a central role or not, and stated the willingness of his Government to make a meaningful contribution. He hoped that if a working party were set up, it would consist of five members of each group. He felt that it would be useful for the Office to prepare a short document for that working party on the activities carried out by the various agencies of the United Nations system in the field of social development.

Mr. Valcavi (Government, Italy) believed that the paper submitted by the Director-General outlined correctly the role that the ILO should play at the Summit. In other words, one had to acknowledge that the organizers of the Summit had not recognized the exclusive or central role of the ILO. However, it was important to stress that the subject of the Summit was a highly complex one and that tripartism, which was reflected in the functioning of the ILO, was a key part of this complex issue.

With regard to the preparatory work, the speaker stressed the need to guarantee the high quality of the ILO contribution and to make maximum use of
ILO experience. He believed that the contribution of the standing committees of the Governing Body was important because their experience could help to avoid treating the problem in a purely theoretical manner and would permit a more direct approach in a shorter time. The role of the working party, which could be established with some flexibility as long as it safeguarded an appropriate regional balance, should consist of coordinating and synthesizing the work done by the standing committees.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) expressed concern about the direction of the debate, which seemed to imply the setting up of some form of standing body. Rather, the preparation of the Summit required a small group for a limited time period, which would put together an agenda and would outline some of the Organization's concerns in order to ensure that the ILO's voice was heard at the Summit. The Workers' group therefore suggested establishing a small working party of three persons from each group, precisely in order to avoid it becoming a more permanent body. She pointed out that three standing Governing Body Committees would be requested to make a contribution, and believed that their Officers could produce together an output which could be examined by the Governing Body. The Director-General could then be requested to ensure that the Office would assemble the required documentation. This was the most expeditious way of preparing a basis for the Governing Body's discussion. She pleaded against creating additional bureaucracy and in favour of limiting the membership of the working group to nine because she believed that the Officers of the three Committees concerned were familiar with the issues to be treated by the Summit, including deregulation, privatization, free trade and other subjects promoted by the IMF and the World Bank.

Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines) felt that there was a consensus for setting up a working party of either nine or 15 members. However, he pointed out that the meetings of the working group at the February, May and November Sessions of the Governing Body might not coincide with the timing of the preparations by the United Nations. Consequently, it was the International Labour Office which should carry the main responsibility for the preparatory work because it was in a position to respond to developments as they occurred. The Director-General could report regularly to the Governing Body on the progress made.

Mrs. Caron (Government, Canada) considered that the proposal of the Workers' and Employers' groups to set up a working party was a constructive one. The rules of group dynamics would, however, call for a smaller group. The group would not take decisions on behalf of the Governing Body; it would merely engage in a preliminary selection of the aspects to be treated and would thus assist the Governing Body in taking a final decision. Whereas she believed that there was no magic number for the composition of the working party, the selection of three members from each group seemed to be a logical one in view of the three Committees involved. She saw no reason why the Officers of these Committees should not be appointed to compose the group. This would have the advantage of avoiding extensive consultations concerning the persons to be chosen and would ensure that the persons who composed the group benefited from the experience of these Committees in dealing with the various aspects of social development.

Mr. Maassen (Government, Germany) repeated his formal proposal that the group should consist of at least nine persons because a group that was smaller than that could not ensure a well-balanced composition.

The Chairman noted that there was a consensus in favour of establishing a tripartite working party but there were differences of view regarding its numerical composition. He felt that it was equal tripartite balance that
really mattered and that the actual numbers had less importance. He believed that the Governing Body could agree that five members from each group would not represent too large a membership. It should, however, be ensured that the Committee on Discrimination, the International Organizations Committee and the Committee on Employment would carry on the work until November 1993, in particular in view of the renewal of the Governing Body's membership in June 1993. The most prudent solution would be to select five persons from each group, which would ensure adequate geographical coverage. The new Governing Body could, of course, take a different decision. He felt therefore that the Governing Body was in a position to take a decision on the proposal in paragraph 15 of the Office paper.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) pointed out that both the Employers' and Workers' groups as well as some Government representatives shared the view that the group be composed of three times three members. There was accordingly no majority for a composition of "three times five". However, should the majority of the Government group have difficulties in accepting a number lower than that, and if the Employers were requested to accept this formula, they would do so, but it should not be considered as representing the majority view.

The Chairman replied that he had never referred to any majority view and that his personal intervention had stressed the desirability of a prudent approach in view of the changes which might occur in the composition of the Governing Body.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) supported the prudent approach of the Chairman and requested the Employers' and Workers' groups to accept a composition of "three times five", because this was a sensitive issue, especially for certain members of the Government group.

Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines) pointed out that his acceptance of the formula of "three times five" was relevant for the purposes of this working party only and should in no way be construed as an admission on the part of the Asian group that there were five regions for any other purpose.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) accepted the proposal of "three times five".

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) maintained his preference for a membership of nine.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) reiterated that the Workers' group was against a big working party in view of its temporary nature. While she was ready to accept the prudent approach of the Chairman, she wished to place on record her reservations about the size of the group and about the length of time it would require, in particular because the Workers were already overworked as a result of their participation in many other committees.

The Chairman proposed that a membership of 15, i.e. five from each group, be accepted for the sake of compromise and in order to meet any unforeseen problems. He felt that the regional coordination among the Governments was an important element in preparing for the Summit.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 15 of the report.

The Director-General responded to a series of questions raised in the debate. Concerning tripartite representation at the Summit and the message to
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e conveyed, he agreed with the first speakers, and notably the representative of the Government of France, that the ILO should display neither an attitude of excessive superiority nor one of excessive inferiority. He recalled that in recent months the ILO had had repeated contacts with the United Nations. Ir. J.P. Martin had met several representatives of the United Nations in New York and ILO representatives had also participated in the last meeting of the United Nations Commission for Social Development, which had been held in Vienna, and which had been entrusted with drawing up the agenda of the Summit. All interlocutors within the United Nations system expected the ILO to play an important role in the preparation of the Summit. This was due to the ILO's functional competence within the UN system and the experience it had accumulated, particularly in the field of employment but also in other areas. There were therefore no grounds for anxiety about the contribution which the ILO could make to the Summit but this had to remain within the limits of the UN system.

As had been pointed out by some of the previous speakers such as the representatives of the Governments of Venezuela and the Philippines, the ILO was not the only agency which was competent in this field. The United Nations had to respect internal democracy within the UN system and, as a result, could not entrust the responsibility to the ILO alone at the cost of excluding other organizations; the ILO was therefore required to cooperate with the others. The question of the precise content of the ILO's contribution could not be answered at this stage because no detailed agenda had been worked out so far by the United Nations, nor was there any certainty as to who would be formally responsible for organizing the Summit. The ILO would do its best to prepare its own contribution, and there was no cause to believe that it was behind schedule. In some respects, the ILO was slightly ahead and the United Nations looked forward to benefiting from the ILO's input.

Of particular concern was the question of tripartism. Many speakers found it difficult to imagine a debate on questions of employment without the contribution of the Employers and the Workers. The modalities of tripartite participation had yet to be worked out. Some had invoked the possibility of encouraging governments to include Employer and Worker representatives in their delegations both during the preparatory stages and at the Summit itself. The international organizations of employers and workers should in any case be given a special status and should not be treated in the same manner as non-governmental organizations were often treated within the UN system. Another idea was to devote a part of the Summit's work to hearing the views expressed by the Workers and the Employers. With regard to ensuring tripartite representation, the Office would play its role to the extent possible within the bureaucratic system of the United Nations. However, in the General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations, it was the governments which took all decisions. It was consequently essential to involve both the Office and the member States throughout the entire process. When the ILO representatives had pleaded for the participation of the ILO in the preparation of the Summit at the United Nations Commission for Social Development, only three governments had, in their statements, referred specifically to the role of the ILO. The Director-General was grateful to these pioneers, which were the Governments of Germany, the Netherlands and the United States, and expressed the hope that these would be joined by many others when intervening in the different fora of the United Nations.

Turning to the question of the message, he pointed out that it concerned not merely the preparation of an oral statement. If that were the case, the ILO had ample time left for its preparation. However, a far greater input was required than that. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development had examined a vast amount of documentation, and the whole of the United Nations system had been involved during several months in its 1668G/v.3
preparation. The role of the ILO had started with the preparation of such documents and also with the preparation of the agenda. It was evident that the contribution of the ILO would be combined with those of other agencies and, consequently, the ILO's specific message would form part of a larger entity. If the ILO insisted on upholding the purity of its principles and its message, it would automatically be left aside. It would therefore have to be very precise in defining its message and also about the manner and extent of combining it with others. This was more complex and difficult than simply preparing a message for the Summit. In other words, the ILO message would be part of a collective effort, which would be examined, amended and approved by the participants of the Summit.

The representative of the Government of the Philippines had pointed out rightly that it was not the ILO which would determine the timetable of the work of the United Nations system, but it was possible that the ILO would have to take important decisions and make difficult choices between the two sessions of the Governing Body. The task of the working party would therefore have to be more than administrative. The Office should be able to consult a permanently available representative team, which could meet at the appropriate time, even between two sessions of the Governing Body. The task of the working party would be limited and would end its work when the Summit commenced, but its mandate should not be too restrictive or too administrative because this could make it a superfluous body.

With regard to the dates of the Summit, the Office had written to the Secretary-General of the United Nations but had not yet received an answer. The Office had also addressed the host country via its Minister of Labour requesting him to take up the issue with his colleagues in the Government. The Director-General hoped that all members of the Governing Body would communicate their concern in this respect to the representatives of their governments in New York in order to ensure that the dates of the Summit would not coincide with those of the International Labour Conference. He shared the view expressed by some speakers that the organization of the Summit in June would virtually amount to a provocation, but hoped that this would not occur. At the next meeting of the Administrative Committee on Coordination in six weeks' time in Rome, the question of the Summit would most probably be raised. He would then report to the Secretary-General and the other executive heads present on the concerns expressed by the members of the Governing Body.

The last point concerned the proposal of Mr. Blondel to invite the representative of the United Nations system who was actually responsible for the Summit. No such representative had yet been appointed, but those who were particularly interested in the success of the Summit included the members of the UN secretariat who would be coordinating the preparatory activities and also Ambassador Somavia, who had been the representative of the Secretary-General in this field and who had just been appointed as President of ECOSOC. Ambassador Somavia had already expressed his desire to visit the ILO and meet with some of its leaders. If all groups were in agreement, the Director-General would be pleased to invite Ambassador Somavia. The Governing Body could then receive him and discuss the matter within the framework either of the International Organizations Committee or of the Governing Body itself. Ambassador Somavia had also put forward the idea of organizing hearings for a certain number of persons who could testify to economic and social realities. The Director-General had communicated this idea to the Employers' and Workers' groups, and he would pursue the discussion both with Ambassador Somavia and the groups concerning the modalities.

In conclusion, the Director-General stressed that there was, within the United Nations system, an extremely positive attitude towards the contribution of the ILO and towards considering tripartite participation throughout the
entire process. The ILO should help to reinforce this positive attitude through the quality of its work. For this reason, it was important to start the work immediately and to detach ILO staff to the secretariat which would be set up for the preparation of the Summit. He hoped also that the Governing Body working party could be established rapidly with a view to preparing some elements which could be incorporated in the ILO message.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) was still unclear about the precise mandate of the working party in view of the Director-General's statement that it should not be limited. Would its mandate now be different from the one described in the paper? Would the working party engage in long debates on the themes of the Summit? His own previous understanding had been that it should be essentially an operational body.

The Chairman indicated that the working party would consist of five members of each group and would follow, with the Office, all aspects of the participation of the ILO in the preparatory work of the Summit, and that it would keep the Governing Body informed on a regular basis.

The Clerk of the Governing Body requested the groups to designate as soon as possible the names of their five representatives so that the working party could be constituted before the end of the 255th Session.

The sitting closed at 6.10 p.m.
SECOND SITTING
(Tuesday, 2 March 1993, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.10 a.m., with Mr. Vargas Campos in the Chair.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General¹

Second Supplementary Report

Commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the ILO and of the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Philadelphia

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) had no objection to the point for decision in paragraph 6 of the report. However, he did not consider that the ratification of a Convention lent itself to celebrations: it was after all mainly a legislative act, and not entered into merely to please the ILO. It would be more appropriate, in order to pay tribute to the Declaration of Philadelphia, to put oneself in the place of those who had written it at the end of the Second World War. Its adoption had also been accompanied by a revision of the Constitution of the ILO, focusing on its objectives. Celebrations of the ILO's 75th anniversary and of the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Philadelphia called for publicity: however, such exercises often aroused only momentary interest, and were quickly forgotten in the wake of the next novelty. There was every reason why 1994 should be an important year for the ILO, for it offered a valuable opportunity to reflect at length on its basic objectives, and to consider the means at its disposal and the structures it used to pursue them. On the eve of the 21st century the ILO needed a sense of vision, and the Employers' group had several ideas on this subject. In the absence of such serious reflection on the aims and purposes of the Organization, the events suggested in the report seemed of minor importance, for the minting of postage stamps and art competitions hardly suggested the importance of the issues dealt with by the ILO. In a recent statement, the new Director of the United Nations Office in Geneva had stated that the 50th anniversary of the United Nations would be celebrated mainly by the introduction of substantive reforms in its internal structure. This seemed the right path to pursue, and the ILO should follow it.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) found Mr. Oeschlin's statement somewhat pessimistic; the ratification of Conventions was surely a cause for celebration, and did not happen often enough. The report had rightly addressed the areas in which people at all levels of society could participate in celebrations. Another idea might be to pursue the possibility of a slot on CNN television, which seemed to have a worldwide following: this would mean telling the whole world, for a short period of time, what the ILO was about, and was sure to reach a large number of people. The Workers' group also proposed that preparations should immediately begin for a campaign at the forthcoming 80th Session of the International Labour Conference to encourage

¹ See also first, sixth (private), seventh and eighth sittings.
all countries to ratify basic human rights Conventions. This would provide useful background for the Director-General's Report to the Conference in 1994 which would refer to the two anniversaries. It would also be helpful if governments could inform the Office of their intentions concerning the commemoration of the anniversaries so that they could receive assistance. In addition, she proposed that the point for decision be amended by replacing the words "communicate to member States", which meant governments, by the term "the ILO's tripartite constituents".

Mrs. Caron (Government, Canada) found the proposals interesting, and shared the view of the Employer Vice-Chairman: the 75th anniversary of the ILO was an excellent opportunity to reflect on the aims and purposes of the Organization in terms of its role for the future. This would help establish priorities for its activities and identify the changes necessary to adapt it to the coming century.

Mr. Gopalan (Government, India) supported the proposals, to which member States would be able to give effect as they saw fit. Another idea might be to institute an international award for achievements, say, in the field of industrial relations.

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) found the proposals adequate, but they could go further: organizing an international day for the ILO was a good idea, but both time and resources were now lacking. Responsibility would have to lie with ILO constituents in member States, and should involve tripartite events. For its part, France intended to organize a major seminar — with a tripartite composition — on the theme of the ILO's relevance to the modern world, and other ideas could be incorporated into this theme. The Director-General might also lend consideration to the possibility of recommending that national tripartite bodies, which existed in all countries, should meet during the anniversary year.

Mr. Dejong (Government, Australia) supported the previous speaker's suggestion regarding meetings of national tripartite bodies: employers' and workers' organizations should be addressed more directly by the proposals. The anniversaries were an occasion for celebration, but as other speakers had already said, they were also a time to reflect on the Organization and its goals and this would probably occur during the International Labour Conference of 1994.

Mr. Hashim (Government, Nigeria) felt that the proposals were a good start, but more could be done, and governments might have been consulted more closely on the possibilities available. Greater emphasis on the ILO's core mandate would be appropriate, as it would be valuable to demonstrate the ILO's activities for the elimination of poverty and in combating unemployment and promoting social justice. Similarly, the ILO's role in providing social and labour policy advice could be mentioned, not to forget the principle that was central to the ILO as a whole — tripartism.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairman that the anniversary would offer an excellent opportunity to reflect on the future of the Organization and to promote the ILO's basic human rights Conventions. Her own Government had given consideration to the question only recently, but it unfortunately seemed that it was already too late to commission a postage stamp. The Worker Vice-Chairperson's suggestion concerning approaches to international television networks was a good idea, and probably preferable to the idea of a film suggested in the report, for it would be difficult to produce a film that would be of equal interest to all parts of the world. It might be advisable to suggest to countries that they try to interest local television stations in producing a special programme.
that could focus on themes of particular interest to the country in question. The idea of an international award was also appealing, and she herself suggested that exhibitions might be appropriate, preferably of a more professional nature than the simple displays of books mounted by the ILO at international events. An impressive exhibition, well prepared, and perhaps incorporating some of the more recent information technology, such as the CD-ROM applications, could tour several countries in different regions.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) thought that there was already sufficient discussion of the aims and purposes of the ILO in progress in various fora, and another one was not needed. By contrast, it was necessary to seek some evidence of new commitment to ILO Conventions and to their adoption and application. Very few people outside ILO circles understood what international labour Conventions were about, and a major effort to improve public awareness of them would be very valuable.

The Director-General explained that the paper was intended simply to suggest how all member States might be involved in the celebrations and was therefore drafted in very general terms. Naturally, each member State was free to decide on its own activities, and the Office stood ready to help them to commemorate the anniversaries, although obviously no additional resources were available for such purposes. He thanked speakers for their additional suggestions, especially those who had drawn attention to the need to emphasize tripartism. The Worker Vice-Chairperson's suggestion concerning the involvement of international television news networks in the celebrations so as to offer an international panorama of ILO activities at a given moment was of great interest and would be pursued. Equally important were those who had emphasized the need to look forward as well as backwards. His Report to the Conference in 1994 might in this respect be dedicated to a review of prospects for the coming century. Meanwhile, the Office would continue to lend thought to the question.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) reiterated her proposal concerning approaches to CNN television. It was disappointing that the Director-General had said that no particular emphasis would be placed on encouraging further ratifications of international labour Conventions. Surely this was a clear priority.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) explained that she had not proposed that the Office should finance activities in member States. A small amount had been set aside in the programme and budget for anniversary celebrations, and she had simply suggested that some of it might be spent on promotional material.

The Governing Body adopted the proposal in paragraph 6 of the report as amended by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
there was no provision either in the Constitution or the Standing Orders of the Conference to prevent participation in the work of the Conference, nor did the convocation letter sent by the Director-General constitute a legal invitation. The Governing Body also had no power to predetermine the treatment given to credentials presented at the Conference, which was a matter for the Conference alone. The reference to Security Council resolution 777 was equally inappropriate, in that the resolution applied only to the non-participation of Yugoslavia in the General Assembly, for the Legal Adviser of the United Nations had said on 29 September 1992 that it applied only to the United Nations and was not legally binding on the specialized and related agencies. While the report referred to a number of agencies that had decided that Yugoslavia could not continue its participation in their proceedings, it was also of note that no such decision had been taken at the recent meeting of the Executive Board of the WHO. Furthermore, in view of the present situation regarding the search for a peaceful solution to the conflict, it was unjustifiable to adopt new sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and no measures should be taken to condemn it, particularly in view of the position adopted by Serbia itself in support of the peace plan developed by the United Nations. The international community, including the International Labour Organization, should make every effort to develop more balanced approaches to the resolution of the conflict.

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

FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association

TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH REPORT

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), the Committee's Reporter, introduced the report. At its meeting the Committee had had before it 111 cases concerning 51 countries. It had examined 37 cases as substance, adopting definitive conclusions in 15 and interim conclusions in 22 cases. Figures alone, however, did not illustrate the variety of cases some concerned tragic situations that merited special attention. In a number of countries there was a situation of extreme insecurity, leading to the total absence of the civil stability that was essential for the exercise of freedom of association or of any freedom, and as a result it was virtually impossible to guarantee respect for such human rights. Particular attention should be given to the situations in Colombia, Peru and El Salvador, for the allegations in the cases concerning them were extremely serious: in El Salvador, the Committee had been forced to note the lack of cooperation by the Government in its procedures. The Committee intended to examine the case concerning the country again in May 1993, and if the Government of El Salvador did not send full and detailed information or did not agree to the sending of a direct contacts mission, then the Committee would recommend the Governing Body to give the widest possible publicity to its report. Other cases concern allegations of threats to basic human rights. This was still the case in China, and it was hoped that the Government would draw on the Committee's recommendations to achieve positive developments in the situation. The Committee had also considered a case concerning the Republic of Korea, a new member State, concerning which the Committee had been forced to note that the situation regarding freedom of association in that country was far from the principles and practices embodied in ILO Conventions. It was hoped that the Government of the Republic of Korea would take the necessary measures, wit
he Office's assistance, to bring the situation into line with the Committee's recommendations.

In the introduction to its report, the Committee referred to cases that had to be postponed because the government replies or the observations waited from complainants had not yet reached the Committee or had arrived too late to be taken into consideration. At each session of the Governing Body, in presenting the report he made the observation that the late submission of observations and of replies was a serious obstacle to the functioning of the Committee. It could also be noted in the report that the Committee had addressed urgent appeals in the cases concerning Guatemala, Chad, Morocco and Egypt, asking the governments to send their replies as a matter of urgency, and he Committee intended to examine these cases in substance at its next meeting even if the Governments' observations were not received in time.

In a more positive vein, the Committee had also examined cases in which the governments concerned had kept it informed of the effect given to its recommendations. This concerned 13 cases, and showed that the Committee's recommendations had an effect: legislation in Greece guaranteeing the financial independence of trade union organizations had been adopted; in Panama workers dismissed from their jobs had been reinstated; and in Turkey legislation concerning the restitution of the assets of the DISK Confederation had come into force and trade unionists had been released.

Mr. Noakes (Employer, Australia), speaking on behalf of the Employers' Group, expressed concern at some of the cases in the report. He echoed the comments of the Reporter of the Committee concerning the climate of violence that prevailed in a number of countries mentioned in the report. It was always regrettable when the Committee had to deal with cases of violence perpetrated against workers and trade union officials, some of it of an extreme nature. In some of the countries in question, violence had become a part of the very fabric of society, and it seemed impossible to do anything to reduce the level of violence or to eradicate it so as to ensure that the principles of freedom of association were respected. Acts of terrorism and counter-terrorism had been so destabilizing that it was impossible to achieve any positive change in present circumstances, and the Employers expressed their deep regret at the situation and their strong support for the remarks by the Reporter.

Once again, regrettably, it was necessary to draw attention to the lack of cooperation by certain governments with the work of the Committee and their failure to reply to the Committee's requests. The most serious of these cases concerned El Salvador, and as the Reporter had stated, the Committee had drawn attention to the persistent refusal by the Government to cooperate with the Committee, and in particular its refusal to accept a direct contacts mission.

He also drew attention to paragraph 22 of the report concerning the failure of the Government of Iraq, for 12 months now, to reply to the Committee's questions on its action in Kuwait.

By contrast, progress was reported in paragraph 13 and the following paragraphs in a number of cases where the Committee's recommendations had achieved an effect.

Some of the cases considered by the Committee had arisen as a result of the legislative situation regarding labour relations in certain countries. Two of these cases were of special importance - those concerning the Republic of Korea and China - and he drew attention to them not only because of their special nature but also because of the extent of the changes necessary in both...
legislation and in the Governments' attitudes to ensure that the Committee's recommendations were accepted. In the case of the Republic of Korea, the Committee had concluded that a number of aspects of current legislation governing public and private sector workers were unsatisfactory. Noting that this country was a new Member of the ILO and the establishment there of a tripartite committee to review existing legislation, the Committee had drawn the Government's attention to the availability of technical assistance from the Office. The Committee had also expressed concern at the arrest and imprisonment of a number of trade unionists, the death of a prominent trade unionist, and the dismissal of a large number of teachers on account of their trade union activities.

In the case concerning China (No. 1652), the Committee had concluded that many aspects of the Trade Union Act of 1992 were contrary to the principles of freedom of association, and had requested the Government to take action to correct this situation. The Committee had also expressed serious concern at action taken against a number of workers and the severity of the sanctions applied to them. Despite the strong positions taken by the Governments of the Republic of Korea and China, he expressed the sincere hope that it would be possible, through the cooperation of those Governments, to bring the situation there into line with the principles upheld by the Committee.

As usual, there had been a number of cases that had arisen as a result of measures taken by governments to pursue the aim of economic stability: in Case No. 1624 concerning Canada (Nova Scotia) and specifically public-sector teachers, this was similar to a number of other cases concerning that country that had been dealt with by the Committee, and the Committee had once again expressed its regret that the Government did not give priority to collective bargaining and expressed the hope that the restrictions imposed would be removed in the very near future. In the case concerning Greece (No. 1632) the Committee had concluded that the measures taken by the Government in 1999 went beyond the normally acceptable limits that may be placed on collective bargaining. In the case concerning Argentina (Case No. 1369), the Committee had concluded that the limits imposed by the Government on the general extension of collective agreements went beyond a reasonable time-frame, but it had indicated that its considerations on this matter were specific only to the system of collective bargaining in Argentina.

A number of cases concerned the designation of essential services. Case No. 1681, concerning Canada, involved grain-handling operations that were regarded as being of such economic importance that back-to-work legislation was justified; in the case concerning Sri Lanka (No. 1621), workers in the garment export trade had been denied the right to strike, and the Committee had noted that many other industries had been designated as essential services. In the case concerning Colombia (Case No. 1620), work stoppages in the hotel industry had been declared illegal by the Government, on the ground that the operation concerned was a state enterprise.

In all these cases the Committee had reiterated its position concerning the definition of essential services. Nevertheless, the number of such cases that continued to come before the Committee was an indication of the difficulties governments faced in dealing with work stoppages in sectors of key economic importance.

Particular interest also surrounded the case (No. 1623) concerning Bulgaria and the problem of the devolution of trade union assets acquire under the former communist regime. As a consequence of the process of democratization, these assets had been confiscated, which had given rise to complaint by the new trade union organizations which involved some difficult
and complex issues, and the Committee hoped that these would be resolved by agreement.

Case No. 1673, concerning Nicaragua, involved the question of the entitlements of workers dismissed when an enterprise was sold as part of the process of privatization. Current legislation prevented the application of any collective agreement by restricting entitlements in such circumstances. The Committee had asked the Government to take measures to ensure the application of the terms of collective agreements in such circumstances.

Finally, two cases involved restrictions on the free expression of views by trade union officials: Case No. 1663, concerning Peru, involved the suspension of trade union officials from their employment for six months and charges of slander brought against them following the circulation of certain documents. In Case No. 1640 concerning Morocco, two trade union officials had received prison sentences for allegedly insulting the King and Royal Family, and while the Committee indicated its concern at the severity of these penalties and the procedures involved, it recalled that the right to freedom of expression was not an unlimited right and that trade union officials should observe certain limits of propriety and refrain from the use of insulting language. The Committee would in his view apply the same rule to officials in employers' organizations.

Mrs. Engelen-Kefer (Worker, Germany), speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, supported the Committee's recommendations, and joined the previous speakers in expressing serious concern at the continued violation of freedom of association. Such violations involved murder, torture, threats to families and similar misdeeds, and there was no sign of improvement on the part of certain governments, in particular those of Peru, El Salvador, Colombia, the Dominican Republic and Morocco. The situations in those countries were sufficiently serious to merit special attention, and as regards El Salvador, she supported the statement of the Reporter of the Committee that, if insufficient information was provided by the Government, the matter would be taken up at the International Labour Conference in an appropriate manner so as to make the case public.

The case (No. 1623) concerning Bulgaria was unprecedented and was of great importance, as the situation might well arise in many other countries currently transforming their economies and their social structures, especially in Central and Eastern Europe and in some parts of Africa. The shared identity in the past of the ruling political party and the official trade movement had had the consequence that unions had carried out certain activities that were in fact the responsibility of the State and were not, strictly speaking, trade union activities. Where such activities reverted to state bodies with the process of democratization, then it was only right that such assets should be returned to the State. However, this did not apply to all trade union assets. Another difficult aspect of the problem was to identify the unions representing workers' interests: the former trade unions, now reformed, owned most of the assets, but new trade unions, either created or in the process of being created, needed funds to establish premises and structures. It was not possible for such disputes to be resolved from the outside, and for this reason the Committee had adopted what seemed a wise decision and had recommended that in such countries special bodies should be created to decide on the distribution of unions' assets in individual cases, and that the unions concerned by such questions should be involved in the work of such bodies and in the decisions they took.

The Workers' group were particularly concerned at the violations of trade union rights in the Republic of Korea (Case No. 1629), in particular those affecting people working in the civil service and the public sector, and they
supported in full what had already been said and what was stated in the Committee's conclusions. However, the attitudes expressed by the Government were a cause for concern: it had stated that Confucian ethics made it impossible for trade union rights to be respected in the civil service, and that it was in accordance with Asian morals and ethics that the relationships between workers and employers should be characterized by harmony, and not conflict. She strongly rejected this view, which indicated a failure to understand the basics of freedom of association.

The Workers also expressed serious concern at the continuance of unjustified interference by governments in collective bargaining procedures and in collective agreements, in particular in the public service, and this applied to the cases concerning Canada (Nova Scotia), Colombia, Argentina and Greece. The Workers fully supported the very clear conclusions and recommendations of the Committee, and drew attention to the explicit statement by the Office regarding the interpretation of collective agreements, and in particular the very clear definition of when it was possible in the public service to intervene in collective bargaining procedures, that is, only where they concerned essential services. Some governments claimed that the hotel industry, the export trade and the activities of teachers were essential services, but this was not acceptable.

The Workers also supported in particular the Committee's recommendations in the case concerning Malawi (Case No. 1638) and the release of the Secretary-General of the Southern African Trade Union Coordination Council (SATUCC), Mr. Chihana, who had been imprisoned on account of the alleged distribution of political material. Such an accusation was a clear infringement of trade union rights. The Committee's conclusions also applied to all the other persons concerned, including Mr. Chihana's wife.

As regards the case concerning China (Case No. 1652), again the Workers noted with concern that trade union rights remained the subject of serious violations, and that permitted trade union activities were still tied to the Communist Party, which was not acceptable. However, it was noted that some of the detained trade unionists had been released, and she encouraged the Government of China to continue to move in this direction and to amend its legislation and practice.

Finally, she drew attention to the case concerning Denmark (Case No. 1674), which was of a kind that had not been encountered before. She concerned the question of whether competing trade unions could establish unemployment funds and offer those funds to their members, and whether the Danish Government would give financial support for such funds. The Committee had taken a wise decision in finding that no union could be denied the right to seek financial assistance or to offer it to its members in the event of unemployment. However, it was not reasonable to expect such subsidies to be paid by the Government in the case of multiple schemes in a given sector.

Mr. Ramond (Government, France) considered that there was a discrepancy in that, while the world was witnessing an increase in democracy, an increasing number of complaints were being registered concerning freedom of association. The complaints concerning violations of basic human rights should be distinguished from the others, for there still remained States in which human rights were systematically ignored, and yet no complaint was made for dictatorships did not countenance complaint. With the relaxation of dictatorship, however, complaints became more tolerable, and the increase in the number of complaints should not therefore necessarily be regarded as indicating a worsening of the situation.
At the same time, the cases ranged from serious violations of human rights to problems of the application of legislation and regulations, and it might be useful for the Committee to consider categorizing its cases according to the seriousness of the allegations, for after all there was a big difference between crimes and minor offences. However, he did not deny that problems of interpretation of legislation in some cases concerned serious problems, such as the definition of essential services. Perhaps greater differentiation was needed between different types of conclusions and recommendations adopted by the Committee. Governments understandably felt uneasy at appearing in the same report as other governments accused of extreme violence, but it should be recalled that the Committee's aim in all cases was to ensure respect for the rule of law. Countries that had embarked on a process of democratization needed encouragement, and the Committee should take his into consideration in dealing with the many obvious problems that would rise in such processes.

Mr. Mayoral (Government, Argentina) paid tribute to the quality of the report, which was well drafted. No one could help noticing that a considerable number of the cases before the Committee concerned countries in Latin America. The previous speaker's comments were perhaps very appropriate in this connection: the high proportion of complaints relating to that region was due to the fact that Latin America was now emerging from the black night of dictatorship and entering an era of democracy, and for the first time in history every country in the region had now embarked on the democratic process. This should be borne in mind in establishing a correct perspective on the Committee's work. Nor should it be forgotten, however, that during the recent military dictatorship in Argentina, the Committee's consideration of complaints had helped save many lives.

Mr. Al—Jassem (Employer, Kuwait) thanked the Committee for its valuable work. Indeed, the Committee dealt with the most fundamental issues of human rights addressed in the work of the ILO, and this too was something on which emphasis should be placed in activities to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the ILO. As regards Case No. 1556 (Iraq), it was regrettable that the Iraqi regime had not been receptive to the Committee's requests for information and had in fact failed to cooperate with the Committee at all. Many workers and trade unionists still languished in Iraqi prisons. The regime was also still arresting workers and continued to ignore the decisions of the United Nations Security Council regarding the restitution of assets and property or the payment of compensation for them. In addition, the situation of the many migrant workers who had suffered as a result of the invasion of Kuwait was well known. He therefore called on the members of the Governing Body to do all they could to persuade the Iraqi regime to cooperate with the Committee, for if it did not do so, then in May 1993 the Committee should consider the next step to be taken in dealing with the case. Kuwait had not forgotten the many acts of friendship during its recent hardship, and was pleased now to be able to celebrate the second anniversary of the withdrawal of Iraqi troops. Its thanks also went to the international organizations that had helped it, and especially the ILO which had done so much to help the workers affected by the crisis. It unfortunately seemed that such work would have to continue, for there was still no sign of the Iraqi regime paying money into any compensation fund.

Mrs. Engelen—Kefer (Worker, Germany) observed in reply to Mr. Noakes concerning Case No. 1640 (Morocco) that the General Secretary of the Moroccan CDT, Mr. Amaoui, was alleged by the Government to have insulted the Royal Family, whereas the union's position was that he had simply expressed criticism of his Government's social and economic policies and was in detention on account of his trade union activities. For this reason the Committee had requested the Government to provide more detailed information.
Mr. Tapiola (Worker, Finland) shared the view of the representative of the Government of France that the emergence of complaints from countries that had previously known totalitarian regimes was a positive sign. However, it would be very difficult in practical terms for the Committee to adopt formal distinctions between major and minor offences, for its case law had to address all complaints in a uniform manner. The distinction was already there in an informal fashion and was reflected in the wording of the Committee's recommendations. To complicate case law any further would be to introduce even more delays into the Committee's work, and it was preferable for its machinery to remain open to all types of complaint.

Mr. Al Suwaidi (Government, United Arab Emirates) expressed deep regret at the failure of the Government of Iraq to cooperate with the ILO by giving effect to the Committee's recommendations, which concerned the detention of Kuwaiti trade unionists and others and the confiscation of property. He fully supported the statement by Mr. Al-Jassem, and called on the ILO to continue its efforts to secure the release of the detainees as soon as possible and to ensure that the confiscated property was returned to its rightful owners.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 46 of the report.

Mr. Mayoral (Government, Argentina) stated that his Government would give due consideration to the Committee's recommendations in Case No. 1551.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 60, 94, 127, 141, and 152 of the report.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson), referring to Case No. 1681 (Canada) and speaking on behalf of the Canadian trade union concerned, thanked the Committee for its strongly worded conclusions in paragraphs 162 to 167 of its report. Once again the Government of Canada had violated the principles of freedom of association by applying back-to-work legislation to end a legal strike. The Committee had stated in its conclusions that grain handling was not an essential service in the strict sense of the term, and this could only be regarded as a strong reprimand that should be respected by the Government of Canada. In paragraph 23 of its report the Committee had requested information concerning developments in the case it had considered in the past and which concerned Canada. This was Case No. 1616, concerning the Federal Government, and she informed the Governing Body that on 17 February 1993 the Government of Canada had introduced an Act to provide for restraint on government expenditure: this was an omnibus Bill that would extend for a further two years the wage restraint previously enacted under the Public Sector Compensation Act that had given rise to Case No. 1616, and the new legislation was to come into force on 1 April. With the imminent departure of the Prime Minister, it seemed hard to advise for such strong legislation to be introduced, and it was sure to lead to yet another case being submitted to the Committee.


Mr. Petrov (Government, Bulgaria) offered further information on recent developments concerning Case No. 1623. His Government regarded the problem as one of great importance and was considering the appropriate steps to take to bring about a just settlement of the dispute. The Committee's conclusions and recommendations would receive full consideration by his Government, and he thanked the representatives of the Employers' and Workers' groups for their...
useful comments. Over the past few weeks the Government's efforts to find a solution acceptable to all parties had been furthered by an agreement between the two main representative trade union confederations, the Confederation of Independent Trade Unions and the Confederation of Labour (Podkrepa). They had agreed in principle to distribute the assets of the former Central Council of Bulgarian Trade Unions between themselves and the Government. At the same time, the Government had expressed its readiness to assign funds and other assets to the new workers' organizations, which would guarantee the possibility of effectively exercising their activities to defend workers' rights and would ensure the development and continuation of trade union pluralism in Bulgaria. The Council of Ministers had formed a working party including representatives of various ministries and of trade unions to discuss the formula for the distribution of the assets covered by the Act of 9 December 1991. This had produced a positive outcome two weeks previously: the Government had issued a decree on the division of the assets of the dissolved trade union, whereby 55 per cent of the assets would revert to the Confederation of Independent Trade Unions in Bulgaria; 35 per cent to the Confederation of Labour (Podkrepa); and the remaining 10 per cent would revert to the State. As regards the Committee's recommendations concerning the restrictions on freedom of movement suffered by Mr. Ivan Neikov, Vice-President of the Confederation of Independent Trade Unions of Bulgaria, no such restrictions had in fact prevented Mr. Neikov from participating in international trade union meetings, in particular the 77th (1990) Session of the International Labour Conference, in which Mr. Neikov had actively participated in the work of the Committee on the Application of Standards. His Government would not fail to inform the Committee of further developments in the situation.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 513 of the report.

Mr. Khurshid Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan), referring to Case No. 1629 concerning the Republic of Korea, observed that, following the formation of trade unions, some 1,500 teachers had been dismissed and 80 imprisoned. A leading trade unionist had also died. The Republic of Korea had only recently joined the ILO, and in becoming a Member of the Organization had undertaken to fulfill its obligations under the Constitution, one of the fundamental principles of which was respect for freedom of association. Of particular concern was the Government's assertion that its approach to the issue was based on a "traditional Asian non-adversarial approach to labour relations". This was surely a misrepresentation of "Asian" culture, which in any case could not be so construed as to mean that issues could not be resolved by third-party intervention. Nor did it exclude the formation of trade unions, which in any case, as he had already stated, was a fundamental right that must be respected by all Members of the Organization. The Workers' group therefore fully supported the Committee's recommendations, and urged the Government to bring its legislation into conformity with the ILO Convention and to release the detained workers. As for the dismissed workers, their case should be reviewed. The Republic of Korea was welcome as a new Member of the Organization, but it must understand its basic principles, which were not furthered by the death in detention of trade union officials.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 575, 590, 611, 646 and 673 of the report.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) welcomed the Committee's thorough recapitulations when it described cases. Referring in particular to Case No. 1652 (China), he drew particular attention to the fate of Mr. Han Dongfang, the leader of the Beijing Autonomous Workers' Federation. He and his companions had intended to organize a silent demonstration on
4 June 1992 to commemorate the third anniversary of the Government's suppression of the democratic movement. For his pains he was now under house arrest. His treatment at the hands of the authorities was nothing new in the case. The trade unionists involved in the democratic movement had been accused of various charges, for which they had received sentences out of all proportion with them. Nor were the Government's replies to the Committee's requests for information particularly clear and it was questionable whether its explanations were fully believable. Beijing had unfortunately been chosen by the United Nations as the venue for the Fourth World Conference on Women to be celebrated later in the year. This was incongruous, and the choice was to be regretted, although it seemed too late to change it. Reference had been made earlier to the obligations incurred by countries on becoming Members of the ILO and in ratifying Conventions. It was particularly depressing in this connection to note that, yet again, the Government of China maintained that the Committee's work constituted interference in its internal affairs. This was a stock argument that had been put forward regularly by several governments in the past, and it had always been rejected by the Committee in view of the ILO's legitimate concern for the application for its basic Conventions. Democracy was spreading throughout the world and it was to be hoped that the situation would also evolve in China and that its Government would, like others, stop resorting to this old argument.

Mr. Zhang Wei (Government, China) had not intended to speak but Mr. Blondel's comments called for a reply. China attached great importance to safeguarding the rights and freedoms of its people, which were enshrined in the country's Constitution and legislation. New trade union legislation had been introduced to pursue the same end at the request of workers and trade union organizations following repeated consultations. The world was extremely varied, with great differences in terms of historical background, social systems, culture and levels of development, and account had to be taken of these differences in understanding human rights. The main need for China was to carry out reforms to introduce market mechanisms with a view to accelerating economic development and improving standards of living. China's population continued to grow, and its basic rights of subsistence could not be maintained without the maintenance of stability and continued economic development. Work was continuing to safeguard the freedoms and rights of China's citizens. As regards the judgements handed down on criminals, the judicial authorities in China passed judgement on the basis of facts in a manner that was governed by law and in strict observance of legal procedures without any interference from Government authorities, groups or individuals. Allegations of abuses of criminals in China were absolutely groundless. China had ratified the Convention Against Torture, and had made resolute efforts to achieve the full prohibition and elimination of torture in the past few decades, with remarkable results. As for the Fourth World Conference on Women, mutual respect and cooperation were necessary in attitudes towards the Conference. It was unfair to apply double standards and to impose opinions on others.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 728 and 733 of the report.

The sitting closed at 1.10 p.m.
THIRD SITTING
(Tuesday, 2 March 1993, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.05 p.m., with Mr. Vargas Campos in the Chair.

SEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Allocations Committee

Mr. Fuchs (Government, Czech Republic) endorsed the recommendations of the Allocations Committee as outlined in paragraphs 13 and 15 of the report. This showed the willingness of the Czech Republic to find a solution that was favourable to the ILO in budgetary terms, as had been proposed by the Government already in December 1992. At the same time he expressed reservations about the Office's interpretation of the Czech Republic's membership in the ILO. Without wishing to open the discussion on that topic and trusting that a competent body of the ILO would examine the problem, he drew attention to the letter which the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Government had addressed to the Director-General on 29 January 1993, in which he had stressed the indisputable element of continuity of the membership in, cooperation with and contribution to the International Labour Organization of the former State of Czechoslovakia over the last 73 years and the acceptance of the Czech Republic of all obligations stipulated in the Constitution of the ILO. He suggested therefore to amend the text of paragraph 15 by inserting the word "eventually" after the words "for 1993 reduced" and by deleting the words "of each Republic" at the end of the fifth line. He concluded by thanking both the members of the Governing Body and the staff of the ILO for their understanding, support and goodwill, which was particularly appreciated at this crucial moment in history. The Government of the Czech Republic was ready to further develop its fruitful cooperation with the ILO, its member States and its tripartite constituents.

The Chairman said that the remarks of Mr. Fuchs would be taken into consideration when the Governing Body discussed paragraph 15, but proposed to deal first with the points for decision contained in earlier paragraphs.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 5 and 8 of the report.

Mr. Hashim (Government, Nigeria) presumed that the decision to be taken concerning the contributions of Croatia and Slovenia would set a precedent. On the one hand, the ILO had to abide by the decision of the United Nations not to recognize the newly proclaimed Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as the continuation of the former Yugoslavia, yet it had proceeded to the assessment of this new Republic, on the other hand. This was questionable in particular in view of the fact that the fragmentation or integration of the countries belonging to the former Yugoslavia might continue and the present assessment might have to be revised. While agreeing to keep aside the more general questions regarding the assessment of member States' contributions, he felt that the Office needed to give more consideration to the assessment of Croatia and Slovenia.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Ahmad) assured the previous speaker that at its May 1993 meeting the Allocations Committee would
make a recommendation for the scale to be applied to member States in 1994 which would provide him with an opportunity to express his views on the scale of assessment as a whole. With regard to the question of Yugoslavia he remarked that, although an assessment had been made, the Office had so far not dispatched any letter to Yugoslavia requesting a 1993 contribution.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 10 of the report.

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

The Chairman recalled that the representative of the Czech Republic had proposed some amendments to the wording of paragraph 15 and read out the following amended text:

The Committee recommends that the Governing Body request the Director-General to consult the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic with the aim of obtaining an aggregate provisional payment calculated by reference to the contribution assessed for the former Czechoslovakia for 1993 reduced eventually pro rata by reference to their respective period of membership during that year, and to report the results of these consultations or make any further proposals as may be appropriate as a result of such consultations to the Allocations Committee during the 256th (May 1993) Session of the Governing Body.

Mr. Fuchs (Government, Czech Republic) pointed out that the text read out by the Chairman referred to "their respective period" instead of "the respective period" and remarked that this modification was not part of his own amendment because he did not exclude the possibility of the Czech Republic paying the whole assessment.

The Legal Adviser accepted the insertion of the word "eventually" as long as it did not prejudice the question of principle, that is, when and on what juridical basis the two Republics had become Members of the Organization. He believed that the words "their respective period of membership" could make the sentence clearer and, in particular, dispel the possible impression that both Republics would be ready to pay their contributions even for those periods during which they had not been Members.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 15 of the report as read out by the Chairman.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 17 of the report.

NINTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the International Organizations Committee

Mr. Mayoral (Government, Argentina), as Chairman and Reporter of the Committee, introduced the report. He thanked the two Vice-Chairmen and the members of the Committee for their confidence, which enabled a representative of the Government of Argentina to continue chairing the Committee. He recalled the introductory statement of Mr. Maier (Deputy Director-General Standards and Labour Relations Sector), in which the latter had underlined the
importance for the ILO of the World Summit for Social Development, which had prompted the Director-General to submit a paper direct to the Governing Body. Mr. Maier had also referred to the restructuring undertaken by the secretariat of the United Nations, in particular as it touched upon the relations with the specialized agencies and the work of the United Nations in the economic and social field. The United Nations was giving increasing emphasis to these aspects in its approach to development, and this would enable the ILO to enhance its values and to implement a common policy with the United Nations.

With regard to the preparations for the World Conference on Human Rights, some members of the Committee had regretted that it would be held simultaneously with the International Labour Conference in June 1993 and several speakers had stressed the need for national delegations to the World Conference to include employer and worker representatives.

The Committee had further dealt with the follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and had emphasized the importance of the participation of employers' and workers' organizations in the work of the inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development. In addition, the Committee had briefly discussed the International Year of the Family (1994), with particular reference to rural women and part-time work, and the Fourth World Conference on Women (1995). In that connection, it was envisaged to organize a tripartite international forum in 1994, which could make a substantive input to the discussions at the World Conference.

Concerning the International Conference on Nutrition (Rome, 5-11 December 1992), the Committee had drawn attention to the fact that the conclusions of the Conference had not yet been implemented and that, in spite of the limits on the ILO mandate in this field, the ILO had a fundamental role to play in the promotion of social justice and the struggle against poverty.

During the discussions of the question concerning international cooperation in matters related to nuclear safety and radiological protection, the representatives of the Governments of Belarus and the Russian Federation had appealed for increased technical cooperation and assistance from the ILO with a view to eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl accident.

Mr. Lacasa Aso (Employer, Spain), as Employer Vice-Chairman of the Committee, expressed gratitude to Mr. Mayoral for having accepted to replace Mr. Rodriguez as Chairman of the Committee and for the Office's efforts to improve the quality of the papers submitted to it.

He felt that the ongoing reform process within the United Nations had an effect on the ILO's competence within the system and that it was essential to consider the modifications which had to be introduced in the structure and functioning of the Organization as a consequence of these reforms. In the course of the last few years the United Nations had developed a number of documents of principle, such as the International Development Strategy or "Agenda 21", which were well-suited to the new global context. Similarly, the ILO should reflect about the future of the Organization and its adaptation to new international concepts. As had been suggested by the Employer Vice-Chairman, the 75th anniversary of the ILO would provide the Organization with a good opportunity to engage in a reflection process, which in turn would have to be followed by appropriate internal changes.

The speaker encouraged both the Committee and the Office to set priorities in the Organization's cooperation with the United Nations. Not all United Nations actions or programmes fell within the mandate or the competence of the ILO. Consequently, it should choose those spheres which were well adapted to the Organization's mandate and tripartite structure.
As to the participation of the ILO in major United Nations meetings, it was essential to define, together with the organizers, the exact role which the ILO was expected to play in these events and to overcome either the inferiority or superiority complexes to which the representative of the Government of France had referred to. In the case of the World Conference on Human Rights, the ILO had expressed great interest in playing an important role, yet the United Nations had not made any provision for any increased contribution by the specialized agencies. The ILO should be more realistic and should not strive to do more than the United Nations actually expected from it. The speaker then turned to the governments which were represented both on the Governing Body of the ILO and in the United Nations fora, such as ECOSOC and urged them to be very careful with the administration of the public funds of their countries which were destined to benefit the United Nations system. It was important for them to keep in mind the specificities of each organization and to ensure that the economic and social fields be not neglected when taking decisions in fora such as the United Nations.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France), as Worker Vice-Chairman of the Committee, expressed satisfaction at the presentation of the Office papers and the way the discussion of the Committee had been conducted. He also welcomed the paper submitted by the Director-General to the Governing Body on the World Summit for Social Development in his report. This was an additional indication that the International Organizations Committee had worked well and had regained its importance. The Office papers fell into two parts. The first related to the mandate of the ILO and the issues that were likely to arise in future within the UN system, whereas the second dealt with the follow-up of already accomplished activities. This approach made it easier to formulate proposals for future action, and enabled the Government representatives to communicate to the appropriate ministries within their governments or to the representatives of the United Nations the essence of the ILO's tripartite deliberations and conclusions even if these represented tendencies or orientations rather than formally adopted conclusions. He therefore encouraged the representatives of the governments not to hesitate in expressing their views in the tripartite discussions of the International Organizations Committee and to transmit the ILO's viewpoint to their ministries or to the competent authorities of the United Nations.

Turning to the World Conference on Human Rights, he remarked that it was most unfortunate that it would take place concurrently with the International Labour Conference. The Director-General should therefore point out to the UN when the occasion presented itself, that the month of June did not always have to be chosen for important events of this kind, in particular since some of the agencies, notably the ILO, could be interested therein. The most important aspect of this question was of course the participation of workers and employers' organizations and the expression of tripartite views.

With regard to international cooperation on environment and development, the Workers were frustrated about the manner in which the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development had been conducted. In their view the action plan "Agenda 21" and the conclusions of the Conference had been secured at a very high cost. They expressed interest in the establishment and functioning of the Commission on Sustainable Development and hoped that the ILO would be integrated in its work, and that consequently the employers' and workers' organizations could make their voices heard effectively.

On the subject of the International Year of the Family (1994), he was somewhat shocked at the manifest will to promote part-time work as a virtual solution to all problems of the family. The manner in which part-time work was being promoted in France and the consequences thereof indicated quite the contrary. The Workers wished to point out that problems like unemployment...
poverty placed an enormous burden on families, and proposed that the ILO study
the impact on families of the increase of night work, work during weekends and
home-based work and the lack of employment security. The Workers felt that
this would be the best contribution the ILO could make to the topic.

With reference to the Fourth World Conference on Women (1995), the
speaker expressed satisfaction at the fact that the event represented the
continuation of the World Conference on Women, which had been held in Nairobi
in 1985, and the implementation of the Forward-looking Strategies for the
Advancement of Women to the year 2000, which were fully consistent with ILO
principles. However, he expressed concern about the selection of Beijing as
the venue for the Conference. It was astonishing that the United Nations,
which cherished the values of freedom and non-discrimination, would choose
China, a country which could certainly not be regarded as exemplary concerning
equality between women and men. This choice would permit a society, which did
not promote equality between women and men to boast about having been
recognized by the international organizations as competent in the question.
The Workers applauded, however, the orientations of the Conference. They
believed that this international forum on women's equality in a changing world
would enable the ILO to make its message heard. They proposed that the
contribution of the ILO include the question of rural women.

Turning to the 47th Session of the General Assembly, Mr. Blondel
commended the Office on its comprehensive and clear paper. The United Nations
was going through a relatively critical period, in which it was engaged in
restructuring itself in order to be more efficient without compromising its
basic principles and objectives. To some extent he shared Mr. Lacasa Aso's
belief that the ILO should also examine the possibility of restructuring itself and redirecting its activities. The Secretary-General has so far
attempted to favour the political, humanitarian and military aspects of the
United Nations mandate. It seemed that at present the General Assembly wished
to give equal importance to the Agenda for Peace and the Agenda for
Development. While this re-equilibrium was a matter for satisfaction, there
was at the same time an inherent danger that the United Nations might attempt
to take over some activities falling within the competence of the ILO. As
expansionism was a characteristic of all bureaucracies it was therefore
important for the ILO to manifest its presence and the Workers believed that
the ILO should, more than ever, develop its relationship with the United
Nations in such a way as to mark its own territory, so as to avoid any future
misunderstanding. There were a number of factual elements on which the ILO
could rely in this connection. This concern also justified the Workers' standpoint concerning the World Summit for Social Development, and the ICFTU's
request to be associated with the peace-promotion activities of the United
Nations in El Salvador, Haiti and elsewhere.

Furthermore, he welcomed the establishment of closer links between the UN
system and the Bretton Woods institutions as this would provide the ILO with
the opportunity to encourage the latter to pay more attention in their work to
humanitarian and socio-economic objectives, as outlined in their agreements
with the ILO. The UN should also be reminded that social justice and the
protection of workers were the paramount objectives of the ILO.

On the subject of the International Conference on Nutrition, he remarked
that the Workers and the other members of the Committee found it unacceptable
that 20 per cent of the population in developing countries still had no access
to sufficient food. This harsh fact made it imperative for the ILO to
continue its work in this field, although it had only a limited mandate.

With regard to international cooperation in matters related to nuclear
safety and radiological protection, he welcomed the results that had been
obtained because they responded to the concern expressed by the Workers. The Workers also supported the proposal for tripartite participation in the preparation of a joint IAEA/ILO Guide on Safety Requirements in Dismantling Nuclear Power Plants, but wished to be more closely associated with the elaboration of the proposed Convention on Nuclear Safety. Since the subject was a highly technical one, the Workers had much competence to offer. They were pleased to see the favourable development of the question.

The speaker concluded by thanking Mr. Mayoral for having accepted the chairmanship of the Committee and for having led the discussion in such a way as to enable the Committee to conclude its work with a consensus.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) remarked that the long and detailed presentations just made by the Officers of the International Organizations Committee strengthened the proposal made in the Working Party or Improvements in the Functioning of the Governing Body to conduct once a year a general debate on issues related to international organizations, rather than having them discussed both in the Committee and in the Governing Body.

Turning to Mr. Blondel's statement on part-time work, she was pleased to note that it was more balanced than the one recorded in paragraph 20 of the Committee's report. She believed that he said that it was alright to promote part-time work but that it was not a panacea. She agreed with both parts of the statement. However, part-time work was very important for many workers for a variety of reasons, of which she listed three: workers might wish to combine part-time work with family responsibilities or educational leave; part-time work might fit the pattern of certain industries better than full-time work; and at times of economic difficulty job-sharing could be an acceptable way of making work available to more people. She therefore regretted the views expressed in paragraph 20 of the report. She noted, however, that the International Labour Conference would shortly be discussing part-time work, which meant both the promotion of part-time work opportunities where they were valued by employers and employees and the appropriate terms and conditions for the protection of part-time workers. With this understanding, the Government of the United Kingdom would support the item on the Conference agenda.

Mr. Al-Suwaidi (Government, United Arab Emirates) stressed the importance of paragraphs 42 and 43 of the report which contained a reference to a General Assembly resolution on Lebanon asking the ILO to provide assistance to the Ministry of Labour and to workers and employers in Lebanon and to ensure that the ILO Regional Office for Arab States returned to Beirut. He associated himself with this request and underlined the need to provide assistance to the Palestinian people, as recommended in the General Assembly resolution concerning assistance to Palestinian people. Furthermore, he encouraged the ILO to follow up the ILC resolution related to the situation of workers in the occupied Arab territories. He wished to put on record his thanks and appreciation for the excellent report and the efforts made by the Chairman and the members of the Committee.

Mr. Willers (Government, Germany) thanked the Employers' and Workers' Vice-Chairmen of the Committee for having launched an appeal to the governments to follow carefully the reforms the United Nations was undertaking in the economic and social fields. He invited all Government representatives of the Governing Body to examine and take up this appeal. He called also on the leadership of the ILO and the New York Office to be vigilant because, as expressed by the German proverb, "a stitch in time saves nine". He believed that the reforms to be undertaken in the United Nations could result in the ILO losing some territory in very important areas of its terms of reference. The Office paper (GB.255/10/2/8) contained serious indications to that
effect. He was concerned by the impression given that the UN Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis would serve as the lead unit within the United Nations system for economic and social information which was after all within the purview of the ILO. He feared that this development could lead to this Department acquiring a monopoly for negotiating with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, whereas the ILO should continue to exercise direct influence on the Bretton Woods institutions in order to ensure that structural adjustment programmes were implemented in such a way as to reduce their possible negative impact on social development. He considered it important that this point be echoed by Employers, Workers and Governments alike.

Ms. Zhang (Government, China) expressed the satisfaction of the Government of China in hosting the Fourth World Conference on Women. It attached great importance to the event and had already started the preparations with a view to ensuring the smooth running of this major conference. The Government of China hoped that together with the other constituents of the ILO it would contribute to the advancement of women all over the world.

She took note of the special interest expressed by some of the speakers for the condition and rights of women in China and believed that the forthcoming World Conference was the best forum for exchanging views on the achievements of the past decades and on the problems that remained in that field. At present, she wished to concentrate on a possible ILO contribution to the smooth running of the Conference. She thanked the Office for its efforts to ensure the active participation of the ILO in all relevant international activities. Referring to the proposals made by the representative of the Government of China to the International Organizations Committee, as recorded in paragraph 28 of the report, she added one more point, namely the request that the ILO take the opportunity provided by the convening of the World Conference for giving publicity to the importance of adopting and applying the international labour Conventions concerning women. She also re-emphasized the necessity for the ILO to prepare in 1995 an historical overview of ILO activities in favour of women over the past 76 years in order to enhance public recognition of the role the ILO had played in this regard and to increase the awareness of the difficulties and tasks that still lay ahead. This should serve as an encouragement for overcoming the obstacles in the way of women's advancement.

Mr. Cilia-Debono (Government, Malta) noted with satisfaction the activities of the ILO in relation to the International Year of the Family, as outlined in paragraphs 19 to 25 of the report. The Government of Malta took a keen interest in questions related to the family. In 1989, it hosted the European Conference on the Family and at present it was preparing draft legislation which, if adopted, would provide wider scope for employment and better quality of working life for workers with family responsibilities. According to the relevant ILO Convention, workers with family responsibilities were those workers who were disadvantaged as a result of their family responsibilities. There were, however, other groups of workers who were disadvantaged because they were unable to meet the needs of their families due to unemployment or excessive working hours. A positive ILO contribution to the International Year of the Family should include the promotion of meaningful employment opportunities and improvement of the quality of the working life of individuals in a family context. This should include the promotion of part-time employment opportunities for those who were unable to take up full-time jobs as a result of their family responsibilities, while keeping in mind that in certain social contexts part-time employment could have a negative impact on the family. Finally, he noted with satisfaction the activities of the ILO and the United Nations in the social field.
Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) wished to clarify his earlier statement concerning part-time work. The Workers merely wished to point out that there were other contributions possible besides the one that was outlined in the relevant paragraph of the Office paper. Discussions on this topic should be carried out where appropriate, and the Workers believed that this was not the right time to deal with the issue. He was astonished to see that a question which, within the framework of the discussion on the relationship between the ILO and the United Nations, had only a marginal importance, received such attention. This, in itself, was an indication that the International Organizations Committee had to be maintained and should not be replaced by a general discussion, which might stray from the topics examined. He recalled that he represented a trade union for the protection of workers and that consequently his ideas might differ from those of governments, who had other interests to defend.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Multinational Enterprises

Mr. Dejong (Government, Australia), as Chairman and Reporter of the Committee, introduced the report. He thanked the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairmen and the Office for their cooperation in dealing with the first item on the agenda, namely the request for an interpretation of the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, which concerned a sensitive matter. This request for interpretation was the first that had been received since 1985. It had been submitted by an international trade union (named), on behalf of its affiliate in a country (named), which had complained about the decision of a specific MNE to undertake and expand investment in that country where there were flagrant violations of human rights and a total disregard for trade union rights. In the view of the complainant, this was against the letter and spirit of the Declaration.

The interpretation procedure approved by the Governing Body in 1986 provided that in the first instance it was for the Officers of the Committee on Multinational Enterprises to decide unanimously whether or not the request was receivable. In this case the Officers had not been able to agree and the matter had thus been referred to the full Committee for consideration. Given the divergent views of the Employer and Worker members, it had not been possible for the Committee to reach a consensus. There was no alternative but to vote on the issue. As noted in paragraph 14 of the report, as a result of the vote, the request for interpretation was declared receivable. The Committee thus had taken a decision, in line with paragraph 4 of the Procedure for the examination of disputes concerning the application of the Tripartite Declaration, and submitted its report to the Governing Body for information.

Miss Hak (Employer, Netherlands), speaking as Employer Vice-Chairman of the Committee, observed that, while the agreement could be reached in this case, any further requests for interpretation would be considered on their merits by the Employer members of the Committee, who expected that the Procedure would be duly respected. The point of view of the Employers was reflected in paragraph 4 of the report. She considered that the Committee had strictly followed the provisions concerning receivability of requests for interpretation contained in paragraph 4 of the Procedure. She emphasized that
the Employers did not perceive respect for human rights as a precondition for investment. If that were the case, the Employers would not have accepted the Tripartite Declaration. At the same time she did not think that the Government concerned had a very good record in respect of human rights, but that question had to be dealt with in other fora.

Mr. Bonmati Portillo (Worker, Spain), as Worker Vice-Chairman of the Committee, wished to put on record the point of view of the Workers without wanting to challenge the decision of the Committee or to reopen the debate. The Workers were convinced of the receivability of the request which related to the interpretation of the Declaration and the determination of the Procedure. They believed that the decision of the Committee had been based on political considerations rather than on the interpretation of the Procedure which they had requested. Objectively, the request should have been considered receivable, in particular since, in their opinion, no solid arguments had been put forward in the debate which could have justified a finding of irreceivability. He pointed out that the request was based on a disagreement between the parties in the country concerned and stemmed from a real situation. The MNE in question was investing in a country which was already known for its violation of trade union and human rights and which disregarded international labour standards. Under these circumstances, the enterprise concerned had known that it could not abide by the letter and spirit of the Declaration, and consequently it had violated its tenets in a premeditated fashion. In addition to disagreeing with the enterprise concerned, the trade union in that country submitted the request through the International Union of Food and Allied Workers' Associations because it also disagreed with the Government on the interpretation of the Declaration and its application. In other words, both prerequisites for receivability were fulfilled, namely the fact that the problem had arisen in a real situation and that a disagreement existed between the parties.

The Workers regretted the decision of the Committee, in particular because, according to the legal advice of the Office, the request, as it had been presented, could not be dealt with under any other ILO procedure.

He pointed out that in the Committee there were no differences of view about the nature of the political system in the country in question. According to Amnesty International, at the time of the coup d'état thousands of persons were assassinated and at present there were 3,000 political prisoners. The exceptionally brutal violations of human rights and workers' rights in that country had been examined by various international bodies, including the ILO and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Although the Workers had not received satisfaction in the Committee, they had received a certain amount of satisfaction outside of it. They had learned that there were both governments and enterprises which were aware of the situation in the country in question and which were questioning the appropriateness of investing in it, in particular since the Declaration invited multinational enterprises to respect human rights, and in view of the principles contained in the international instruments of the ILO and the United Nations. Several governments, mainly of industrialized countries had imposed sanctions on the country concerned and several MNEs had decided to suspend investment there because of the lack of respect for human rights and the rights of workers. He quoted the press release of a MNE in the country concerned, according to which the military Government was one of the owners of that enterprise, which meant that every benefit to the enterprise provided indirect support to the military Government, which was one of the leading violators of human rights in the world. While accepting the result of the vote, the Workers regretted that the Committee had refused to study this problem, which fell clearly within its competence. They feared that this
would harm the credibility of the Tripartite Declaration and the Committee itself. However, since the Workers believed in the value of the Declaration, they would continue strengthening it.

Mr. Peterson (Government, United States) believed that the amount of time this issue had occupied in the Committee reinforced a very positive aspect of the Committee's work, namely its meticulous care for due procedural processes. He was pleased to note that the views expressed by the representative of the Government of the United States were accurately reported in the report. He expressed great concern for human rights and for issues concerning workers' rights in the country in question, and welcomed the fact that the Governing Body would deal under the twelfth item on its agenda with a representation under article 24 of the Constitution concerning the same country.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

The sitting closed at 4.50 p.m.
FOURTH SITTING
(Wednesday, 3 March 1993, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.25 a.m., with Mr. Vargas Campos in the Chair.

SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA
Action to be taken regarding the appointment of the Director-General

First report of the Officers of the Governing Body

The Chairman stated that the Governing Body was now required to determine the procedure to be followed for the appointment of the Director-General as well as the date on which the election should take place. The paper submitted by the Officers indicated that it would be judicious to determine the procedure by applying the rules governing the election of the Director-General which had been adopted by the Governing Body at its 240th Session in June 1988, and which were appended to the paper. At that time it had been considered that these rules should remain valid for at least several years and they had been applied at the last election. However, if members of the Governing Body wished to make any changes to these rules, they were free to voice their opinion. As regards the date of the election, a proposal was made in the paper. He stressed on behalf of the Officers that this was a mere proposal and that the Governing Body was sovereign to decide both on the procedure and the election date.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers felt that there was no need to change the rules and these could therefore be adopted immediately.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) stated that the Workers supported the position taken by the Employers.

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) stated that his Government was prepared to adopt the proposals in the document as a whole. As both of the non-governmental groups had agreed to maintain the procedure adopted previously, and he was convinced that all the governments shared this view, there was no need to discuss the rules. The only remaining problem concerned the date: this was not a political, but a procedural, problem and he hoped that all the statements made by speakers would be limited to the election procedure and date. His Government agreed with the date proposed by the Officers for two main reasons. First, with the election date at the end of May 1993 there would be ample time for a campaign to be conducted. Secondly, the Organization was faced with the tremendous task of carrying out the reforms which had been proposed in recent years and adopted by the Governing Body, of implementing a new programme and budget for the next biennium and applying new working methods. He was convinced that this task would be obstructed if the campaign was as long as six months.

Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines) said that while he basically agreed with many of the preceding speaker's remarks, he felt that the Governing Body should be in control of the situation, rather than passively going along with the status quo. The Governing Body currently found itself in a dilemma because the procedure adopted in 1988 did not include a provision which made...
it possible to pre-establish, in relation to the Director-General's term of office, a specific date for the next election. In the present instance, any proposal in favour of either May or November as the election date was open to misinterpretation. He therefore proposed that the Office should present a paper to the Governing Body as soon as possible for the purpose of fixing a determinable date for the following elections, so that the Governing Body would avoid any such dilemma at that time.

The representative of the Director-General (the Legal Adviser) considered that the representative of the Government of the Philippines had made a valid proposal, as it would be advantageous to include a provision specifying the date of the election in the general rules concerning the election of the Director-General. Furthermore, the procedure involved was a very simple one: an Office paper on the subject could be submitted to the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, proposing that a paragraph be added to these rules. Then, on the recommendation of that Committee, the Governing Body could approve this amendment to the rules at an opportune time.

The Chairman proposed that the Governing Body should take the initiative to study the question so that at the next election it would not find itself in the same dilemma. The Governing Body could agree on the matter at the present sitting and the Office would prepare, in due time, a document to be submitted to the Governing Body so that a date could be fixed.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer France; Employer Vice-Chairman) agreed with the representative of the Government of France that the Governing Body now had to decide on a purely procedural matter, without prejudging the actual decision it would take on the date of the election. His group considered this point fundamental. He welcomed the proposal of the representative of the Government of the Philippines to include in the rules a set date for the Director-General's election in future. Such a measure would spare the Governing Body a debate of this kind which was not very pleasant. His group had examined the proposal put forward by the Officers of the Governing Body; which was based on the practice observed in similar cases. This practice was not binding on the Governing Body or on any group. His group had carefully studied the arguments that could be put forward in favour of the two possible dates. In general, the Employers' group felt that it was preferable for the election to be held in November 1993 for the following reasons.

The decision concerning the choice of Director-General would be taking place at an important time in the Organization's history, when it should be redefining its role, methods and procedures. The previous evening the International Organization of Employers had adopted a document which would be circulated shortly to the members of the Governing Body. The document reflected the IOE's interest in conducting, particularly with the Director-General, an in-depth dialogue concerning the future orientations of the ILO. This dialogue was crucial and required time and an atmosphere of serenity. The additional period between March and November would give the Director-General the necessary authority to conduct the Office's affairs during the difficult period ahead. Furthermore, the Director-General's authority would be considerably strengthened as a result of the in-depth dialogue advocated by his group.

Mr. Mbila (Government, Cameroon), speaking on behalf of the African governments, stated that his group had examined this question carefully and had concluded that, in order to give the Organization a chance to progress in the reforms which had been set for it in the coming years, the Director-General should be elected in May and not in November. Holding the elections at the latter date was likely to hinder this progress.
Consequently, the implementation of these reforms would be deferred, with all the drawbacks that this implied. This would be to the detriment of African countries which urgently needed intervention by the ILO.

Mr. Valcavi (Government, Italy) stated that his Government was in favour of holding the election on 27 May 1993. His choice was obviously guided by the concern not to obstruct the smooth management of the Organization's affairs. In fact, a long election campaign might lead to a period of uncertainty and possible division within the Organization.

Mr. Leemans (Government, Belgium) observed that, in addition to the written rules, it was necessary to take into account certain considerations which had inspired the practice adopted since the 1950s concerning the date at which the election should be held when the incumbent was submitting his candidacy for re-election. The Governing Body had considered that in such a case it should decide on the appointment sufficiently early so as to allay any uncertainty within the Organization itself and, above all, so as not to weaken the authority of the Director-General in place. Originally, in 1957, the election was held 18 months in advance. More recently, when Mr. Blanchard's mandate had been renewed for the first time, and during the campaign which led to his second election, this time-limit was set at one year by the Governing Body. The proposal of the Officers of the Governing Body was fully in line with this tradition and his Government therefore subscribed to it.

Mr. Hosannah de Mattos (Government, Brazil) also expressed his Government's agreement with the date proposed. This date seemed to be opportune, as he felt that an election campaign that was too long could be detrimental to the Organization's functioning.

Mr. Hakkou (Government, Morocco) endorsed the statements made by previous Government speakers, in particular, those of France, Cameroon, Italy, Belgium and Brazil.

Mr. Thamae (Government, Lesotho) fully endorsed the points for decision in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5. It was not necessary to depart from the reasonable tradition which had hitherto been upheld, especially since important reforms in the ILO were under way and the next Conference would have to take a decision on them. Furthermore, the acute financial difficulties facing the Office made it incumbent on its constituents to avoid any uncertainty.

Mr. Al Suwaidi (Government, United Arab Emirates) agreed with the date for the same reasons given by other Government speakers. In addition, he stated that this was in line with the Organization's practice of electing Directors-General, especially since the deadline proposed gave ample time to anyone who was interested in submitting his candidacy.

Mr. Krasilnikov (Government, Russian Federation) supported the proposal put forward for the election of the Director-General in the report of the Officers, as this date would make it possible to maintain the necessary continuity in the functioning of the Organization and would be in line with long-standing practice.

Mr. Kazmi (Government, Pakistan) stated that his Government found it difficult to understand the refusal of some members to support the Office proposal. Only one group had expressed reservations regarding this matter and the arguments it had put forward were not substantive. He saw no reason to deviate from the well-established tradition of holding elections one year to 18 months before the expiry of the Director-General's term of office. There were additional reasons for holding them in May. If the elections were held in November, a new incumbent would have only three months in which to acquaint
himself with the delicate nature of his duties. A further advantage in holding the election in May would be that it would take place prior to the International Labour Conference which had issues of fundamental importance to consider. If the election of the Director-General was not held before the Conference, there was a danger that the Conference would focus on this administrative issue, to the detriment of infinitely more important ones. It seemed to be the general consensus that three months were sufficient for holding an election campaign. Furthermore, as stated by other members of the Governing Body, the implementation of reforms should take precedence over all other matters. If the issue of the Director-General's election was resolved, the process of implementing these reforms would gain momentum. He therefore urged the Governing Body to endorse the proposal to hold the election in May.

Mr. Dejong (Government, Australia) was very pleased to note that in introducing the paper, the Chairman had stated that the date of 27 May had been put forward merely as a proposal by the Officers of the Governing Body. The statement made in paragraph 1 of the paper, according to which the Governing Body had agreed to the inclusion in the agenda of its present session of the question of "the action to be taken regarding the appointment of a Director-General in order that the appointment could be made during the 256th Session of the Governing Body (May 1993)", was not a fair reflection of the discussion held in November 1992. It had only been a brief discussion during which the Chairman had put forward a view and the Vice-Chairman of each group had expressed their opinions. He recalled that the Employer-Vice-Chairman had stated on that occasion that the Employers were ready to accept the proposal, on the understanding that at the February-March Session the Governing Body would be free to take any decision it considered appropriate, both concerning the date and the procedure of the election. An alternative date had been proposed and this date was quite acceptable, as the term of office of the Director-General did not expire until the following year.

While he did not question the validity of the arguments concerning the uncertainty which was likely to arise if the election was deferred as well as the need to give precedence to the implementation of reforms, he contended that in fact it would be very useful to have time to reflect on the longer-term issue of the direction in which the ILO was going. It was also important for the new Governing Body, which would be elected in June 1993, to have the opportunity to address this matter.

The Chairman made it clear that the Officers of the Governing Body had merely put forward a suggestion as to the date of the election. The Officers had felt that the appropriate body to decide on the matter was the Governing Body itself.

Mr. Gopalan (Government, India) observed that in the absence of an established date, the Governing Body should follow past practice. It should therefore opt for the date proposed in the paper.

Mr. Petrov (Government, Bulgaria) and Mrs. Cabrera (Government, Venezuela) expressed the support of their respective Governments for the date proposed in paragraph 3 of the paper.

Mr. Joukowsky (Government, Belarus) endorsed the proposal made by the representative of the Government of the Philippines for setting a date in advance for future elections. He proposed that the Working Party on Improvements in the Functioning of the Governing Body should discuss this proposal and make a recommendation for approval by the Governing Body. This would certainly improve the Governing Body's work in future. His Government fully supported the date proposed in the paper.
Mr. Hashim (Government, Nigeria) endorsed the statement made by the coordinator of the African group.

Mr. Mananjara (Government, Madagascar) agreed with the date proposed in the paper for two reasons. First, there was no legal obstacle to holding the election on that date. Secondly, the ILO, under the guidance of the current Director-General, had initiated an important process of reform, the primary objective of which was improving the Organization's efficiency and achieving greater decentralization of the Organization's activities so that the latter could be closer to its constituents.

Mr. Brehoi (Government, Romania) supported the points for decision in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the paper.

Ms. Adler (Government, Denmark) stated that her Government favoured the proposed date: like other governments, it felt that a long campaign might delay the process of reform under way.

Mr. Takahashi (Government, Japan) considered it a pity that some of the views expressed confused the issue of the date of the election with another matter, namely the support to be given to a specific candidate. His Government felt that these two issues should be considered separately. He felt it was reasonable for the Director-General's election to take place after the election of the new Governing Body, so that the Director-General could assume his functions with the latter's full support.

Mr. Spring (Government, United States) said that the newly appointed Secretary for Labor of the United States, Mr. Robert Reich, was greatly interested in the work of the ILO and looked forward to attending the International Labour Conference in June 1993 and to discussing affairs concerning the Organization with his fellow ministers. Since he had been in office for such a short time, Mr. Reich had not yet had an opportunity to focus on the specific role that he wished the United States to play in the ILO so as to contribute to the successful implementation of its programmes. His Government therefore supported postponing the election until November 1993 in order to give the new Administration time to focus on these issues.

Mr. Reilly Salaverri (Government, Uruguay) stated that, while appreciating the arguments put forward in favour of postponing the election, he considered the date proposed in the Office paper reasonable. An election held on this date would be in keeping with the rules and would avoid any politicization of the issue.

Mr. Cilia-Debono (Government, Malta) expressed his Government's support for the point for decision in paragraph 3 of the paper.

Mr. Fuchs (Government, Czech Republic) said that his Government supported all the points for decision in the paper.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) said it was important to regard the election as a procedural and practical issue. Whatever date was chosen had no implication for the political content of the decision, and it was important not to confuse the two issues. She welcomed the Chairman's clarification that it was up to the Governing Body to decide. The Governing Body hardly needed to concern itself with the wording of the paper. Views had been expressed for and against both dates and these arguments all had their merits. First, concerning the need to respect custom and practice, she considered that the Employer Vice-Chairman was absolutely right in saying that this practice was in no way binding upon the members of the Governing Body. Indeed, this practice had varied to some extent on previous occasions.
However, the practice was a sound one and, unless there was a valid reason for departing from it, it should be followed. Although this argument was no overwhelming, it should be taken into account.

Secondly, she felt that it should be the present Governing Body that elected the new Director-General. This was a particularly important issue for the Government benches where there was a greater turnover at Governing Body elections than in the Employers' or Workers' groups. The election was a great burden to place on new members of the Governing Body who would have to come to grips with issues facing the Organization, its problems, work and priorities. As the present Governing Body had been in office for nearly three years and was well versed in these issues, it was well placed to take a view on this very important matter. Finally, the most convincing argument, and one which was underscored by virtually all governments, concerned the implication that a nine-month delay would have for the Organization's work. The ILO currently faced enormous challenges, including the preparation of a new regional structure. She therefore agreed with other governments that such a delay would seriously undermine much of this important work. This would be particularly detrimental to developing countries. For these reasons, she strongly supported the holding of the elections in May 1993, as this date would give three clear months for a free and fair campaign to be conducted.

Mr. Simanjuntak (Government, Indonesia) stated that he had thoroughly read the paper and had listened attentively to the previous speakers. On subject that was not included in the rules for the election of the Director-General was the appropriate length of time between the election and the date of expiration of the term of office of the outgoing Director-General. He realized that this period should not be too short, so that the new Director-General would have a sufficient time to become acquainted with his new functions. However, the period should also not be too long. If the Director-General in place was re-elected, there would be no problem. If this were not the case, however, he might find it difficult to take firm decisions. For this reason, he considered three months an appropriate length of time and therefore preferred that the election be held in November 1993. Secondly, the new membership of the Governing Body would be elected in June 1993. It would be wise if those members had an opportunity to elect the new Director-General to whom they would give their full support.

Thirdly, as in the United States, a new cabinet would soon be appointed in Indonesia and his Government would prefer if the new minister was able to contact his ministerial colleagues in Geneva before taking a decision on the candidate to be elected to the post of Director-General.

Mr. Sabari (Government, Kenya) supported the statement of the coordinator of the African group. He considered that the proposal for holding the election in November would prolong the campaign and would be to the Organization's detriment.

Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines) requested clarification as to the length of time between the expiration of Mr. Blanchard's term of office and Mr. Hansenne's election.

In reply, the representative of the Director-General (the Legal Adviser) indicated that in the election concerned the incumbent, Mr. Blanchard, had not been a candidate himself. This election had been held on 13 February 1989 for a mandate which had been due to expire on 26 February. The new Director-General had assumed his functions on 3 March 1989.

Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines) stated that though small countries like his own were often reluctant to participate in discussions of this nature, he felt it his duty as a titular member of the Governing Body to mak
he following remarks. He agreed with the statement of the representative of the Government of Japan that the issue of which candidate to support was entirely separate from that of fixing the date of the election. In drafting future rules to ensure that the date was more determinable, he would not consider personalities, but would try to be very objective and reflect on what was best for the Organization. In these rules it would be necessary to include provisions for a transition period, in the event that an incumbent, who was a candidate for re-election, might lose. Some were in favour of a long transition period, as this would give the incoming Director-General a good deal of time to become familiar with his new assignment. While this argument seemed valid, the ILO would be in the anomalous position of having two Directors-General, one incumbent and one shadow Director-General who might even be more powerful than the incumbent.

Looking at countries all over the world, it could be seen that parliamentary governments changed overnight and presidential governments hanged with a transition period of under a year. From the point of view of future rules, he would be in favour of holding the election in November.

As a relatively new member of the Governing Body, he had sought the advice of more senior members concerning this issue. He had received conflicting views, as some members had advised him to favour the postponement of the elections to November if his Government wished to support another candidate, but to opt for the May date if it wished to support the present Director-General. Some had hinted that the proposal to hold the election in May was a manoeuvre to ensure that the incumbent would win because other candidates would not have had enough time to campaign. As his Government supported the Director-General and wished any person elected to win in the fairest and most unassailable conditions possible, he favoured holding the election in November.

Mr. Mayoral (Government, Argentina) stated that his Government was prepared to support any consensus which emerged from the discussions. He considered it unfortunate that the fixing of an election date, which was essentially a procedural matter, was gradually turning into a question of substance, and the date chosen seemed to be linked to the outcome of the election. He felt that an organization such as the ILO with such a long history and great needs at the present time should really act by consensus. In the absence of a consensus, since most governments had endorsed the proposal to hold the election in May, his Government would also support that choice.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) said that, before taking a position, the Workers' group wished to have a meeting to consider all the views that had been expressed by the Government speakers and the Employer Vice-Chairman.

Ms. Zhang (Government, China) said that, after listening with great interest to the previous speakers, she considered the determination of the date of the election to be a technical matter. Her Government adopted a flexible attitude. She believed that the discussion at the present sitting should be aimed at strengthening solidarity within the ILO and promoting progress in the labour field throughout the world. She continued to hope that appropriate arrangements could be made through consensus and, in view of the fact that the majority of governments supported holding the elections in May, her Government agreed to that date.
The sitting adjourned at 11.40 a.m. and resumed at 12.40 p.m.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) welcomed the point raised by the representative of the Government of the Philippines concerning the rules to be established for the date of election of the Director-General. It was the unanimous decision of the Workers' group that the date of 27 May 1993 be upheld.

The Governing Body —

(a) decided that the election for the appointment of the Director-General should take place on Thursday, 27 May 1993, at 11 a.m.;

(b) confirmed that the rules adopted in 1988 as set out in the Appendix to the report would apply to the appointment;

(c) decided that the candidatures must reach the office of the Chairman no later than midnight on 26 April 1993 in order to be taken into consideration.

The sitting closed at 12.45 p.m.
FIFTH SITTING
(Wednesday, 3 March 1993, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.25 p.m., with Mr. Vargas Campos in the Chair.

ELEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA


Mrs. Caron (Government, Canada), as Chairperson of the Working Party, introduced its first report. She drew attention to the point for decision in paragraph 38 on the question of travel expenses. This issue had first been raised in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee in connection with the Programme and Budget proposals for 1994-95 and had then been referred to the Working Party. After a discussion, the Working Party had decided to recommend that, in view of its financial implications, this matter be further examined by the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee at its next meeting in May 1993. On the other items the Working Party had held a constructive and fruitful discussion even if it had not arrived at any firm conclusions, except on a few issues listed in paragraphs 29 and 30. Nevertheless, a number of points on which possible agreement and recommendations could be reached in future had been identified. The Working Party now required a further opportunity to pursue its discussions; paragraph 40 therefore recommended that the Governing Body should make provision for a second meeting of the Working Party at its forthcoming 256th (May 1993) Session.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) thanked Mrs. Caron for her report and welcomed her optimistic approach. Without wanting to enter into the different issues upon which there was not yet any agreement, he emphasized that the Employers' proposal mentioned in paragraph 35 was aimed at establishing an advisory group which could advise and assist the Officers of the Governing Body without in any manner superseding the latter. It had been agreed to refer the delicate issue of air travel standards of Governing Body members to the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee; however, the Employers had raised reservations which would be discussed in May. Generally speaking, reforms in the functioning of the Governing Body formed part of a whole series of reforms advocated by the Employers, which were set out in a document prepared by the International Organization of Employers. This document was being made available by the IOE secretariat.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) stated that the Workers' group had enjoyed participating in the meeting and had been interested by the different proposals emanating from all sides. This important process of self-examination would of course have to continue, but it had already resulted in unanimous agreement on the maintenance of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and the Committee on Freedom of Association.

With reference to the Government group's proposal to add one member to the Officers of the Governing Body (as indicated in paragraph 35), she emphasized that, whereas the report merely stated that the Workers had reservations on this proposal, in fact they were clearly opposed to it.
On the issue of travel standards, she recalled that the Workers had suggested the possibility of Business Class air fares for Governing Body members and all ILO staff.

The role of the International Organizations Committee was a matter of continuing concern to the Workers, and they intended to revert to it at the next meeting. While the first round of discussion on all these issues had been beneficial, there was clearly a need to hold a second and possibly a third meeting and she therefore agreed with the recommendation in paragraph 40.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) shared the view that the discussion, although of a preliminary nature, had been fruitful and was faithfully reflected in the report. Progress had clearly been made and areas identified on which agreement might be reached at a forthcoming meeting.

Mr. Hashim (Government, Nigeria) expressed concern that the importance of the Committee on Employment, as one of the three major Governing Body committees, was not taken into account in the Working Party's report (paragraph 29), and requested that the report be amended to reflect his statement in favour of retaining that Committee.

Mrs. Caron (Government, Canada) assured the previous speaker that his statement in the Working Party, like other individual comments made by other members, would be reflected in the more detailed report to be prepared by the Office for distribution to the members of the Working Party, together with a paper to serve as a basis for its further discussions.

The Chairman noted that this reply clarified the question raised by the representative of the Government of Nigeria, and recalled that he, in his capacity as Chairman of the Governing Body, and his predecessor Mr. Chotard had also participated in the discussion and would continue to do so.

Mr. Maassen (Government, Germany) welcomed the report and the fruitful discussion in the Working Party, since there was now a consensus to streamline the work of the Governing Body without prejudicing the objectives set forth in paragraph 28. He looked forward to the final report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 38 and 40 of the report.

The sitting closed at 3.45 p.m.
At this sitting, which was held in private, the Governing Body considered, under the twelfth item on its agenda (Report of the Director-General), the Fourth and Fifth Supplementary Reports, which dealt with the following questions:

- the Third Report of the Officers of the Governing Body: Representation made by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) under article 24 of the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by Myanmar of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29);

- the Fourth Report of the Officers of the Governing Body: Representation made by the Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO), the Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees (TCO) and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) under article 24 of the ILO Constitution, alleging non-observance by Sweden of the Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121).

In accordance with article 14, paragraph 4 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the minutes of this sitting are published separately.
SEVENTH SITTING
(Wednesday, 3 March 1993, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 4.50 p.m., with Mr. Vargas Campos in the Chair.

THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Consideration of the Director-General's report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories at the 80th (1993) Session of the International Labour Conference

The Chairman recalled that, following the submission at the 254th (November 1992) Session of a draft resolution on this subject by a number of regular members of the Governing Body, the latter had decided to include the above-mentioned item on the agenda of its 255th Session. The Office paper analysed the legal implications of both of the alternative proposals put forward in the resolution, either for the setting up of a Conference committee to consider the Director-General's annual report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories, or for the holding of a special sitting for its consideration. As stated in paragraph 15 of the paper, the Governing Body would have to determine whether the first of these options could meet with the necessary level of agreement or whether the consensus was still in favour of holding a special sitting to consider the Director-General's report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories under the same conditions as at the 79th Session of the Conference. If so, the Director-General might be instructed to propose similar arrangements to the Selection Committee and the Conference for approval.

In discussing this issue, it was also relevant to note that the Office had taken a series of measures to follow up on suggestions made at the previous sessions of the International Labour Conference. For example, the Office was participating in a number of international meetings on the subject of the occupied Arab territories, and it was also stepping up its technical cooperation activities for the benefit of employers and workers in these territories, for example through vocational rehabilitation projects, assistance to Palestinian refugees, workers' education seminars for Palestinian trade unionists, assistance to Palestinian employers and support to small enterprises.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the majority of the Employers' group was in favour of continuing the procedure followed at the three previous sessions of the Conference, and which was set out in detail in Appendix II to the Office paper.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) recalled that many members of the Workers' group had mixed feelings on this issue. However, in the light of the analysis contained in paragraph 10 of the Office paper, with which she agreed, the Workers' group could go along with the holding of a special sitting as in previous years, but was not prepared to go any further.

Mr. Al Suwaidi (Government, United Arab Emirates), speaking on behalf of the Arab members of the Governing Body, thanked the Office for the objective analysis presented in the paper. Like the Office, the Arab group attached a great deal of importance to the attainment of consensus and wished to ensure
that the work of the Governing Body would continue to be as smooth as possible. The main reason behind the Arab group's request for the establishment of a Conference committee to consider the report of the Director-General on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories was to activate the role of the Conference in discussing this report. The experience with the special sittings held at the three previous sessions of the Conference had shown that those sittings were not a satisfactory forum for serious in-depth discussions and for reaching positive conclusions. On the other hand, a committee would be able to submit resolutions or recommendations to the Conference in order to help the ILO in its future work in this field. This would be perfectly in line with the proposal made by the Director-General in his latest report, calling for more direct dialogue between the parties concerned on all issues relating to workers' rights in the territories and even suggesting the establishment of a mechanism, including representatives of all parties concerned, to find solutions to the labour and social problems involved. The Arab members therefore felt that such a special committee would be a useful ILO contribution towards finding just solutions to the problems of the Middle East. Moreover, in making this proposal, the Arab members had been inspired by the positive experience of the Conference Committee on Apartheid, without wishing to imitate that Committee. If the ILO was really to assume its responsibilities within its mandate, they felt that the issue should be studied in a special Conference committee, and they therefore hoped that a consensus could be reached in the Governing Body on that proposal.

Mr. Hakkou (Government, Morocco) supported the proposal made by the previous speaker for the establishment of a special Conference committee. The three years' experience with special sittings at the Conference had shown that this was not the best solution for dealing with the extensive and very serious problems faced by the workers of the occupied Arab territories, which concerned not only issues of freedom of association and discrimination, but involved the very survival of these workers and their protection against a well-organized system of immigration which was aimed at supplanting them on the labour market. The purpose in establishing this committee would be to reflect dispassionately and objectively on such problems and to come forward with concrete proposals to the Conference, aimed at alleviating the sufferings of these workers and guaranteeing them decent and stable conditions of existence. Although the financial cost involved had been invoked as an argument against setting up a special committee, this obstacle could be overcome by reducing the number of its participants and sittings so as to make it not more expensive than the special sittings held so far. As indicated in the Office paper, there was no legal obstacle to the establishment of such a committee, of course provided that it met with a similar degree of consensus as did the organization of the special sitting in the past. In the speaker's view, there was no reason why such consensus should not be attained in favour of a mechanism that would contribute effectively to the implementation of a Conference resolution, without in any way contravening the Constitution and the Standing Orders, or involving extra expenditure.

Mr. Hashim (Government, Nigeria) recalled that the African countries had experienced a similar traumatic situation in southern Africa, and they were therefore always sympathetic to the victims of such oppression and willing to give them every support. There was definitely a need to move forward on this issue beyond the existing status quo. His Government therefore wholeheartedly endorsed the reasonable and fair proposals put forward by the representative of the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) reiterated his earlier position on this issue, which was that any special procedure of this kind constituted a weakening of the ILO's regular supervision machinery and amounted to a form of discrimination. Genuine progress on this issue would only be achieved through
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and would not be furthered by holding another special sitting or establishing a special committee, which might in his view lead to a hardening of positions. He could therefore not support the proposals.

Mr. Booth (Government, United States) recalled that in the budget debate in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee he had expressed his Government's strong support for increased ILO technical cooperation in the occupied Arab territories. Secondly, he agreed fully with the previous speaker that the ILO's regular supervision procedures needed to be strengthened and should not be undermined by any special proceedings. Thirdly, his Government could not tolerate the establishment of a special Conference committee, and therefore no consensus existed on that proposal.

Mr. Kchaou (Government, Tunisia) said that his Government considered the establishment of a Conference committee to be the most appropriate means of examining the Director-General's annual report on the situation of Arab workers in Palestine and the other occupied territories. Firstly, the setting up of a committee was the normal procedure for the consideration of items, both at the Conference and in the Governing Body. This procedure enshrined the principle of tripartism and enabled a real exchange of views to take place, unlike the special sitting which was merely a succession of speeches leading to no conclusions.

Secondly, the establishment of such a Conference committee had been requested for many years by several parties in various bodies, including the Governing Body and the three special sittings held at the Conference. He also drew attention to a special resolution on Palestine adopted by the Fourth Conference of Ministers of Labour of Non-Aligned and Other Developing Countries (Tunis, November 1990), which had called for the setting up of a permanent committee at the International Labour Conference to examine the conditions of Palestinian workers and strengthen technical assistance for their benefit.

Thirdly, as shown clearly and objectively in the Office paper, there was no legal obstacle to the establishment of such a committee. Moreover, there was a greater risk of politicization at the special sitting than in a committee. Indeed, if the terms of reference of the committee were clearly spelt out when it was established, this would avert the danger of politicization feared by some. In addition, the creation of such a committee went in the same direction as the reforms recently adopted in the functioning of the Conference; because of the restricted number of its participants and sittings, it would not be more costly than the special sitting and, by meeting simultaneously with other committees, it would lead to a saving of time as compared with the special sitting, for which all other work was interrupted.

Fourthly, the situation of the Palestinian workers had some special features which did not fall within the framework of the ILO's regular supervision machinery. For this reason, the issue had been before the Conference for nearly 20 years, and two resolutions had been adopted in 1974 and 1980, respectively. The Director-General had been submitting special reports on this subject for almost 15 years. Despite numerous UN resolutions calling upon the specialized agencies to increase their assistance to the Palestinian people, ILO technical assistance to Palestinian workers and employers had so far been somewhat limited. Moreover, the situation described in the Director-General's successive reports had deteriorated constantly, as shown by the expropriation of land, the dismissal of Palestinian workers and their replacement by Jewish immigrants, the periodic closure of the territories which prevented Palestinian workers from going to their place of work, the banning of trade unions and the imprisonment without trial of their leaders, etc.
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For all these reasons, his Government supported the establishment of a special Conference committee and hoped that a consensus would be reached on that proposal.

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) noted the lack of unanimity on this question within all three groups, and it was therefore necessary to be realistic. Three years previously, a compromise had been reached with difficulty on the holding of a special sitting, and this still seemed to remain the only possible basis for a consensus. He therefore appealed to both the Arab members to content themselves this year with the holding of another special sitting, and to the other members of the Governing Body who had not agreed with that procedure but had accepted it in recent years to continue to do so.

Mr. Lin (Government, China) observed that the situation of the workers in the occupied Arab territories had not improved and no peace settlement had been reached in the Middle East. The constant bloodshed in that region was a threat to the peace process. His Government therefore hoped that the ILO would consider the just request of the Arab countries and take appropriate action.

Mr. Naar (Employer, Lebanon) said that he had listened very carefully both to the appeal made by the representative of the Government of France and to the statements made by the Employer Vice-Chairman and the Worker Vice-Chairperson on behalf of their groups. As one of the co-sponsors of the resolution submitted in November 1992, the speaker had hoped that a consensus could be reached for establishing a special Conference committee. However, he now realized that such a consensus was not attainable. In these circumstances, he drew attention to his own statement at the 252nd (February-March 1992) Session, as recorded in the minutes of that session, in which he had "accepted the Chairman's assessment of the situation in spite of the fact that he would have preferred a different result. He hoped that the Director-General would follow the discussion in the special sitting with close attention and that he would draw out conclusions therefrom that would enable the ILO to promote activities aimed at improving the conditions of workers and employers in Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories. He also trusted that the Director-General would inform the Governing Body in the appropriate manner of the result of his renewed efforts in this field". This statement had met with the agreement of the Chairman of the Governing Body one year previously. He now reiterated it with the hope that it would again meet with the acceptance of the Chairman and the Director-General.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) stated that her Government's position remained the same as in previous years. It supported the ILO's programme of technical assistance in the occupied Arab territories. While appreciating the very moderate way in which the Arab proposal for the setting up of a special committee had been put forward, her Government could not support this proposal for reasons already mentioned by other speakers. Although the United Kingdom Government continued to have some reservations about organizing a further special sitting, it could go along with any consensus in support of such a special sitting provided that it was held under exactly the same conditions as in previous years.

Mr. Guerbov (Government, Russian Federation) said that his Government supported the proposals made by the Arab members of the Governing Body for the discussion of the Director-General's report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories and could accept either of the two options proposed. It hoped that the Governing Body would be able to reach a decision on this issue on the basis of consensus.
Mr. Maassen (Government, Germany) stated that, while his Government would have difficulties in accepting that the special sitting be transformed into a permanent event, he was ready to heed the appeal launched by the representative of the Government of France and Mr. Nasr. He therefore supported the holding of a special sitting.

Mr. Simanjuntak (Government, Indonesia) stated that his Government could accept either of the two alternatives proposed as a forum for discussing the Director-General's report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories, although it had some preference for the solution advocated by the representatives of the Governments of the United Arab Emirates, Morocco and Tunisia.

Mr. Lowe (Government, Ireland) shared the Director-General's concern for the situation of workers in the occupied Arab territories. His Government considered that the three previous special sittings had provided the best compromise forum for achieving progress in this area. He therefore joined the representative of the Government of France in appealing to all the parties concerned to accept the proposal to hold another special sitting at the next session of the Conference.

Mr. Khurshid Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan) supported the technical cooperation provided by the ILO in the occupied territories and hoped that these activities would be further strengthened. The Palestinian problem was an issue of concern to the whole Middle East. Efforts were now being undertaken to bring about a settlement in the region and it was to be hoped that this would lead to positive results for the Palestinian people in its own homeland. He supported the statement made by Mr. Nasr with a view to ensuring that positive conclusions would emerge from the special sitting.

Mr. Romero (Government, Mexico) endorsed the appeal made by the representative of the Government of France. His Government supported the proposal to hold another special sitting under the same conditions as in previous years.

The Chairman noted that all speakers had agreed that the decision should be taken on the basis of consensus. What did that term exactly mean? It clearly did not imply that everyone agreed with the decision proposed because that would mean unanimity. In any consensus there could be disagreement, but meant that those who disagreed were prepared to refrain from obstructing the decision sought. After having listened to the statements made on behalf of the Employers' and Workers' groups and the various views expressed on the Government benches, and especially the statements of the Arab members of the Governing Body – all of which would be duly reflected in the minutes – he felt that there was a consensus, as so defined, in favour of holding a special sitting at the next session of the Conference to consider the report of the Director-General on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories under the same conditions as were approved at the 79th Session of the Conference. He therefore proposed to put this consensus to the Governing Body for approval.

Mr. Booth (Government, United States) stated that, within the definition of consensus given by the Chairman, his Government would not block this action, considering the fact that the same conditions would apply as at the previous session of the Conference.

The Governing Body took note of the Office paper, and in the light of its contents:
(a) decided in favour of the proposal for the holding of a special sitting at the 80th (1993) Session of the International Labour Conference for the consideration of the Director-General's report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories;

(b) invited the Director-General to submit proposals to the Selection Committee of the Conference relating to the holding of a special sitting at the 80th (1993) Session of the International Labour Conference for the consideration of his report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories, based on the arrangements worked out at the 77th (1990) Session and adjusted at the 78th (1991) and 79th (1992) Sessions of the Conference, subject to any further changes or additions which might be made thereto in the light of the Governing Body discussion.

EIGHTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

Introducing the report as Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Reilly Salavorre (Government, Uruguay) paid tribute to his predecessor, Miss Silva y Silv. (Peru), who had chaired the Committee with great efficiency.

The first of the two items considered by the Committee concerned the amendments to the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference and of the Governing Body which were necessary to give effect to the changes in the functioning of the Conference which had recently been approved by the Governing Body on the recommendation of its Working Party on Improvements in the Functioning of the International Labour Conference. These related in particular to the new discussion pattern whereby the Conference would discuss in plenary, in non-budget years, a consolidated report on the activities of the ILO and in budget years a report of the Director-General on a social policy theme. In making these proposals, the Committee decided to add sentence to article 12, paragraph 2, of the Conference Standing Orders to make it clear that this new pattern would not impede the presentation annually of reports on other questions on which the Conference may have requested the Director-General to report to it on an annual basis, such as the report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories. In addition to these various amendments, the Committee had also adopted a note concerning maritime sessions of the Conference to be included in the Conference Standing Orders.

Under the second item on its agenda, the Committee had reached agreement on a set of rules to govern the conduct of ad hoc meetings convened under the ILO's Sectoral Activities Programme, which it recommended to the Governing Body for approval.

Miss Hak (Employer, Netherlands) drew attention to two other issues that would require early consideration by the Committee. The first concerned electronic voting at the International Labour Conference. If such a system was introduced at the next session of the Conference, this would require some change in article 19 of the Conference Standing Orders, concerning the method of voting.

The second issue which the Committee would need to take up was the proposal made, during the discussion on action to be taken for the appointment...
of the Director-General, for the setting of a pre-established date for the
election of the Director-General in the rules governing that election.

As regards the items covered in the report, the Employers supported all
the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders, and in particular those that
provided for the discussion in alternate years of a consolidated report on ILO
activities and a report on a social policy theme. In this connection,
paragraph 6 of the Committee's report made it perfectly clear that the
Conference would continue to deal every year with the Director-General's
report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories.

With reference to the rules governing the conduct of ad hoc meetings
convened under the ILO's Sectoral Activities Programme, the Employers were
pleased that this issue had now finally been settled, after having been
referred back and forth several times between this Committee and the
Industrial Activities Committee. They also welcomed the very clear provision
in these rules that conclusions would only be drawn up at such meetings if so
decided by the Governing Body. Finally, they were also pleased that these
rules would not apply to meetings of experts or symposia and seminars.

Mr. Khurshid Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan), on behalf of the Workers' group,
supported all the amendments to the Standing Orders of the Conference and the
Governing Body proposed in paragraphs 15, 20, 23 and 25 of the report, as well
as the note concerning the consequential effects on maritime sessions of the
Conference. As regards the rules governing the conduct of ad hoc meetings
under the Sectoral Activities Programme, the Workers' group was of the view
that such meetings should in fact adopt conclusions, in order to ensure
appropriate follow-up by the Office to the considerable efforts put into these
meetings by the participants.

Finally, with reference to paragraph 36 of the report, the Workers hoped
that a meeting of the Committee could be convened in May 1993 in order to
consider the implications of the Advisory Opinion delivered by the Court of
Justice of the European Communities on the question of the ratification of the
Chemicals Convention, 1990 (No. 170).

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 15, 20, 23,
25 and 34 of the report.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General (cont.)1

Fourth Supplementary Report (concl.)2

Third Report of the Officers of the Governing Body:
Representation made by the International Confederation of
Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) under article 24 of the
ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by Myanmar of
the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)

1 See also first, second, sixth (private) and eighth sittings.
2 See also sixth (private) sitting.
Fifth Supplementary Report (concl.)

Fourth Report of the Officers of the Governing Body:
Representation made by the Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO),
the Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees (TCO) and the
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)
under article 24 of the ILO Constitution, alleging
non-observance by Sweden of the Employment Injury
Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121)

The Chairman announced the decisions taken by the Governing Body at its
sixth sitting, held in private.

With regard to the representation submitted by the ICFTU under article 24 of
the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by Myanmar of the Forced
Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), the Governing Body had decided that the
representation was receivable and had set up a committee for its examination,
with the following composition: Government member and Chairperson:
Mrs. Caron (Canada); Employer member: Mr. Noakes; Worker member:
Mr. Sundaram.

As regards the representation made by two Swedish confederations and the
ICFTU under article 24 of the Constitution, alleging non-observance by Sweden
of the Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121), the Governing
Body had likewise declared the representation to be receivable and had set up
a committee to examine it, composed as follows: Government member and
Chairperson: Mr. Willers (Germany); Employer member: Miss Hak; Worker
member: Mr. Brett.

The sitting closed at 6 p.m.

1 See also sixth (private) sitting.
The sitting opened at 10.20 a.m. with Mr. Vargas Campos in the Chair.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General (cont.)

Sixth Supplementary Report

Denial of the immunity from legal process of the Turin Centre

The Chairman recalled that the decision taken recently by the Italian Supreme Court could lead to a situation where an Italian court might condemn the Centre or its officials for acts that were legal as far as the Centre was concerned, but were inconsistent with Italian laws and regulations. This contradicted the principle of independence of international organizations. The Director-General had immediately expressed his concern to the Italian Government and an emergency meeting had been organized between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the representatives of the ILO and the Turin Centre. At that meeting in Rome, it had been agreed that the Government and the ILO should conclude as soon as possible an agreement complementary to the one that had been signed in 1964 on the privileges and immunities of the Centre, which would then be submitted to Parliament for approval. The point for decision in paragraph 5 of the report related to the speeding up of the conclusion of that complementary agreement.

Mr. Mascia (Government, Italy) remarked that the executive and judicial branches of the power in Italy disagreed on the interpretation of the principle in question. The Government had taken the same position as the ILO but the judgement rendered by the Italian Supreme Court had ruled against it. He underlined the will of the Government to find a long-term solution to this problem by concluding a complementary agreement which would then be approved by Parliament. He encouraged the Board of the Turin Centre to meet in Turin without hesitation.

The Chairman highlighted the importance of the statement of the representative of the Italian Government.

Mr. Vanni (Worker, Italy) welcomed the proposed solution and stated the Workers' support for the point for decision.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the agreement of the Employers with the recommendation in paragraph 5 and welcomed the statement of the representative of the Government of Italy. He underlined the importance of the continuing support of the Government of Italy, without which the Turin Centre would not exist and which would certainly play an important role in finding a solution to the present problem.

1 See below and also first, second, sixth (private) and seventh sittings.
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Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines) wished to ascertain that the point for decision would not be interpreted as confining the authority of the Director-General to concluding the draft agreement mentioned in paragraph 3 of the report. Rather, he should have full power and authority to negotiate an agreement with the Italian Government in order to solve the problem. As a member of the Board of the Turin Centre, he wished to be informed about the circumstances which had led the Centre to invoke diplomatic immunity and suggested that an explanation be offered by the management of the Turin Centre at the next meeting of the Board. While agreeing with the principle of immunity from legal process, he pointed out that there was a moral obligation on the part of the Centre to comply with Italian law to the extent possible.

The Chairman believed that there was no need for amending paragraph 3 because its spirit conformed to the concern expressed by the representative of the Government of the Philippines.

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

Seventh Supplementary Report

Fifth Report of the Officers of the Governing Body: Requests from non-governmental international organizations wishing to be represented at the 80th (1993) Session of the International Labour Conference

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 7(a) and (b) of the report.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee

FIRST REPORT

The representative of the Director-General (the Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) - reported that the contributions which had been received since the last meeting of the Committee on 16 February 1993 and the amount of which was given in Swiss francs, were as follows: Cameroon - 93,000; Costa Rica - 45,000; Denmark - 1,706,000; France - 16,128,000; Nepal - 18,000; the Russian Federation - 3,026,000; San Marino - 28,000; and Turkey - 485,000. The total of these contributions amounted to 21.53 million Swiss francs. Denmark, France, Nepal and San Marino had now paid their 1993 contributions in full.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 2 to 6 of the report.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 7 to 12 of the report.

Miss Mackie (Employer, United Kingdom) pointed out that the Employer could not support the recommendation in paragraph 64 of the report. She believed that the temporary inability of some governments to pay their 1700G/v.3
The assessed contributions in time was a structural rather than an ad hoc problem and suggested that the Governing Body establish criteria on the basis of which the Director-General could propose the best course of action when such problems arose in the future. The Employers also regretted that the proposals or expenditure reductions were being discussed as a package and that the Governing Body did not have the possibility of relating them to some re-established criteria.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 64 of the report.

The Governing Body took note of the information contained in paragraphs 5 and 66 of the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 68 of the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 77 of the report.

The Governing Body took note of the information in paragraph 78 of the report.

Mr. Kazmi (Government, Pakistan), referring to paragraphs 79 to 82 of the report concerning the ILO premises in New Delhi, supported the point for decision in paragraph 83. However, he wished to request the Government of India through the Governing Body not to charge the ILO with tax on the transfer of property. He pointed out that in other parts of the world legislation usually had a provision under which a government could exempt a particular transaction from being charged tax on transfer of property.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 83 of the report.

The Governing Body took note of paragraph 84 of the report.

Mr. Willers (Government, Germany) referred to paragraphs 85 to 90 on the cooperation between the ILO and the European Communities (EC) and proposed that the ILO draw on the financial resources of the PHARE programme of the EC or providing support for Central and Eastern European countries as well as for countries of the former USSR. He expressed the wish to receive, at the May 1993 Session of the Governing Body, an Office paper informing the Governing Body whether the financial regulations of the ILO could be adjusted in a way as to enable the Organization to benefit from available EC resources, or whether this could be done without amending the financial regulations of the ILO.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 85 to 90 of the report.

SECOND REPORT: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) regretted that the statement of the representative of the Staff Union in the Committee could not be followed by some questions and answers due to the fact that it was usually the last item to be taken at the end of a long day. She wished to place on record the conviction of the Workers that the representative of the Staff Union should be entitled to be present and to reply to the statement of the representative of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), in particular in view of the need to clarify certain misconceptions. The Workers
were of the opinion that the Director-General was perfectly capable of negotiating with the Staff Union and its representatives and it was not permissible for a New York-based representative of the ICSC to advise the Director-General on staff-related questions, especially if the Staff Union had no opportunity to reply to some of the points which were either misconstrued or not factual. In the future, the Workers wished to follow a procedure which would enable the Chairperson of the Staff Union to comment on the statement of the representative of the ICSC, whether the latter spoke in the Programme Financial and Administrative Committee or in the Governing Body itself. Another procedure would be unacceptable to the Workers, just as it would be at the national level, and this should be clearly understood in the interest of both groups and the entire Governing Body.

Miss Mackie (Employer, United Kingdom) expressed support for the recommendations in paragraph 34(a), (b), (c) and (d) of the report and for the amendment to point 34(b) which referred to the possibility of the Director-General inviting a representative of the ICSC to meetings at which proposals pertaining to staff entitlements were discussed. She pointed out that the Employers supported the right of the representative of the Staff Union to address the Committee, as it had been the case so far, and that this had usually been the first item on the agenda under personnel questions. The Employers welcomed the comments of the representative of the Staff Union when they were made and did not challenge her right to make reference to items which were on the agenda of the Committee. The speaker felt that discussion items which might, in the worst case, be confrontational, should be avoided in the Committee. She believed that it was for the Officers of the Programme Financial and Administrative Committee to consider whether to change the practice so far followed in the Committee. She felt that the Committee's present method of work was satisfactory and hoped that it could be maintained without change.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) said that it was not a question of debating or negotiating and insisted on the right of the representative of the Staff Union to clarify errors or correct possible misunderstandings after the statement of the representative of the ICSC.

Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines) supported the position of the Workers' group with the clear understanding that no decision was being taken to that effect at this stage.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 34 and 38 of the report.

THIRD REPORT: PROGRAMME AND BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 1994–95

Miss Mackie (Employer, United Kingdom) recalled that the Employers' group was dissatisfied with the draft programme and budget proposals because they believed that at this particular point the Organization should mobilize all its efforts in support of employment creation. The Employers were also dissatisfied with the procedure and the structure of the budget discussion. She wished to put on record the decision of the Employers' group not to support the programme and budget proposals and not to propose their adoption to the Conference. This decision should be interpreted as signifying the Employers' conviction of the need for change and their willingness to take part in it, rather than uncertainty or lack of interest. Whereas the Employers were unable to support the proposals, they did not wish to be destructive as to vote against it.
Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) regretted the position of the Employers. She hoped that this decision was not based on the belief that employment creation was the only role of the ILO. Turning to paragraph 562, she recalled the firm understanding of the Workers that the Director-General was committed to maintaining a separate, independent unit with sufficient resources for activities relating to multinational enterprises. Without this commitment the Workers could not have agreed to certain parts of the proposed budget. She hoped that by the time of the next programme and budget discussion the Employers would have reason to change their opinion.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) reiterated his opposition to the principle of zero growth and pointed to paragraphs 36 and 37 of the Committee's report in which his underlying arguments were recorded.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) paid tribute to Miss Carol Robson, a long-serving member of the Government delegation of the United Kingdom, who as a consequence of a new assignment in London, would not attend the meetings of the Governing Body any longer. She had for some five years served in all UN agencies in Geneva but had gained particular distinction in the ILO's Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee through her thorough knowledge of such arcane matters as the Working Capital Fund, the Terminal Benefits Fund and the lapse factor, which had been a source of wonder and admiration to all members of the Governing Body. She believed that Miss Robson's understanding of these matters was probably unrivalled. She therefore wished to place on record her Government's and her own personal appreciation of Miss Robson's excellent work.

The Chairman, speaking for all those present, joined the previous speaker in paying tribute to Miss Robson for her dedicated and efficient cooperation with the Governing Body.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 568 of the report.

THIRTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) considered that it would have been more correct, in view of the provisions of article 2, paragraph 3(b), of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference, to have submitted the proposal in paragraph 1 of the paper to the Governing Body for a decision to authorize the Director-General to invite the association concerned to the 80th Session of the Conference.

The Chairman took it that there was no objection to inviting the Latin American Integration Association to the Conference.

It was so agreed.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 6 of the Office paper.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) indicated that on the list of Employer substitute members nominated for participation in the
Tripartite Meeting on Safety and Related Issues Pertaining to Work on Offshore Petroleum Installations, four other names should be added, and these would be communicated in writing to the Office.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 8 and 10 of the paper.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 13, 17 and 20 seriatim.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) asked whether the Tripartite Regional Meeting of Experts on Social Security in the Americas included also Canada and the United States.

The Chairman replied in the affirmative.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 23, 25 and 29 of the paper.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Symposia, seminars and similar meetings

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), referring to paragraph 4 of the Office paper, expressed satisfaction at the fact that seven countries would be represented by a tripartite delegation at the Tripartite Seminar on National and International Labour Standards for English-speaking Countries of Southern Africa. Noting also that the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) would be invited to send an observer, he pointed out that it would be desirable to invite also a representative each of the workers' organizations and employers organizations, which existed already or were in the process of being established in South Africa.

The representative of the Director-General (Mrs. Chinery-Hesse, Deputy Director-General, Technical Cooperation and Field Programmes Sector) assured the previous speaker that his point would be taken into consideration when the decisions would be taken in response to the new situation in South Africa.

Mr. El-Telawi (representative, Arab Labour Organization) pointed to an error in the Office paper concerning the ILO/ALO Seminar on the Role of Employers' Organizations in the Promotion of Entrepreneurial Spirit and the Development of Small-sized Private Enterprises in the Arab States. According to the timetable appended to the paper, this seminar was to be held from 19 to 21 April 1993, whereas paragraph 55 of the Office paper reported that this seminar had been postponed to the first half of 1994. Furthermore, he inquired whether the two UNDP-financed events, namely the Subregional Trainers' Course in Labour Inspection in Arab States, to be held in April 1993 in an Arab country, and the Subregional Seminar on the Cooperation between Labour Inspection, Labour Courts and the Social Partners in Arab Countries, to be held in June in Tunis, Tunisia, were planned in the context of the Regional Arab Project for Labour Administration (RAPLA) which had its headquarters in Tunis or whether they would be organized independently.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Dajani, Assistant Director-General responsible for ILO activities in the Arab States) said that...
the previous speaker was correct in pointing out the error and confirmed that the seminar in question had been postponed to 1994. As to the point concerning RAPLA, he promised to provide the requested information after consulting the technical department concerned.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) requested that meetings of this kind organized in the Asian continent include participants from Western Asia and that, whenever possible, participants from other Asian countries be invited to meetings in Arab Western Asia. He felt that the paper included several meetings where this idea could be reinforced.

Mr. Al-Jassem (Employer, Kuwait) associated himself with Mr. Nasr's statement concerning meetings in the Asian region. He thanked the ILO for showing interest in the organization of seminars in the Arab region. Turning to the information contained in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Office paper concerning the Asian Inter-Country Symposium on Remittance Services for Migrant Workers, he regretted that no Arab countries were being invited to a symposium, the subject of which was of vital concern to the governments, employers and workers of Arab countries. While he understood that the financing of the event by the UNDP placed certain limits on participation, he encouraged the ILO to take this matter up with the organizations concerned, including the UNDP.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Dajani) assured the previous speakers that the Office was regularly making a complete inventory of the meetings planned for the Asian and Pacific region. Among those which were included in the Office paper under consideration, there were two, which included Arab participants from the West Asia region, namely the Asian-Pacific Symposium on Standards-related Topics (Beijing, 30 March–2 April 1993), to which Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and Yemen had been invited, and the Asian-Pacific Regional Technical Workshop for Chiefs of National Safety and Health Administrations (New Delhi, 1–2 April 1993), to which Bahrain and the Syrian Arab Republic had been invited. He stressed that the Office made every effort to ensure interaction between the various subregions of Asia.

The Governing Body took note of the Office paper.

SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Programme of meetings

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) pointed to a certain inconsistency in determining the duration of meetings. The duration of Regional Conferences, which was fixed by the Governing Body, had been reduced whereas other meetings remained quite long in comparison with those conferences. Furthermore, the duration of some meetings had actually been increased, such as that of the Tripartite Meeting on Productivity and Employment in Commerce and Offices, which would now last nine days whereas the Programme and Budget had foreseen only seven.

Mr. Hashim (Government, Nigeria) expressed the wish to bring forward the date of the African Regional Conference to August 1993, so as to enable him to attend it, in view of the fact that he would relinquish his present duties at the end of that month.
The Clerk of the Governing Body pointed out that the African Regional Conference was now scheduled for the biennium 1994—95 and its exact dates had already been carefully negotiated with the host government. Consequently, it could not be advanced to August 1993.

The Governing Body approved the programme of meetings for the remainder of 1993 and for 1994.

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS FOR THE 256TH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

Mr. Chotard (Government, France) remarked that there had been two-and-a-half slack days during this session of the Governing Body. He asked the Office to re-examine the question of the duration of the Governing Body in order to ensure that this situation would not recur in future.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) expressed the hope that meetings would not be reduced in length to the point at which they would become useless. The Workers felt that much was accomplished during them. She pointed out that the ILO staff had to work extremely hard in preparing in-session documents for the Governing Body. Those who felt that they had two-and-a-half free days spoke only for themselves.

The Chairman confirmed that the duration of the Governing Body was fixed in such a way as to allow sufficient time for the preparation of documents including the weekend. Moreover, the two days of the weekend had to be included in case they were required for extended discussions.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) assumed that the sitting foreseen for 27 May 1993 at 11.00 a.m. would, in accordance with the usual practice, be a private sitting. If so, it would be appropriate to specify this in the programme.

(These nominations have been transferred to the sixth sitting (private), for the sake of consistency.)

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General (cont.)

First Supplementary Report

World Summit for Social Development (concl.)

The Clerk of the Governing Body announced the following nomination received from the three groups for membership of the Governing Body's Working Party on the World Summit for Social Development:

---

1 See also above, and first, second, sixth (private) and seventh sittings.

2 See also first sitting.
Government members: Brazil 
Germany 
India 
Nigeria 
Russian Federation

Employer members: Mr. Al—Jassem 
Mr. Eurnekian 
Mr. Katz 
Mr. Lacasa Aso 
Mr. Owuor

Worker members: Mr. Ahmed 
Mr. Blondel 
Mr. Fergusson 
Mr. Kebe 
Mr. Tapiola

Substitutes: Mr. Brett 
Mr. Gopal 
Mr. Trotman

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairperson) added the name of Mr. Bustos to the list of substitute Worker members.

The Governing Body approved these nominations.

Mr. Rhenan Segura (Government, Costa Rica) asked whether the chairmen of the Committee on Employment, the Committee on Discrimination and the International Organizations Committee could take part in the meetings of the Working Party on the World Summit for Social Development.

The Chairman replied that this decision belonged to the Working Party itself.

OTHER MATTERS

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada, Worker Vice-Chairperson) recalled that the International Women's Day would be celebrated on 8 March and that its themes were women at risk, violence against women and young women. Considering the extreme and unacceptable violence against women in Bosnia—Herzegovina, in other hot spots around the world and in the member States of the ILO, she encouraged everybody to reflect about the circumstances women had to face and to participate in the activities organized for commemorating that day all over the world.

The 255th Session of the Governing Body was declared closed at 12.45 p.m.
LISTE DES PERSONNES QUI ONT ASSISTE À LA 255e SESSION DU CONSEIL D'ADMINISTRATION

LIST OF PERSONS WHO ATTENDED THE 255th SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

LISTA DE LAS PERSONAS QUE ESTUVIERON PRESENTES EN LA 255.ª REUNION DEL CONSEJO DE ADMINISTRACION

I. MEMBRES TITULAIRES ET LEURS SUPPLEANTS
I. REGULAR MEMBERS AND THEIR SUBSTITUTES
I. MIEMBROS TITULARES Y SUS SUPLENTES

MEMBRES GOUVERNEMENTAUX* 
GOVERNMENT MEMBERS* 
MIEMBROS GUBERNAMENTALES*

Allemagne/Germany/Alemania

MAASSEN, Hans Joachim, Mr., Head of the Section for Social Policy Abroad, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

substitute:

WILLERS, Dietrich, Mr., Head, ILO Affairs Division, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

accompanied by:

WESTPHALEN, Gisbert Graf, Section Chief, Ministry of Finances.
SCHLEGER, Magdalena, Mrs., Substitute Head, ILO Affairs Division, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
OHNDORF, Wolfgang, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Germany in Geneva.
WETZ, Clemens, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Germany in Geneva.
HOFFMANN, Suzanne, Mrs., ILO Affairs Division, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

* Ordre alphabétique français/French alphabetical order/Orden alfabético francés.
Australie/Australia

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

substitutes:

WENSLLEY, Penny, Ms., Permanent Representative of Australia in Geneva.
MARKS, Greg, Mr., Director, International Relations, Department of Industrial Relations.

accompanied by:

KNOTT, Chris, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva.

Bangladesh

FARID, Shah Mohammad, Mr., Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Manpower.

substitute:

OSMANY, Mufleh R., H.E., Mr., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Bangladesh in Geneva.

accompanied by:

ALI, Ashraf, Mr., Deputy Chief, Ministry of Labour and Manpower.
KARIM, Iftikharul, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh in Geneva.

Belarus/Belgium/Bélgica

LEEMANS, Eduard, M., ministre d'État.

suppléant:

VANDAMME, François, M. conseiller, service des relations internationales, ministère de l'Emploi et du Travail.

accompagné de:

REYN, Alex, S.E., M., ambassadeur; représentant permanent de Belgique à Genève.
CLOESEN, Joseph, M., conseiller adjoint, service des relations internationales, ministère de l'Emploi et du Travail.
GEDOPT, Marc, M., premier secrétaire, mission permanente de Belgique à Genève.
Brésil/Brazil/Brasil

UR, Bahij Amin, Mr., Adviser of the Labour Secretary of the State of São Paulo.

substitutes:

OSANNAH DE MATTOS, Eduardo, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Brazil in Geneva.

A SILVA, Roque Aparecido, Sr., Secretary of Labour, Ministry of Labour.

Bulgarie/Bulgaria

STROV, Branimir, Mr., Counsellor, Expert at the "Foreign Economic Policy" Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

accompanied by:

ALTOV, Atanas, Mr., Chargé d'affaires, Permanent Mission of Bulgaria in Geneva.

ARKOVA, Plamenka, Mrs., Chief Expert at the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Cameroun/Cameroon/Camerún

BILA, Simon, M., ministre du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale.

accompagné de:

JUBEYOU, François-Xavier, S.E., M., ambassadeur; représentant permanent du Cameroun à Genève.

YANGANG, Claire, Mme, directeur du Travail, ministère du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale.

ANTOH, Charles C., M., premier secrétaire, mission permanente du Cameroun à Genève.

Canada/Canadá

ARON, Lucille, Mrs., Executive Director, Bureau of International Affairs Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Canada on the Governing Body.

substitute:

JSMAN, John, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Canada.

Chine/China

YN, Yongjian, H.E., Mr., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China in Geneva.
substitutes:

ZHANG, Youyun, Ms., Director, Department of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Labour.

ZHANG, Wei, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China in Geneva.

accompanied by:

LIN, Maizhu, Mr., Branch Chief, Department of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Labour.

ZHANG, Gengchen, Mr., Deputy Chief of Branch, Institute of International Labour Study, Ministry of Labour.

WANG, Jiyuan, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China in Geneva.

GUAN, Jinghe, Ms., Official, Department of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Labour.

Costa Rica

RHENAN SEGURA, Jorge, S.E., Sr., Embajador; representante permanente adjunto de Costa Rica en Ginebra.

suplente:

RODRIGUEZ, Javier A., Sr., Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente de Costa Rica en Ginebra.

acompañado de:

RODRIGUEZ HERNANDEZ, Gloriana, Srita., Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente de Costa Rica en Ginebra.

Emirats arabes unis/United Arab Emirates/Emiratos Arabes Unidos

AL SUWAIDi, Mohamed Eissa, Mr., Under Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

substitute:

AL MUHAIRI, Salim, Ali, Mr., Director of International Labour Relations Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

accompanied by:

SIRAG ELNOUR, Yousif Gaafar, Mr., Labour Adviser, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Etats-Unis/United States/Etados Unidos

SPRING, Charles H., Mr., Director, Office of International Organizations, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor.

accompanied by:

BOOTH, Richard T., Mr., Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva.
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GRAISS, Gamal R., Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva.

KRISHER-CLIVER, Margaret A., Ms., Office of UN System Budgets, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State.

NISNER, Julia E., Ms., Office of International Organizations, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor.

PETERSON, David, Mr., Senior Policy Adviser, Office of Economic Policy, Department of Commerce.

QUEBENSAAL, Clayton R., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva.

COHN, Richard H., Mr., Deputy Director for Industrial and Communications Programs, Office of Technical Specialized Agencies, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State.

France/Francia

HOTARD, Yvon, M., président de groupe au Conseil économique et social; représentant du gouvernement de la France au Conseil d'administration.

suppléant:

LAMOND, Maurice, M., inspecteur général des affaires sociales; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la France au Conseil d'administration.

accompagné de:

MONNEVILLE, Patrick, M., conseiller des affaires étrangères, mission permanente de la France à Genève.


OJANNOT, Jean-Marie, M., conseiller, mission permanente de la France à Genève.

Inde/India

OPALAN, S., Mr., Secretary, Ministry of Labour.

substitute:

ULALA, Lalfak, Mr., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour.

accompagned by:

TRUMURTI, T.S., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva.

Italie/Italy/Italia

ORENZO BADIA DI, Giulio Cesare, S.E., M. ambassadeur; représentant permanent de l'Italie à Genève.

suppléants:

ALCAVI, Domenico, M., directeur général de l'Emploi, ministère du Travail.

ALBONI, Alberto, M., ministre conseiller, représentant permanent adjoint de l'Italie à Genève.
accompagné de:

MASCIA, Gian Luigi, M., premier conseiller, mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève.
CARLA, Daniela, Mme, conseiller, ministère du Travail.

**Japon/Japan/Japón**

UKAWA, Hidetoshi, H.E., Mr., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of Japan in Geneva; representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body.

substitutes:

TAKAHASHI, Sakutaro, Mr., Assistant Minister of Labour, Ministry of Labour; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body.
ITO, Tetsuo, Mr., Minister, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body.
WAKAKI, Fumio, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body.
HIGASHI, Yoshinobu, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body.
MIYOSHI, Mary, Ms., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body.
YOSHIZumi, Yukiya, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body.

accompanied by:

YOSHIKAWA, Akira, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva.
MORIKAWA, Yoshiki, Mr., Section Chief, International Labour Affairs Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Labour.

**Lesotho**

THAMAE, C.T., Mr., Principal Secretary, Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare.

substitute:

FANANA, N.M., Mr., Labour Commissioner.

**Madagascar**

MANANJARA, Jules, M., ministre du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale.

suppléant:

RADAODY RAKOTONDRAVAO, Laurent, S.E., M., ambassadeur; représentant permanent de Madagascar à Genève.

accompagné de:

RAZAFIMBELO, Toussaint, M., directeur des études et des relations extérieures EDAFE Phabien, M., conseiller, mission permanente de Madagascar à Genève.
Maroc/Morocco/Marruecos

HAKKOU, Mahmoud, M., directeur du travail, ministère de l'Emploi; représentant du gouvernement du Maroc au Conseil d'administration.

suppléant:

BAALLAL, Mohamed, M., chef du Service des organismes internationaux du travail, ministère de l'Emploi.

Mexique/Mexico/México

VARGAS CAMPOS, Marcelo, S.E., Sr., Embajador; representante permanente alterno de México en Ginebra; Presidente del Consejo de Administración de la OIT.

suplentes:

GOMEZPERALTA DAMIRON, Manuel, Sr., Subsecretario A, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social.
ROMERO, Eusebio, Sr., Tercer Secretario, Misión Permanente de México en Ginebra.

Nigeria/Nigeria

HASHIM, A.M.S., Mr., Director General, Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity; representative of the Government of Nigeria on the Governing Body.

accompanied by:

WILLIAMS, F.O., Mr., Director, Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity.
OKON, J.T., Mr., Deputy Director, International Labour Relations Division, Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity.
ODEWUNMI, A.P., Mr., Labour Officer, Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity.

Philippines/Filipinas

PALMA, Leo J., Mr., Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Philippines in Geneva.

accompanied by:

CASTRO—MULLER, Bernaditas, Mrs., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Philippines in Geneva.

Royaume-Uni/United Kingdom/Reino Unido

substitute:

ANDREWS, K., Mr., Senior Executive Officer, International Relations Branch, Department of Employment.

accompanied by:

WESTON, M., Mr., Head of International Relations Branch, Department of Employment.
LEWIS, L.W., Mr., Head of International Division, Department of Employment.
CHAPLIN, E.G.M., Mr., Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva.
ROBSON, C., Miss, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva.
PERRY, G., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva.
BOARDMAN, S., Miss, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva.

Fédération de Russie/Russian Federation/Federación de Rusia

KRASILNIKOV, Sergei P., M., directeur adjoint, Département des relations internationales, ministère du Travail.

suppléants:

LOCHTCHININE, V.V., M., représentant permanent adjoint de la Fédération de Russie à Genève.
GUERBOV, V.M., M., conseiller, ministère des Affaires étrangères.
ORLOV, A.V., M., conseiller principal, mission permanente de la Fédération de Russie à Genève.

accompagné de:

MELEKH, A.I., M., attaché, mission permanente de la Fédération de Russie à Genève.
TCHERNIKOV, Pavel, G. M., troisième secrétaire, mission permanente de la Fédération de Russie à Genève.

Uruguay

REILLY SALAVERRI, Ricardo, Sr., Viceministro de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.

Venezuela

CABRERA, María Elena, Sra., Directora General Sectorial de las Relaciones Internacionales y Enlace, Ministerio del Trabajo.

acompañada de:

PESTANA MACEDO, Carlos, Sr., Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra.
MEMBRES EMPLOYEURS
EMPLOYER MEMBERS
MIEMBROS EMPLEADORES

EURNEKIAN, Muriat, Sr., (Argentina), Union Industrial Argentina.
GAZARIN, A., Mr. (Egypt), President, Federation of Egyptian Industries.
HAK, Cornelie, Miss (Netherlands), Adviser, International Labour Affairs,
Netherlands Council of Employers' Federations.
KATZ, A., Mr. (United States), President, United States Council for
International Business.
MACKIE, Anne M., Miss (United Kingdom), CBI, International Consultant.
MOUKOKO KINGUE, F., M. (Cameroun), président de l'Union des syndicats
professionnels du Cameroun.
NASR, M., Mr. (Lebanon), Association of Lebanese Industrialists.
OECHSLIN, Jean-Jacques, M. (France), délégué du Conseil national du patronat
français pour les relations avec l'OIT; Vice-président du Conseil
d'administration.
OWUOR, T.D., Mr. (Kenya), Executive Director, Federation of Kenya Employers.
PERIQUET, Aureli, Mr. (Philippines), President, Pacific Union Insurance
Company.
SANTOS NEVES, J., Sr. (Brasil), Vicepresidente, Confederacão Nacional da
Industria.
TABANI, A., Mr. (Pakistan), President, Employers' Federation of Pakistan.
THUESING, Rolf, Mr. (Germany), Member, Executive Board, Confederation of
German Employers' Association.
TSUJINO, Hiroshi, Mr. (Japan), Adviser, Mitsubishi Chemical Industries, Ltd;
Member of the Board of Nikkeiren.

* * *

BALBOUL, Fouad, M., suppléant personnel de M. Nasr.
CORNACCHIO, Kevin J., Mr., Manager, International Labor Affairs, US Council
for International Business; personal substitute for Mr. Katz.
SUZUKI, Toshio, Mr., Director, International Division, Japan Federation of
Employers' Associations; personal substitute for Mr. Tsujino.

MEMBRES TRAVAILLEURS
WORKER MEMBERS
MIEMBROS TRABAJADORES

AHMED, K., Mr. (Pakistan), General Secretary, All-Pakistan Federation of
Trade Unions.
BRETT, William, Mr. (United Kingdom), General Secretary, Institution of
Professionals, Managers and Specialists.
BUSTOS, Manuel, Sr. (Chile), Presidente, Central Unitaria de Trabajadores.
CARR, Shirley, Mrs. (Canada), Canadian Labour Congress; Vice-Chairperson of
the Governing Body.
ENGELEN-KEFER, Ursula, Mrs. (Germany), Vice-President, German Confederation of
Trade Unions (DGB).
GOPAL, V.G., Mr. (India), Vice-President, Indian National Trade Union Congress.
GRAY, Charles, Mr. (United States), International Affairs Director, AFL-CIO.
KEBE, Mohamed S., M. (Guinée), secrétaire général, Confédération nationale
des travailleurs de Guinée.
KLOCHKOV, I.E., Mr. (Russia), President, Federation of Independent Trade
Unions of the Russian Federation.
MARUYAMA, Yasuo, Mr. (Japan), Adviser, Japanese Trade Union Confederation
(JTUC-RENGO).
MENDOZA, D.T., Mr. (Philippines), President, Trade Union Congress of the Philippines.
MUGALLA, Joseph, Mr. (Kenya), Secretary General, Central Organisation of Trade Unions.
SANCHEZ MADARIAGA, Alfonso, Sr. (Mexico), secretario de relaciones internacionales, Confederación de Trabajadores de México.
TAPIOLA, Karl, Mr. (Finland), Director for International Affairs, Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions SAK.

* * *

ADAMY, Wilhelm, Mr., accompanying Mrs. Engelen-Kefer.
MALLON, Brian, Mr., accompanying Mrs. Carr.
RECHETNIKOV, Eugen, Mr., accompanying Mr. Klochkov.
STAMPFLI-HAYASHIBARA, Michiko, Mrs., accompanying Mr. Maryuama.
STEYNE, Simon B., Mr., accompanying Mr. Brett.

II. MEMBRES ADJoints ET LEURS SUPPLEANTS
II. DEPUTY MEMBERS AND THEIR SUBSTITUTES
II. MIEMBROS ADJUNTOS Y SUS SUPLENTES

MEMBRES GOUVERNEMENTAUX ADJoints
GOVERNMENT DEPUTY MEMBERS
MIEMBROS GUBERNAMENTALES ADJUNTOS

Argentine/Argentina

MAYORAL, César, Sr., Consejero, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra; representante del Gobierno de Argentina ante el Consejo de Administración.

acompañado de:

MALP jede, Diego, Sr., Secretario de embajada, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra.

Bolivie/Bolivia

SORUCO, Jorge, S.E., Sr., Embajador; representante permanente de Bolivia en Ginebra.

suplente:

BANZER, Wilma, Sra., Consejero, Misión Permanente de Bolivia en Ginebra.

République centrafricaine/Central African Republic/República centrafricana

OGBAMI, Fidèle, M., ministre de la Fonction publique, du Travail, de la Sécurité sociale et de la Formation professionnelle.
accompagné de:

‘ANGO-SINDO, Alexandre Desiré, M., directeur général du Travail, de l'Emploi et de la Formation professionnelle.

Congo

NdELY-BEEVE, M., ministre du Travail, de l'Emploi, chargé de la gestion des ressources humaines.

suppléant:

1. NZABA, Anatole, M., directeur général du Travail.

accompagné de:

MOUROU, Joseph, M., attaché au cabinet du ministre, ministère du Travail, de l'Emploi, chargé de la gestion des ressources humaines.

Danemark/Denmark/Dinamarca

ADLER, Lone, Ms., Special Adviser to the Minister of Labour in International Affairs; representative of the Government of Denmark on the Governing Body.

substitutes:

EDELBERG, Einar, Mr., Head of Division, Ministry of Labour.
EKMANN JENSEN, Helle, Ms., Head of Section, International Relations Division, Ministry of Labour.
JORGENSEN, Peter, Mr., Counsellor (Labour Affairs), Permanent Mission of Denmark in Geneva.

Honduras

CARIAS ZAPATA, María Guadalupe, Sra., consejera, misión permanente de Honduras en Ginebra.
TURCIO DIAZ, Marlen, Srta., primer secretario, misión permanente de Honduras en Ginebra.

Indonésie/Indonesia

SIMANJUNTAK, Payaman, Mr., Director-General, Industrial Relations, Development of Labour Standards, Minister of Manpower; representative of the Government of Indonesia on the Governing Body.

substitutes:

KURDI, Mulyadi, Mr., Senior Adviser to the Minister of Manpower.
SUPARMAN, Soepomo, Mr., Head of Sub-Directorate of Information, Publication and Documentation, Department of Manpower.
MARDI, Frans, Mr., Official, Department of Manpower.
accompanied by:

ABAS, Musma Musa, Ms., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva.
JAYA, Heri Indra, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva.

Irlande/Ireland/Irlanda

LOWE, J., Mr., Assistant-Secretary, Department of Enterprise and Employment.

substitutes:

SWIFT, John, F., H.E. Mr., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Ireland in Geneva.
FLOINN, Colm O., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ireland in Geneva.
TISDALL, Brian, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of Ireland in Geneva.

Kenya

SABARI, J.T.N., Mr., Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Kenya on the Governing Body.

substitute:


Malte/Malta

CILIA—DEBONO, E., Mr., Director of Labour and Emigration, Department of Labour and Emigration.

substitute:

FARRUGIA, R., Mr., Management Duty Officer, Ministry of Education and Human Resources.

Nouvelle-Zélande/New Zealand/Nueva Zelandia

RICHARDS, Margaret, Ms., International Liaison Officer, Department of Labour.

substitute:

DUNCAN, Lucy, Ms., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of New Zealand in Geneva.

Pakistan/Pakistán

KAZMI, Safdar Hussain, Mr., Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
accompanied by:

AALOCH, Irfan, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan in Geneva.

Pérou/Perú/Perú

JRRUTIA CERUTI, José, S.E., Sr., Embajador; representante permanente del Perú en Ginebra.

suplentes:

ILVA y SILVA, Rosa Esther, Srta., Ministra, Misión Permanente del Perú en Ginebra; representante alterna del Gobierno del Perú ante el Consejo de Administración.

INCOPA, Romy, Srta., Tercera Secretaria, Misión Permanente del Perú en Ginebra.

Roumanie/Romania/Rumania

BREHOI, Gheorghe, M., secrétaire d'Etat, ministère du Travail et de la Protection sociale; représentant du gouvernement de la Roumanie au Conseil d'administration.

suppléant:

IRCEA, Tudor, M., conseiller, mission permanente de Roumanie à Genève; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la Roumanie au Conseil d'administration.

accompagné de:

BABEAIU, Constantin, M., conseiller, ministère du Travail et de la Protection sociale.

République tchèque/Czech Republic/República Checa

FUCHS, Miroslav, Mr., Deputy Director of the International Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs; representative of the Government of the Czech Republic on the Governing Body.

accompagné par:

BERANEK, Milan, Mr., Head of Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

INTER, Ivan, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic in Geneva.

Tunisie/Tunisia/Túnez

ENNACEUR, M., S.E., M., ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la Tunisie à Genève; représentant du gouvernement de la Tunisie au Conseil d'administration.
suppléant:

KCHAOU, Mohamed, M., directeur général du travail, ministère des Affaires sociales; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la Tunisie au Conseil d'administration.

accompagné de:

TEBOURBI, Habib, M., secrétaire des affaires étrangères, mission permanente de la Tunisie à Genève.

MEMBRES EMPLOYEURS ADJOINTS
EMPLOYER DEPUTY MEMBERS
MIEMBROS EMPLEADORES ADJUNTOS

AL—JASSEM, A., Mr. (Kuwait), Assistant Director—General, Kuwait Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
ARBESSER—RASTBURG, M., Mr. (Austria), Manager, herz—Armaturen A.G.
DAMBE, Christopher, Mr. (Botswana), Managing Director, PEP Botswana Holdings.
DURLING, Walter, Sr. (Panamá), Consultores y Asesores S.A.
HULTIN, Göran, Mr. (Finland), Director, Finnish Employers' Confederation.
KASWARA, Joel, Mr. (Uganda), Executive Director, Federation of Uganda Employers.
LACASA ASO, José María, Sr. (España), Director del Departamento de Relaciones Internacionales, Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales.
McVEIGH, Charles, Mr. (Canada), President, Construction Labour Relations Association of British Columbia.
MONTT BALMACEDA, M. (Chile), Presidente, Comisión de Asuntos Internacionales del Trabajo.
MUYUMBÉ, André, M. (Burundi), président, Association des employeurs du Burundi.
NOAKES B., Mr. (Australia), Deputy Chief Executive Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
OULD SIDI MOHAMED, M.A., M. (Mauritanie), secrétaire général, Confédération générale des employeurs de Mauritanie (CGEM).
PIERIDES, Antonio, Mr. (Cyprus), Director—General, Cyprus Employers' and Industrialists' Federation.
TOURE, Ousmane, M. (Mali), secrétaire permanent, Fédération nationale des employeurs du Mali.
YANKANA, David, Mr. (Guyana), Executive Director, The Consultative Association of Guyanese Industry Ltd.

MEMBRES TRAVAILLEURS ADJOINTS
WORKER DEPUTY MEMBERS
MIEMBROS TRABAJADORES ADJUNTOS

BLONDEL, Marc, M. (France), secrétaire général de la Confédération générale du travail—Force ouvrière (CGT—FO).
BONNATI PORTILLO, Manuel, Sr. (España), Secretario de Relaciones Internacionales, Unión General de Trabajadores de España (UGT).
CHAVEZ, José, Sr. (Ecuador), Presidente, Confederación Ecuatoriana de Organizaciones Sindicales Libres (CEOSL).
CHIRWA, Alec, Mr. (Zambia), Secretary—General, Zambian Congress of Trade Unions.
DJEFFAL, A., M., (Algérie), secrétaire général, Union générale des travailleurs algériens.
III. REPRESENTANTS D'AUTRES ETATS MEMBRES DE L'ORGANISATION
ASSISTANT A LA SESSION
III. REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER STATES MEMBERS OF THE ORGANIZATION
PRESENT AT THE SESSION
III. REPRESENTANTES DE OTROS ESTADOS MIEMBROS DE LA ORGANIZACION
PRESENTES EN LA REUNION

Autriche/Austria

DESSER, Michael, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of Austria in Geneva.

Chili/Chile

MIMIZA, Antonio, Sr., Agregado Laboral, Misión Permanente de Chile en Ginebra.
LLABACA, José-Luis, Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente de Chile en Ginebra.

Colombie/Colombia

SALAZAR, Renato, Sr., Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra.

République de Corée/Republic of Korea/República de Corea

PARK, Chung-Kyu, Mr., Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea.

Côte d'Ivoire

KOUMA, Koffi, S.E., M., ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la Côte d'Ivoire à Genève.
accompagné de:

MLINGUI KEEFA, Emile, M., premier conseiller, mission permanente de la Côte d'Ivoire à Genève.
N'TAKPE, N'Cho, M., conseiller, mission permanente de la Côte d'Ivoire à Genève.

**Egypte/Egypt/Egipto**

ZAHRAI, Mounir, H.E., Mr., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva.

accompagned by:

OMAR, Moustafa, Mr., Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva.
GHEITA, Naguib, H., Mr., Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva.
KHALIL, Hesham, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva.

**Espagne/Spain/España**

DE SEGOVIA, D. Luis Fernando, Sr., representante permanente adjunto de España en Ginebra.
ALBALATE LAFITA, J., Sr., Consejero Laboral, Misión Permanente de España en Ginebra.

**Finlande/Finland/Finlandia**

JARVELA, Ilmi, Mrs., Senior Counsellor, Ministry of Labour.

accompagned by:

VIRTANEN, Marja-Liisa, Ms., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Finland in Geneva.

**Ghana**

AMOO-GOTTFRIED, Kojo, H.E., Mr., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Ghana in Geneva.

accompagned by:

POKU, Fritz K., Mr., Minister Counsellor; Deputy Permanent Representative of Ghana in Geneva.
ACQUAH, Eric Kojo, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Ghana in Geneva.

**Grèce/Greece/Grecia**

YANTAIS, Dimitri, M., premier conseiller, mission permanente de Grèce à Genève.
Hongrie/Hungary/Hungría

BOYTHA, György, H.E., Mr., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Hungary in Geneva.

accompanied by:
KLEKNER, Péter, Mr., Director General, Department of International Programmes, Ministry of Labour.
SZABO, József, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Hungary in Geneva.
MARTINUSZ, Zoltán, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Hungary in Geneva.

Israël/Israel

KEREM, Ariel, M., ministre-conseiller, représentant permanent adjoint d'Israël à Genève.

Myanmar

NYUNT SWE, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Myanmar in Geneva.

Nicaragua

ALANIZ PINELL, Jorge, S.E., Sr., Embajador; Representante Permanente de Nicaragua en Ginebra.

acompañado de:
MIRANDA CASTILLO, Norman, Sr., Ministro Consejero; Representante alterno de Nicaragua en Ginebra.
SABORIO ARGUELLO, Julio, Consejero, misión permanente de Nicaragua en Ginebra.

Norvège/Norway/Noruega

BRUAS, Odd, Mr., Adviser, Ministry of Local Government.
STROMMEN, Wegger, C., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Norway in Geneva.

Panama/Panamá

VELASQUEZ, Osvaldo, S.E., Sr., Embajador; representante permanente de Panamá en Ginebra.

acompañado de:
AMEGLIO, Rossana-Luigia, S.E., Sra, Embajadora; representante permanente alterna de Panamá en Ginebra.

Pays-Bas/Netherlands/Países Bajos

SCHRAMA, Henk, Mr., Director for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
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accompanied by:

STOKVIS, Laurent, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in Geneva.
VAN BLANKENSTEIN, Jan, Mr., Senior Official, Department for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

Pologne/Poland/Polonia

PRZYGODZKI, Stanislaw, Mr., Minister Plenipotentiary; Deputy Permanent Representative of Poland.

accompanied by:

HENCZEL, Remigiusz Achilles, Mr., Director, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

Portugal

ALMEIDA, Luis Tomé, M., conseiller (affaires sociales et travail), mission permanente du Portugal à Genève.

Suède/Sweden/Suecia

JONZON, Björn, Mr., Deputy Assistant Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
WIKLUND, Kerstin, Mrs., Deputy Assistant Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
KASTBERG, Nils-Arne, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Sweden in Geneva.

Suisse/Switzerland/Suiza

HENCHOZ, Alain-Denis, M., secrétaire d'ambassade, mission permanente de la Suisse à Genève.

Saint-Siège/The Holy See/Santa Sede

TABET, Paul, S.E., Mgr, Nonce Apostolique, observateur permanent du Saint-Siège à Genève.

accompagné de:

PIERRE, Christophe, Mgr, conseiller, mission permanente du Saint-Siège à Genève.
ROCH, Raymond, R.P., conseiller technique.
GUERRA, Paolo, M., conseiller technique.

******
IV. REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Nations Unies/United Nations/Naciones Unidas

DJERMAKOYE, A., Mrs., Chief, External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs.

accompanied by:

KHMELNITSKI, S., Mr., External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs Officer.

Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement
United Nations Development programme
Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo

BONEV, Evlogui, Mr., Senior Consultant, European Office.

Haut-commissariat des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
Oficina del Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas para los Refugiados

BERGLUND, Stefan, Mr., Senior Inter-Organization Officer, Division of External Affairs.

Fonds des Nations Unies pour les activités en matière de population
United Nations Fund for Population Activities
Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para Actividades en Materia de Población

MUNTASSER, BASHIR S, Mr., Chief UNFPA European Liaison Officer.

Organisation des Nations Unies pour le développement industriel
United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
Organización de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo Industrial

AKPA, A., Mr., Officer-in-Charge, Liaison Office, Geneva.

Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture
Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación

PURCELL, A., Mr., Senior Liaison Officer, Geneva Office.

Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura

ZACHARIEV, Z., Mr., Director, Liaison Office in Geneva.
Organisation mondiale de la santé/Worid Health Organization
Organización Mundial de la Salud

GALLI, T., Dr., Associate Director, Division of Emergency Relief Operations.
MARTI, R.M., Mr., Adviser, Division of Budget and Finance.

Fonds monétaire international/International Monetary Fund
Fondo Monetario Internacional

JUNZ, H.B., Mrs., Special Trade Representative and Director.

Agence internationale de l'énergie atomique
International Atomic Energy Agency
Organismo Internacional de Energía Atómica

OPELZ, Merle S., Ms., Head, IAEA Office in Geneva.

accompanied by:

WEBSTER, Aileen B., Ms., IAEA Office in Geneva.

Organisation internationale pour les migrations
International Organisation for Migration
Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

SCHATZER, Peter, Mr., Director, External Relations.

BELL, W.K., Mr., External Relations Officer.

Commission des Communautés européennes
Commission of the European Communities
Comisión de las Comunidades Europeas

DEVONIC, Fay, Mrs., Head of Division.

accompanied by:

VERSCHUEREN, Herwig, Mr., Administrator.

Ligue des Etats arabes/League of Arab States/Liga de Estados Arabes

ASKALANI, Nehad, S.E., M., ambassadeur, représentant permanent.

accompagné de:

HARGUEM, Ahmed, M., représentant permanent adjoint, délégation permanente à Genève.

ALMOMAN, Ala, M., attaché.

Organisation arabe du travail/Arab Labour Organisation
Organización Arabe del Trabajo

EL-TELAWI, Adnan Khalil, M., chef, délégation permanente à Genève.
Organisation de l'Unité africaine/Organisation of African Unity
Organización de la Unidad Africana

FARAG, Aziz, M., Counsellor (Labour Affairs), Permanent Delegation in Geneva.

V. REPRESENTANTS D'ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES NON GOVERNEMENTALES ASSISTANT A TITRE D'OBSERVATEURS
V. REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS ATTENDING AS OBSERVERS
V. REPRESENTANTES DE ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES NO GOBERNAMENTALES PRESENTES EN CALIDAD DE OBSERVADORES

Association internationale de la sécurité sociale
International Social Security Association
Asociación Internacional de la Seguridad Social

HOSKINS, Dalmer, M., secrétaire général.

Confédération internationale des syndicats libres
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
Confederación Internacional de Organizaciones Sindicales Libres

LAURIJSSEN, E., Mr., Director, Geneva Office.

accompanied by:

RYDER, G., Mr., Assistant Director, Geneva Office.
CUNNIAH, Dan, Mr.,

Confédération mondiale du travail/World Confederation of Labour
Confederación Mundial del Trabajo

FAUCHERE, Béatrice, Mme, représentante permanente.

Fédération syndicale mondiale/World Federation of Trade Unions
Federación Sindical Mundial

POTAPOV, Albert, M., représentant permanent à Genève.

accompagné de:

RETUREAU, Daniel, M., représentant permanent à Genève.

Organisation internationale des employeurs
International Organisation of Employers
Organización Internacional de Empleadores

KAPARTIS, Costas, Mr., Secretary-General.
accompanies by:

CHACKO, Roy, Mr., Executive Secretary.
DAN, Charles, Mr., Executive Secretary.
PEÑALOSA, Antonio, Mr., Executive Secretary.
ULBRICHT, Jutta, Miss, Executive Secretary.

Organisation de l'unité syndicale africaine
Organisation of African Trade Union Unity
Organización de la Unidad Sindical Africana

SUNMONU, Hassan, Secretary-General.

***************

Les membres suivants n'ont pas pris part à la session:
The following members did not attend the meeting:
Los siguientes miembros no participaron en la reunión:

TOGO, membre gouvernemental titulaire
Sr. J. de REGIL GOMEZ (Mexico), miembro empleador titular

Mr. EL SAYED RASHED (Egypt), regular Worker member
Mr. M. FERGUSON (Australia), regular Worker member
Sr. A. RIOS (Venezuela), miembro trabajador titular

MALAWI, Government deputy member
NIGER, membre gouvernemental adjoint

Mr. D. CHANAIWA (Zimbabwe), Employer deputy member
Mr. G.C. OKOGWU (Nigeria), Employer deputy member
Mme L. SASSO MAZZUFFERI (Italy), membre employeur adjoint
Sr. H.G. VILLALOBOS (Venezuela), miembro empleador adjunto