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The 265th Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva, from Tuesday, 26 March at 3 p.m. to Thursday, 28 March 1996, under the chairmanship of Mr. Yvon CHOTARD (France).

Monday, 25 March, was devoted to a meeting of the Working Party on the Social Dimensions of the Liberalization of International Trade in which most of the Governing Body members participated.

The list of persons who attended the session of the Governing Body is appended.
FIRST SITTING
Tuesday, 26 March 1996, afternoon

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

First item on the agenda
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 264TH SESSION

The Governing Body approved the minutes of the public sittings of its 264th Session, subject to the corrections indicated in document GB.265/1/1.

Second item on the agenda
DATE, PLACE AND AGENDA OF THE 1998 SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

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

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), referring to the recommendation in paragraph 53 of the Office paper, stated that while at the previous session of the Governing Body the Employers’ group had proposed a general discussion on the question of child labour, it now favoured the Workers’ proposal for a Convention and Recommendation. However, a general discussion followed by a single discussion did not seem adequate, since the instruments would be of major significance and required careful preparation: experience showed that single discussions often resulted in unsatisfactory wording in the instrument, and a double discussion was hence preferable, as it also allowed for greater consultation with governments, which could submit useful observations for the final text. Workers and Employers should normally be involved in such consultation.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) said that this matter had been the subject of extensive discussion at the meeting of the Workers’ group the previous morning, as the Workers attached great importance to this issue, an attitude shared by the Government and Employer benches. The Workers’ group had decided in favour of a double discussion.

The Workers’ group was disturbed at the reference to domestic servants in paragraph 29 to exemplify cases in which it was not the work itself, but the conditions in which it was carried out, that were harmful to children. The use of children as domestic servants was of particular concern to the Workers’ group, not least because it was the wealthier members of society who could afford to exploit children in this manner. There were strong arguments for eliminating the use of children as domestic servants.

The proposal for a new Convention should not render Convention No. 138 obsolete. While he appreciated that the Convention had not been ratified by as many governments as would have been desired, the number of ratifications had gradually increased over the years: at the present Governing Body session alone three ratifications had been reported. Convention No. 138 had a role to play in its own right, and any new Convention in this field should be a complementary Convention dealing with child labour that was subject to economic exploitation. The new Convention should also not be a pretext to discontinue efforts to seek ratification of Convention No. 138 by as many governments as possible. It should be as succinct as possible: it should contain all the necessary elements, but should be focused on the aim of the instrument — to eradicate intolerable forms of child labour. The Workers found the word “intolerable” inappropriate in the context of child labour, for it implied that there was tolerable child labour, even though in some cases it was understandable for children to work — for example in the home or in small pastoral farming circumstances where children were part of the family unit working
in their spare time, at weekends and on holidays. Children required not only education, but also leisure.

As regards paragraph 44, which called for close collaboration with the most representative institutions in civil society, while NGOs did excellent work, the ILO should not only carefully select those with which it worked, but should also recognize that the institutions of civil society with the greatest interest in the problem were in fact employers’ and workers’ organizations.

The developing world had seen the damage done by structural adjustment. It was ironic that many governments which so strongly supported the campaign to eradicate child labour had endorsed the structural adjustment policies which in African countries were leading to a decline in the employment of teachers, the retrenchment of civil servants and reductions in already inadequate social security systems, which in themselves actually depressed wage levels, increased poverty and raised the incidence of child labour. Alleviating poverty was the best solution in the long term for addressing the problem of child labour, but this solution was a long way off. Child labour existed in almost every country in the world — even in some highly developed countries, which could afford to dispense with it.

Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines), speaking on behalf of the Government group, stated that a majority of governments were in favour of a general discussion in 1998 followed by a single discussion in 1999, as in this way the Office would have a much longer time — 20 months instead of four — to give careful thought to the content of the new standards envisaged.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) agreed wholeheartedly with paragraph 45, which advocated the implementation of long-term measures to address the underlying causes of child labour and called for the expansion of productive employment, as well as the extension of social protection to solve the problem. As stated in paragraph 48, the first procedural option had the advantage of following the Office’s customary procedure, but would only leave a few months after the present session of the Governing Body to prepare the law and practice report and the questionnaire.

As indicated in paragraph 52 of the Office paper, there were definite advantages to be gained from the second option. He therefore favoured the full double-discussion procedure, as it offered guarantees of a concise, specific and flexible Convention that would be well structured and likely to be ratified.

Mr Otero (Government, United States) strongly supported the ILO’s work in the field of child labour and regarded it as a priority for the Organization’s action now and in the future. Extensive consideration of this issue in the Committee on Employment and Social Policy in November 1995 and in the Governing Body had revealed a growing consensus in favour of a new Convention, focusing on the most grievous forms of exploitative child labour, which could be counted among the ILO’s Conventions and fundamental rights. The informal tripartite meeting at the ministerial level scheduled to take place at the forthcoming session of the Conference would further advance the discussion, and he hoped that it would also contribute to the achievement of consensus on this important issue, thereby leading to the adoption of a new standard that could be widely ratified. He favoured the second procedural option, for while the item should be placed on the agenda as soon as possible, the first option would put undue pressure on the staff and member States to prepare and compile the necessary documentation to allow for a full, meaningful discussion at the Conference.

Ms. van Leur (Government, Netherlands) congratulated the Office on the clarity of the paper. Her Government attached great importance to the issue of child labour worldwide. As indicated in the Office paper, the Netherlands was planning to hold an international tripartite meeting jointly with the ILO on intolerable forms of child labour. This meeting was tentatively scheduled to take place in late January or in early February 1997, when the Netherlands would hold the presidency of the European Union. It was her Government’s intention that the outcome of that meeting, together with the results of the meeting scheduled for 1997 by the Government of Norway, would provide useful building blocks for the new ILO instrument on intolerable forms of child labour. For this purpose, it was essential for the discussion in the Netherlands to be structured along the lines set out by the ILO for the framing of a new instrument.
As regards the standard-setting procedure, her Government therefore preferred the option which provided the maximum scope for a structured and streamlined discussion, namely the double-discussion procedure. Thus, before the meeting in the Netherlands there would be a preliminary report and questionnaire, which could then serve as guidelines for the discussion during the meeting. A general discussion on this sensitive issue during the 1998 Conference was unlikely to contribute effectively to the establishment of a new instrument. While the double-discussion procedure placed a great burden on the secretariat, since a preliminary report and questionnaire had to be finalized by 15 August 1996 in order to reach governments by December 1996, the aim of eliminating intolerable forms of child labour was important enough to justify the extra burden. The discussion in the Committee on Employment and Social Policy at the previous session of the Governing Body, and the subsequent discussion within and outside the ILO, clearly indicated that the issue had gained enormous political momentum. The time had hence come for constructive action in this area, even if this implied greater effort than usual. The Office should consider setting up a special task force to draft the preliminary report and questionnaire in order to meet the deadlines indicated in the document.

Concerning the possible content of the new instrument, she supported the structure of the new instruments as set out in paragraphs 37-45 in the Office paper. A brief Convention, whereby ratifying Members committed themselves to effective measures to eliminate intolerable forms of child labour and to provide rehabilitative measures, inter alia, through cooperation and assistance, together with guidelines for national action, would provide adequate tools for the short and medium term in the struggle against child labour. In order to avoid duplication and extra reporting burdens on ratifying States, in drafting the new instrument the ILO should take account of the fact that a number of international treaties already addressed the question of child labour, including its intolerable forms.

Ms. Guertin (Government, Canada) congratulated the Office on the quality of the paper. Canada had recently demonstrated the importance it attached to this issue by providing financial support to the IPEC programme. The time had come for the International Labour Conference to adopt a Convention on child labour that was both simple and sufficiently flexible to be ratified by a large number of industrialized and developing countries, and which should belong to the group of fundamental ILO instruments. As regards the procedure, she preferred the second option.

Mr. Ramon (Government, France) commended the Office on the excellent paper, which contained proposals of the utmost urgency. Not only was it necessary to support the excellent work done by IPEC: the ILO should also be seen to have a clear standard-setting position on the fundamental issue of child labour. One element of the regeneration of standard setting was the revision of existing standards, which made it possible to update or abolish useless or obsolete ones; however, this should be complemented by useful and necessary standards that could be adopted by countries throughout the world. Concerning the methods of adopting the instrument envisaged, he shared the minority view expressed by the representatives of the Governments of the Netherlands and Spain. However, since the social partners appeared to agree on the double-discussion procedure, he would accept the majority position.

Ms. Morgan (Government, United Kingdom) welcomed the excellent paper, which reflected the discussion on child labour held in November. The Governing Body clearly agreed that urgent action was needed to develop an effective instrument to tackle the problem. Her Government fully endorsed the aims set out in paragraph 36 of the paper, in particular the need for a Convention that was likely to be ratified by a large number of countries. She also welcomed the emphasis on the use of the new Convention to provide clear guidelines for the Office's technical cooperation activities, as well as the proposal for a brief and clearly focused Convention supplemented by a more detailed Recommendation.

Regarding the two procedural options given in the paper, she had been persuaded by the arguments put forward by the Office in favour of the single-discussion procedure. While she fully appreciated the urgency of the task at hand, she was not convinced that the quality of the result should be put at risk with no apparent gain in the speed of production of the instruments. She therefore supported what now appeared to be the minority position within the Governing Body.
Ms. Voskuhl (Government, Germany) thanked the Office for the excellent paper presented. She welcomed the fact that the subject of child labour was to be placed on the Conference agenda, and wholeheartedly endorsed the objectives set forth in the document. She fully agreed with the statement in paragraph 44 that there should be cooperation not only with employers’ and workers’ organizations, but also with other relevant institutions, for great benefit was to be derived from the collective experience of different organizations gained in the framework of IPEC in the field, as they were intimately acquainted with the day-to-day realities in the field of child labour.

As regards the preparation of the standard, this should be done in the best possible manner and the second alternative was therefore preferable. However, if there was a clear majority in favour of the first option, her Government would accept this position. What was important for Germany was that the issue should continue to be tackled within the ILO, which was the appropriate forum, and Germany had assigned priority to this issue at the Copenhagen Summit. The Conference was the most suitable forum for this discussion. Her Government had already provided US$50 million to IPEC, and in Copenhagen the Federal Chancellor had pledged to increase Germany’s contribution by a further DM50 million. She reiterated her Government’s appeal to other governments which had not yet participated in IPEC to do so, in order to give valuable assistance to countries trying to combat exploitative forms of child labour.

Mr. Mishra (Government, India) paid tribute to the ILO’s involvement in an important and complex issue that was socially and politically sensitive. The proposals demonstrated this interest and he hoped that it would gather new momentum at the Conference. IPEC and similar programmes were important trendsetters which had resulted in a number of useful follow-up activities.

While it had not been possible for India to ratify Convention No. 138, his Government’s commitment to the elimination of child labour had been reflected in the country’s Constitution and legislation. The identification of children working in hazardous conditions, their release and rehabilitation were the main activities of a nationwide child labour project, which had been extended to nearly 150 districts in the country. India had adopted a project approach including surveys, sensitization of employers, parents and working children, as well as special schooling as an important mode of rehabilitating working children released from hazardous employment. The problem was great, and there were no accurate, authentic and up-to-date statistical data available on the actual number of working children engaged in hazardous employment. He supported the proposal in paragraph 53(b)(ii) of the Office paper. The Convention foreseen would be an extremely important instrument which would reinforce international commitment to the elimination of child labour in hazardous conditions.

Mr. Abou Sharbak (Government, Qatar) congratulated the Office on the paper, which contained excellent proposals to curb the abuse of child labour. His country attached great importance to children and had an ambitious plan to tackle the problem of child labour. His Government therefore favoured the single-discussion procedure, as it would give the Office more time to collect and collate the necessary information in preparation for discussion by the Conference, and would thus lead to the adoption of a sound Convention.

Mr. Ngare (Government, Kenya) attached considerable importance to the ILO’s excellent work in the field of child labour, in particular the work done by IPEC. Kenya fully supported the proposal to deal with the item on child labour using the single-discussion procedure. The ILO should aim to produce a fairly simple Convention that could be widely ratified by member States.

Mr. Swails (Government, Australia) endorsed the point for decision in paragraph 53(a), not only for the practical reasons identified in the Office paper, but also in view of the kind of Convention that was desired. He was pleased to note the preliminary proposals regarding the possible content of the Convention, as set out in paragraphs 37-42 of the Office paper; a clear and simple Convention was required, one which could be ratified by the overwhelming majority of member States. Such a Convention could best be achieved through the single-discussion procedure. However, he recognized that there were arguments in support of the double-discussion procedure and, as stated by Mr. Ramond, there now appeared to be a majority in favour of the double-discussion procedure. Consequently, his Government was prepared to accept that decision.
Mr. Cavaglieli (Government, Italy) emphasized that his Government attached great importance to the elimination of child labour, a cause which it had never failed to support in all fora. His Government had decided to give an initial contribution to IPEC, and hoped to increase this contribution in the coming years. The idea of having a single discussion was preferred by some governments, mainly because of the urgency of the action required. While it was obviously important for the ILO to act swiftly, the action taken should be the most appropriate. His Government therefore also opted for the double-discussion procedure.

Mr. Sherdil (Government, Pakistan) thanked the Office for the comprehensive paper it had submitted. Throughout the world child labour took place in grim conditions. It was usually exploitative and affected a large number of children in many different ways: not only was it an obstacle to their physical and intellectual growth, but it was also a danger to their health and safety. The extent and seriousness of the abuse and risks to which child workers were exposed called for a sincere and serious effort by the ILO to address this issue. He therefore welcomed the proposal for a new standard to prohibit intolerable forms of child labour such as debt bondage and employment in hazardous occupations which endangered the health, safety and development of children. The Office had rightly pointed out that not all forms of work were necessarily harmful to children and that certain activities, if regulated appropriately, could be beneficial to children and society if they learned skills which could be gainfully used. However, there were other forms which amounted to economic exploitation. It was also imperative that child labour be examined in its proper perspective and not in isolation. With regard to procedure, he supported the first option, which would provide a better opportunity for a more meaningful discussion on the subject. While it was important to adopt standards on this very important issue, the quality of the instrument should not be compromised by hasty action. His Government therefore strongly recommended that sufficient time should be devoted to the framing of the standard.

Mrs. Hernandez (Government, Cuba) stated that her country attached priority to the issue of child labour: even though Cuba was a developing country facing major economic difficulties, it had managed to set the minimum age of access to employment at 17 years, after establishing an age limit of 14 for compulsory education. She therefore supported the ILO’s aim of abolishing child labour. As regards the two options in paragraph 53, she preferred the double-discussion procedure, which would make it possible to consider the subject in greater depth and detail and would ensure a more flexible approach that would increase the likelihood of ratification by the greatest number of countries in the shortest possible time. Nevertheless, her Government would accept the second option if this was the will of the majority of the Governing Body members.

Mr. Joublanc (Government, Mexico) also congratulated the Office on the proposals. As regards procedure, more time was needed to hold consultations. Mexico preferred the second option, although it was prepared to endorse any consensus that emerged.

Mr. Lin (Government, China) congratulated the Office on the detailed proposals. He preferred the double-discussion procedure.

Mr. Guapindaia Joppert (Government, Brazil) stated that Brazil supported the second option, but would accept any consensus reached.

Mr. Hiromi (Government, Japan) said that his Government attached great importance to the instrument contemplated and felt that it was important for the Office to take the necessary time to prepare a sound instrument. It therefore preferred the single-discussion procedure. Furthermore, the instrument should be as flexible as possible so as to enable wide ratification.

Mr. Zahran (Government, Egypt) stated that the international community had begun to realize that the exploitative use of children by some employers, thereby jeopardizing the children’s health and education, was a waste of human resources. His Government had taken into account all these issues and was currently modernizing its legislation to control child labour. That legislation would of course be based on Conventions to which his Government was a party, including the World Declaration on the Survival, Protection and Development of Children. His Government had also declared the period 1989-99 the decade of the child: during this period efforts would be directed towards the development of child education and health. His Government favoured the double-discussion procedure for dealing with the instrument envisaged.
Mr. Boateng (Government, Ghana) stated that it was necessary to adopt the procedure which offered the best opportunity for a thorough discussion which would meet with the approval of all member States. His Government would therefore endorse any consensus reached at the meeting.

Mr. Henzel (Government, Poland) expressed his preference for the single-discussion procedure.

Mr. Haidoub (Government, Sudan) supported the single-discussion procedure; however, his Government was prepared to accept any consensus reached by the Governing Body.

Mr. Vanerio (Government, Uruguay) felt that the subject was of considerable importance, and one which required rapid action by the Organization. He therefore supported the second option. However, he would agree to any consensus.

Mr. Fuchs (Government, Czech Republic) supported the double-discussion procedure.

Mr. Vidnes (Government, Norway) considered that the Office had put forward some very valid arguments in favour of the second procedural option, which his Government preferred. However, the Workers and Employers preferred the double-discussion procedure, and he was hence prepared to accept this option. Like Mr. Brett, he took issue with the reference to intolerable forms of child labour in the title of the item, as this implied that some forms of child labour were tolerable. He proposed that the Office re-examine this question and consider using words such as “exploitative” or “abusive” child labour or “labour detrimental to children”. However, it was more important for the Governing Body to agree on the content of the instrument. His Government supported the proposals in paragraphs 37-43 of the Office paper, which offered a sound basis for the ILO’s work.

Mr. Silberstein (Government, New Zealand) supported the paper and the option for a double discussion, primarily as this ensured the fullest possible consultation.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 53(a) of the Office paper, and decided that the item concerning child labour should be included on the agenda for standard setting in 1998 and 1999 using the double-discussion procedure.

Eleventh item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON THE SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF THE LIBERALIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom), speaking as Chairperson of the Working Party, presented an oral report on the proceedings of the Working Party. The main business of the Working Party had been to decide on its own future work programme and to reconsider, and if necessary further refine the previous interim decisions it had taken on its mandate, working methods and title. The Working Party had had before it three Office papers: one describing the activities in the Governing Body on the liberalization of international trade; one describing activities in other organizations; and another with an annex summarizing all the suggestions for work items which could be included in the Working Party’s programme of work made by members of the Working Party, with a covering paper setting out the Director-General’s views on the key future directions for ILO action on this issue. She had also submitted to the Working Party an informal note giving suggestions for certain specific work items on which she felt that it would be able to reach a consensus.

The Working Party had held a rich and constructive discussion which reflected participants’ overwhelming support for the continuation of its important work. This was a major step forward and was a tribute to the fair, open-minded, constructive and forward-looking approach taken by all the Working Party’s members. On the basis of this discussion, she had concluded the session with a series of concrete suggestions for work items, some to be set in train immediately by the Office, some to be considered by the Working Party in November and some for the following meeting in March, with the implication that the work programme would continue beyond that date. The Working Party had reached a broad general consensus on its mandate and working methods.
and on continuing with its existing title, while noting the reservations of certain delegations regarding the latter.

Her summary of the proceedings, which was contained in the paper before the Governing Body, had been broadly supported by the Working Party, with some additional refinements suggested by the Employers and Workers.

She expressed her gratitude to all members of the Working Party, in particular the two Vice-Chairpersons, Mr. Tabani and Mr. Brett, for their cooperation, flexibility and mutual tolerance in enabling the Working Party to conduct a serious work programme that would reaffirm the ILO’s credibility and central importance in this field in the eyes of the international community. She also asked the Governing Body to request that the Office ensure that appropriate account was taken of the Working Party’s future programme of work, both in planning schedules for future Governing Body sessions to include Working Party meetings of a suitable length, and also in considering future resource allocation.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated that although he did not seek to change the text of paragraph 5 of the Chairperson’s summary, which called for the Working Party to examine the effect of foreign direct investment, including that by multinational enterprises, on labour standards in host countries, it was impossible to consider foreign direct investment without taking account of multinational enterprises in export processing zones.

Paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 contained an adequate work programme for the future. Paragraph 11, at the Employers’ request, made specific reference to existing UNCTAD studies. The Workers’ group trusted that existing ILO and OECD studies would also be taken into account.

As regards the Working Party’s mandate, this could possibly be defined along the lines of paragraph 4 of the paper submitted to the Working Party, and this might be considered at the meeting in November. The Workers were not yet convinced that there was any need to change the mandate at all, but recognized the right of any Working Party to review its mandate at any time. On that understanding, they could accept the recommendations in paragraph 14. The Working Party was making progress slowly, and the groups were gaining an understanding of one another’s position.

Mr. Tabani (Employer, Pakistan) complimented Ms. Hartwell on having admirably guided the Working Party’s proceedings. As she had rightly stated, the discussion had been rich, and like Mr. Brett he felt that the differences between the groups had narrowed down considerably at the meeting the previous day.

Commenting on paragraphs 3 and 9 of the Chairperson’s summary, concerning country studies, he stated that two countries had volunteered for country studies. The Employers felt that more time should be allowed to give other countries or groups of countries time to reflect and contact the Office, which would then make a choice as to the most appropriate group of countries to be studied.

The Employers had also noted that the Committee on Employment and Social Policy had decided to conduct country reviews. This matter would be covered by the Committee’s report, and it would perhaps be wiser to refer the question of country studies, together with the country reviews, to that Committee. With regard to paragraphs 5 and 11, he reiterated the Employers’ request to examine the effect of foreign direct investment on economic growth and social development in the host country. Multinationals were also included because foreign direct investment was made both by multinationals and by other companies. It was not therefore entirely accurate to state simply that the Working Party wished to examine the effect of foreign direct investment on labour standards: rather, it wished to determine its impact on economic growth and social development. Since the Governing Body’s Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises also reviewed the application of the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, the Employers felt that this item should be referred to the Subcommittee.

As regards paragraph 4 of the summary, the reference to an overview by the Working Party of ongoing work in the Committee on Legal Issues and Labour Standards and the Committee on Economic and Social Policy was difficult to understand, since it was for the Governing Body to maintain such an overview. He requested clarification on this matter.
Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) fully agreed with Mr. Tabani’s statement concerning countries that might come forward for review, and felt that it was necessary to have an idea of the other possible candidates before deciding what action should be taken. As regards work in the Committee on Employment and Social Policy, she observed that, during the Working Party’s meeting, the question had been raised of whether it was possible or sensible to combine the country studies envisaged by the Working Party with those foreseen by the Committee on Employment and Social Policy: if the same countries were prepared to volunteer for both, it would clearly make sense to combine the exercises, but that would depend on the countries themselves, and it was too early to decide how this would develop. Consequently, it had been proposed to refer the matter to the Officers of the Working Party and of the Committee on Employment and Social Policy to examine the candidates that came forward and how this could be carried out in practical terms.

As regards the effects of foreign direct investment, she accepted the need for the terms of reference for the study envisaged to cover the effects on economic growth and social development, it being understood that that would cover labour standards, including the fundamental instruments. However, Mr. Tabani’s proposal concerning the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises was difficult to accept, as there were no plans to change the mandate or size of the Subcommittee, and its mandate concerned specifically the Declaration and related issues. Since the Declaration was a quasi-legal instrument, the Committee operated as a specialized body with a very small membership, and was not therefore the appropriate body to examine the study, as it would be of very general interest to the Governing Body as a whole. Therefore, while the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises should undoubtedly receive copies of any such study, the main reporting channel would have to be the Working Party itself, an open-ended body.

Finally, as regards the overview mentioned in paragraph 4 of the paper, it was widely felt in the Working Party that, while there should be no interference in the business of individual technical committees, it could be useful for the Working Party to examine as a whole the salient features of the work conducted by the various committees and to review them periodically. It was felt that it would be useful, in March 1997, to review the progress that had been made on the issue of child labour and other fundamental human rights Conventions in the Committee on Legal Issues and Labour Standards, as well as in the Committee on Employment and Social Policy. The issue of relations with technical committees remained open, and could perhaps be re-examined.

Mr. Otero (Government, United States) emphasized that the Working Party was a committee of the whole, and therefore had the responsibility and the right to examine work done by other committees in its field of competence.

The Governing Body endorsed the statement by the Chairperson of the Working Party, to the effect that —

(a) the Working Party should continue its work, without changing its title, as an open-ended committee of the whole engaging in a free-ranging debate;

(b) the Working Party should examine on a regular basis an update on developments in other international organizations working in this field, act as a focal point for the ILO to interact with them, and have an overview of pertinent activities in other parts of the Governing Body (particularly as regards progress on fundamental human rights and child labour) in connection with reviewing ILO means of action;

(c) for its meeting in November 1996, the Office was requested —

(i) to undertake substantive action research on the subject-matter, including the distribution of, and analysis of the replies to, a questionnaire distributed to tripartite constituents in member States to obtain their views on current developments with regard to globalization and the liberalization of trade, and the impact they have had on social standards;

(ii) to make available the report being prepared by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development on trade and labour standards, for examination by the Working Party;
(iii) to begin to examine the issue of foreign direct investment (FDI), including that by multinational corporations, and particularly the effect of FDI on economic growth and labour standards in host countries, drawing on existing studies, such as those done by UNCTAD;

(iv) to prepare a report on the idea of country studies;

(d) for its meeting in March 1997 or subsequent sessions, the Office was requested at this stage —

(i) to prepare a paper examining the capacity of ILO's means of action to help member States participate in the benefits of trade liberalization and the future role of the ILO in the context of globalization and the liberalization of trade, as a basis for formulating a strategic action plan;

(ii) to make a progress report on the country studies.

Fourth item on the agenda

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY THE ILO IN GIVING EFFECT TO THE DECLARATION AND PLATFORM FOR ACTION ADOPTED BY THE FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) welcomed the Office paper, which highlighted the important role the ILO had to play in follow-up not only on the Social Summit, but also on the particularly important Fourth World Conference on Women. The three general areas of activity outlined in the paper were well chosen. He agreed with the overall strategic objective of integrating a gender perspective in all ILO activities, and appreciated that a multidisciplinary approach was needed. He welcomed the calls for active dialogue and cooperation with constituents at the national level, as they would inevitably lead to the conclusion that it was necessary to reinforce the capacity of the multidisciplinary teams and their role in gender issues. He also underscored the need to follow up closely on the World Summit, which covered many closely related issues that were in some cases addressed more substantively in the report of the World Summit than they had been in Beijing.

In general, he supported the new institutional arrangements proposed: while he endorsed the proposal to establish an interdepartmental structure for the promotion of equality, he was not sure why it was necessary to designate a focal point. The Workers had been under the impression that the Office of the Special Adviser on Women Workers' Questions was already the focal point. He therefore requested clarification on this matter. While the Workers were in favour of establishing an interregional programme, this and indeed the follow-up activities as a whole seemed ambitious in scope. It should be borne in mind that considerable resources were required for their implementation, and the Governing Body would have to mobilize the necessary funds. Subject to the questions raised, his group approved the points for decision in paragraph 16(a) and 16(b) of the Office paper.

The sitting closed at 4.30 p.m.
SECOND SITTING (PRIVATE)
Tuesday, 26 March 1996, afternoon

At this sitting, which was held in private, the Governing Body took the following decisions.

Thirteenth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY

First report:
Reports of Officers of the Governing Body

First report:
Representation submitted by the Trade Union Confederation
of Congo Workers (CSTC) under article 24 of the ILO
Constitution, alleging non-observance by Congo of the
Protection of Wages Convention, 1949 (No. 95)

The Governing Body decided that the representation was receivable, and set up a committee
to examine it.

Second report:
Representations made by the Latin American Central of Workers (CLAT) and the
Single Confederation of Workers of Peru (CUT) under article 24 of the ILO
Constitution alleging non-observance by Peru of the Right of Association (Agriculture)
Convention, 1921 (No. 11), the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to
Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining
Convention, 1949 (No. 98), the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), the
Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) and the
Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122)

The Governing Body decided that the representations were receivable, and set up a committee
to examine them, referring the allegations relating to trade union rights to its Committee on
Freedom of Association.

Third report:
Representation made by the Senegal Teachers’ Single and
Democratic Trade Union under article 24 of the ILO Constitution,
alleging non-observance by Senegal of the
Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)
and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)

The Governing Body decided that the representation was receivable with respect to
Convention No. 105, and set up a committee to examine it.

Fourth report:
Representation made by the Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions (TÜRK-IS) under
article 24 of the ILO Constitution, alleging non-observance by Turkey of the
Termination of Employment Convention, 1982 (No. 158)

The Governing Body decided that the representation was receivable, and set up a committee
to examine it.
First item on the agenda

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 264TH SESSION

The Governing Body approved the minutes of the fifth sitting (private) of its 264th Session.

* * *

In accordance with article 14, paragraph 5, of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the minutes of this sitting are published separately.
THIRD SITTING
Tuesday, 26 March 1996, afternoon

The sitting opened at 4.30 p.m., with Mr. Chotard in the Chair.

Fourth item on the agenda

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY THE ILO TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE DECLARATION AND PLATFORM FOR ACTION ADOPTED BY THE FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN (cont.)¹

Mr. Popescu (Government, Romania) agreed with the proposals contained in the document concerning measures to be taken by the ILO as follow-up on the Beijing Conference, in particular the proposal to set up within the Office an interdepartmental structure for the promotion of equality between men and women. Two months previously the Government of Romania had established, within the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, a department entrusted with the question of equality between men and women, as well as social policy. In September 1996, with the assistance of the United Nations, the Government of Romania would be organizing in Bucharest a conference bringing together senior officials from Central Europe as follow-up on the Beijing Conference. His Government would obviously be pleased to have representatives of the new interdepartmental structure of the ILO at the Conference in Bucharest, as their participation would enhance the quality of the Conference’s outcome.

Mr. Vidnes (Government, Norway) stated that when the Governing Body had discussed the item in November of the previous year, his Government had strongly advocated that the ILO should wholeheartedly commit itself to follow-up on the Beijing Conference. Reference had been made to the large number of member States concerned about gender issues, and it had been stressed that a substantial contribution to such follow-up would strengthen the ILO’s credibility and relevance. The Office paper was an excellent response to the issues raised the previous year. A wide range of very relevant activities were proposed, and his Government was prepared to support all of them. His only concern was that a considerable amount of resources would be required to carry out these important activities. The Office would have to examine this question carefully and, if necessary, allocate more resources for this purpose. For example, every multidisciplinary team should include a specialist on gender issues. As he had stressed on previous occasions, equality for women was very much a question of promoting basic human rights which the Governing Body had unanimously agreed should be among the highest, if not the highest, priority of the ILO.

Mr. Perez Vega (Government, Chile) fully endorsed the proposals put forward in the Office paper. However, even if the problems in developed and developing countries had been clearly identified, in particular in countries in a precarious economic situation, it was important to bear in mind that general guidelines could only be applicable if they took account of the specific characteristics of the working situation of women in each society. Discrimination against women occurred not only in the working environment: it was the result of the role traditionally assigned to women in society. Every case should be approached individually in different parts of the world, and it was therefore necessary to consider the cultural background and cultural circumstances before defining priorities for ILO action in different regions.

Mr. Swails (Government, Australia) considered that, on the whole, the proposals in the paper appropriately addressed the critical areas of concern identified in the Platform for Action adopted by the Beijing Conference. His Government supported the approach for implementing the follow-up plan proposed in paragraph 6 of the Office paper. There were only two areas that should receive greater prominence in the list of activities planned for the current biennium. These concerned redressing inequalities and improving efficiency in the area of occupational health and

¹ See also first sitting.
safety for women, and the problem of violence against women at the workplace. Freedom from workplace harassment was an important aspect of women's access to economic participation. These areas of concern had been addressed in greater detail in Australia’s implementation report on the Platform for Action. Subject to these observations, his Government had no difficulty in supporting the point for decision in paragraph 16 of the Office paper.

Mr. Lin (Government, China) thanked the secretariat for the very comprehensive paper submitted. It contained many useful proposals which his Government fully endorsed. Unemployment, underemployment and poverty were still among the most serious problems faced by many countries, particularly those in the developing world. Therefore, employment promotion and poverty alleviation were issues of considerable concern to those countries, and in this context women's questions were of paramount importance. In order to alleviate poverty among women, it was necessary to provide them with productive and remunerated employment, as well as the training required to obtain such employment. The ILO should make full use of its expertise in order to follow-up on the Conference. His Government attached great importance to the Conference, and had adopted many immediate and practical follow-up measures. The Office paper contained a plan that was a starting-point for positive action. More importantly, as recommended by the Platform for Action and the Declaration adopted by the Conference, it was necessary to take the practical situation in various countries as a whole and to organize common programmes, particularly in the present financial difficulties. He hoped that the ILO would be able to guarantee enough resources and staff to ensure the implementation of these measures.

Ms. van Leur (Government, Netherlands) stated that her Government attached great importance to follow-up on and the implementation of the Platform for Action, and was convinced that it was fully within the ILO's mandate to carry out a large number of the follow-up activities resulting from the Beijing Conference. Her Government therefore supported the strategic orientations of follow-up activities in the areas listed in paragraph 5 of the paper, though the list seemed somewhat ambitious. She also agreed with the manner in which the Office proposed to implement the follow-up plan described in paragraph 6 of the paper and wholeheartedly supported the establishment of a special task force, as stated in paragraph 14. Her Government endorsed the points for decision in paragraph 16 of the Office paper. She recommended, however, that the Office select a limited number of topics from the list in paragraph 5. The Office could then focus on these topics over the next few years, thus possibly enhancing the chances of achieving clear-cut and visible results when the exercise was evaluated. It would be better to have fewer, but better, results than to embark on an ambitious programme that might bring mediocre results.

Mr. Spring (Government, United States) stated that his Government strongly supported the ILO's overall objective of integrating women and gender issues into its ongoing work in all areas. He acknowledged the value of a multidisciplinary approach in the ILO’s work on women’s issues and the need for a focal point for such activities. However, departmental coordination on all issues should be conducted on a continuous basis and not just confined to occasional special projects. In this connection he cautioned against the establishment of unnecessary bureaucratic structures, which might result in a duplication of effort and take resources and talent away from the real work that needed to be done. The composition, cost and role of the new inter-agency task force should be clarified in relation to the existing office of the Special Adviser on Women's Questions. The paper had failed, however, to address a number of questions, such as what would be done by the task force that could not be accomplished through existing mechanisms, how the comprehensive plan of action to be developed by the task force would differ from that presented in the paper, what the resource implications of creating this task force were, and what activities would have to be sacrificed to pay for it. When these questions were answered, it would support the point for decision.

Ms. Guertin (Government, Canada) congratulated the Office, in particular the Special Adviser on Women Workers' Issues, on the comprehensive and ambitious proposals for follow-up on the Declaration and Platform for Action adopted by the Fourth World Conference on Women.

She was particularly encouraged by the many proposals and projects aimed at integrating gender analysis into the ongoing mainstream work of the Office. It was no longer acceptable to deal with gender issues as if they were separate from the daily objectives and challenges of the Organization. In view of the various areas of ILO expertise on women and gender issues, as
outlined in the appendix to the Office paper, its comparative advantage in relation to other United Nations bodies, and its clear mandate to make a major contribution to recurrent principal concerns facing women today in the world of work, her Government would welcome any attempt by the Office to consider a few general themes that could provide high visibility for the ILO in fulfilling its commitment to both the Beijing Conference and the Social Summit. One of these themes could focus on the issue of atypical work: as was widely known, women’s share in the labour force had continued to rise, but the nature of their participation had changed significantly. Instead of permanent, regular, full-time employment, more and more women were engaged in temporary or casual work, multiple part-time jobs, home work, subcontracting and self-employment in micro-enterprises in the informal sector. These atypical or non-standard forms of work tended to expose women to job and income insecurity and a real risk of marginalization in the labour market.

It was also argued that the growth of atypical forms of work reflected the flexible employment relations needed to allow enterprises to adjust efficiently to the changing economic environment, and that such forms of work met the needs of women workers. She supported the statement made by Ms. van Leur, as well as the suggestions from the Office, concerning common themes that would have the potential to secure priority for currently planned activities on women and gender issues and which would make a visible contribution to follow-up on the Beijing Conference and the Social Summit. She also concurred with Mr. Vidnes concerning the allocation of sufficient resources for this purpose.

Mr. Guapindaia Joppert (Government, Brazil) stated that, on International Women’s Day, 8 March 1996, the Brazilian Government had announced a series of measures to combat violence against women, and four documents had been signed to implement the commitments made by the Government at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. The first of these was a cooperation agreement between the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Education and Sport, aimed at promoting equality of rights between men and women, strengthening the role of women in training and building an attitude of constructive citizenship, and improving equality of men and women through education. The second was a cooperation agreement between the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Labour on promoting equality between men and women at work. Under this agreement action would be taken through programmes focusing on women who were marginalized or at risk, and promoting their access to vocational training and the labour market. There was in addition a cooperation agreement between the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Health to improve women’s health and to train them in health matters. This would promote family planning and early diagnosis and treatment for uterine, breast and colon cancer. A programme had been initiated to eradicate domestic and sexual violence, aimed at encouraging interministerial action to combat domestic and sexual violence and attracting attention to federal, state and municipal capacity to deal with the problem, promoting cooperation between the various authorities when and where necessary. His Government was also reforming the Criminal Code to deal more effectively with crimes of a sexual nature, was training staff to deal with violence against women, and was conducting public campaigns to enhance awareness of the problems facing women. He welcomed the seven points mentioned in the document for action to be taken by the ILO.

The sitting closed at 5.05 p.m.
FOURTH SITTING
Wednesday, 27 March 1996, morning

The sitting opened at 10.45 a.m., with Mr. Chotard in the Chair.

Fourth item on the agenda

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY THE ILO TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE DECLARATION AND PLATFORM FOR ACTION ADOPTED BY THE FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN (cont.)

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France, Employer Vice-Chairman) had a number of reservations regarding the follow-up outlined in the Office paper. The proposals in paragraph 14 were very complex, and it was questionable whether it was necessary to establish a task force for the promotion of equality for women when the Office already had a Special Adviser on Women Workers' Questions and some activities of the Equality and Human Rights Coordination Branch were devoted to women. It was not clear in what way the work of the proposed task force would differ from that already being performed by existing units or individual officials. The Beijing Conference had confirmed the validity of the ILO's activities and consequently there seemed to be no need for new structures. The representative of the United States Government had also expressed doubts about the creation of new administrative structures at a time when these were rather suppressed or rationalized.

He took note of the information contained in the Office paper, and requested the Director-General to pursue his efforts to mobilize the necessary resources, but was not ready to take a decision concerning the proposed administrative reorganization without having more precise indications on the manner in which it would fit into the existing structures and, above all, on its financial implications.

The list of subjects in the appendix to the Office paper encompassed nearly all ILO programmes without indicating whether the subjects were identified as a result of new decisions deriving from the Beijing Conference, or whether they were of interest to male workers as well. Some of the problems mentioned were specific to women, but others, such as part-time work or homework, did not concern the question of equality.

Mr. Baccar (Government, Tunisia) congratulated the Office on its follow-up plan on the Beijing Conference, and approved the objectives set out, together with the means identified for their implementation. He stressed the need to reinforce the Office of the Special Adviser on Women Workers' Questions by providing it with adequate human resources, and approved the proposals in paragraph 14 of the Office paper concerning the creation of a new multidisciplinary task force attached directly to the Office of the Special Adviser. This would enable the Office to examine the question of women workers in a wider framework and would facilitate the coordination between follow-up activities on the World Summit and those on the Fourth World Conference on Women, as suggested by the Governing Body at its previous session. He approved the recommendation in paragraph 16 of the report.

Mr. Guerbov (Government, Russian Federation) supported the Office proposals, in particular as regards the safeguarding of the economic independence of women, vocational training, access to employment, the combating of all forms of discrimination at work, the promotion of equal pay for equal work and the harmonization by men and women of their occupational and family responsibilities. These points were covered by the Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981 (No. 156), which would continue to be a basis for ILO activities in this field. The Russian Federation was taking measures to ratify this Convention.

Mr. Fannizadeh (Government, Islamic Republic of Iran) expressed support for the point for decision in paragraph 16 of the Office paper and complimented the Office on its proposals for follow-up on the World Conference on Women. The implementation of those proposals required,
however, improved coordination and the integration of these issues in all activities, as well as the strengthening of the Office of the Special Adviser on Women Workers' Questions through the provision of adequate staff and resources.

*Mr. Cavaglieri* (Government, Italy) expressed the determination of the Government of Italy to promote the advancement of women. It had already financed several related seminars and programmes both in the Turin Centre and the ILO and was currently organizing, in cooperation with the European Union and the Turin Centre, a further seminar on women and work. The ILO could always count on the Government of Italy when programmes in favour of women needed to be supported.

The formulation of the proposal in paragraph 14 seemed to have provoked a reaction in some quarters, whereas in reality the task force was to consist of a small group of people who, without exceptional expense, would be able to act efficiently under the direction of the Special Adviser. He approved the point for decision in paragraph 16 of the paper.

*Mr. Eamoub* (Government, Sudan) complimented the Office on the paper. Women had to enjoy their political, economic and social rights. He had already outlined the strategy of the Government of Sudan on the question; he now recalled a number of developments that had taken place since the Beijing Conference: women were now admitted to colleges in equal numbers with men; their numbers in secondary education and recruitment to government offices were also equal to that of men; and the Government supported programmes encouraging the work of what were termed "productive families". A Decree signed by the Prime Minister encouraged women to work in the public sector. The employment of women and the alleviation of poverty should thus lead to positive results. He supported the activities outlined in paragraph 14 of the paper and favoured their promotion in all regions. He concurred with the statement made by the representative of the Government of Egypt, and supported the point for decision in paragraph 16.

*Mr. Aibakse Lafia* (Government, Spain) expressed support for the follow-up on the Fourth World Conference on Women and concurred with the proposal by the representative of the United States Government that the most appropriate forum for this subject was the Working Party on the Social Dimensions of the Liberalization of International Trade. He supported the proposals contained in paragraph 14 on the condition that the multidisciplinary task force was a small one and involved only minimum costs.

As regards the activities outlined in the appendix, he supported nearly all of them, but attached special emphasis to the *Special Action Programme on Social Funds* and the interregional project on the promotion of women in private sector activities. In his view, these represented new promotional activities which went beyond the question of non-discrimination in the world of work. The issues of constraints facing women micro-entrepreneurs, obstacles to equality of opportunity for women, social protection and family obligations were also fundamental and had to be emphasized. The protection of homeworkers had more significance for women, even if the employers considered that the question concerned women and men alike. The question of domestic workers concerned women more than men, as in most countries this issue concerned mainly women. Section 3 of the Appendix could perhaps be improved by better wording, as it related more to paragraph 5(c).

Recalling the statement by the representative of the Government of Brazil, who had described activities in his country in favour of women, he proposed that Governments be asked to communicate to the Deputy Director-General in charge of follow-up on the Beijing Conference a list of the activities they were undertaking in this respect. Spain, for example, had an institute which implemented programmes similar to those in Brazil. Other States, and particularly industrialized ones, might do the same. It would be interesting to know what was already being done to promote the activities described in the Appendix.

*Mr. Ramond* (Government, France) welcomed the Office paper and supported the point for decision in paragraph 16. The Government of France attached great importance to the promotion of the status of women, and consequently its delegation to the Beijing Conference had been led by a minister. He expressed satisfaction at the progress made in promoting equality between women and men: the Beijing Conference had shown that the debate concerning the notions of equality and equity seemed to be over. The unanimity with which the members of the Governing
Body expressed their will to promote equality was particularly encouraging. Equality should now also be extended to the civil status of women, which held major implications for their professional life.

As regards the continuation of the present discussion, he shared the views of the Governments of the Netherlands and Norway. The priorities set were acceptable, but they had to be streamlined and assembled. Concerning the proposal in paragraph 14 to set up a multidisciplinary task force, he shared the understanding regarding its dimensions expressed by the Governments of Italy and Spain.

Mr. Diarra (Government, Mali) supported the point for decision in paragraph 16. The Government of Mali had adopted a national plan of action with a view to implementing the Declaration and the Platform for Action adopted in Beijing, which had been preceded by extensive discussion in all democratic institutions and in society as a whole. The Conference in Beijing was considered as a starting-point for the society the world wished to construct for the twenty-first century.

In countries where the question of employment in general and women’s employment in particular were among the major concerns of governments, it was important to spread knowledge of the role that the ILO could play in that respect at all levels of society. It seemed that the ministries responsible for the promotion of women were insufficiently informed, and thus turned to other organs of the United Nations or to non-governmental organizations when seeking financial support or technical cooperation. It was hence necessary to increase awareness of the mandate of the ILO: some specific issue should be identified through which awareness could be raised of the ILO’s role in implementing the Platform for Action adopted in Beijing. In countries where the status of rural women could effectively be promoted by facilitating their access to credit or markets, the ILO’s regional or area offices should be involved in such activities.

Mr. Boateng (Government, Ghana) congratulated the Director-General on the concrete measures to follow up on the Beijing Conference, at which the Government of Ghana had been represented by a delegation led by the country’s first lady. Subsequently, the Government had approved a programme of affirmative action which was to be implemented by a multi-sectoral committee under the leadership of the National Council on Women in Development. This would help the Director-General to mobilize resources for such programmes. However, in the light of budgetary constraints, the Office should give priority to activities that would have the greatest impact on women in the labour market. He supported the point for decision in paragraph 16 of the paper.

Mr. Mishra (Government, India) expressed support for the Director-General’s efforts to mobilize resources for the implementation of the recommendations made at the Beijing Conference. The main objective should be to ensure that the gender perspective was incorporated in all ILO programmes and projects. Emphasis should be placed on promoting women’s access to all economic activities, ensuring equality in employment and wages, developing women’s skills in all spheres of the economy, the organization of women in both formal and informal groups, including cooperatives, trade unions, self-help groups, thrift and credit groups, and facilitating the empowerment of women. With this in mind the Government of India supported the orientations for ILO follow-up activities outlined in paragraph 5 of the paper, together with the measures proposed in paragraph 14.

The activities suggested by the Office for the 1996-97 biennium were comprehensive and appropriate, and would undoubtedly contribute to the process that had been set in motion in Beijing. The ILO should also engage in effective publicity, to emphasize the idea of equality in respect of intelligence, ingenuity and dexterity, and dispelling all related taboos and misconceptions. A comprehensive set of measures should also be taken to stop all exploitation of girls and women, both at home and in the workplace.

The Government of India was preparing a national policy on women. India already had a National Commission on Women with quasi-judicial and executive powers concerning the enforcement of women’s rights. It was now proposed to set up a national resource centre, which would provide technical support for the successful implementation of national policy. It would focus on sensitization, training, the collection and dissemination of information, and advocacy. It
was also proposed to appoint a commissioner on women's rights in order to ensure that those rights were guaranteed by legal instruments at the national and district levels. The Integrated Child Development Service (ICDS), which was one of the largest composite programmes for women and children in the world, had been extended to all parts of India, and now covered nearly 6,000 community development blocks. Another major effort made by the Government concerned the education of girls in general, and literacy in particular: literacy campaigns had been launched in 330 districts, and investment in education would be increased to 6 per cent of the GDP.

Ms. Amin (Government, Egypt) believed that ILO's strategy concerning follow-up on the Declaration and Platform for Action adopted in Beijing gave a considerable impetus to women's issues, and would ensure that gender issues were taken into account in all ILO forums and projects. She supported the establishment of a task force under the direction of the Special Adviser on Women Workers' Questions and proposed that the Office consider the integration of women in the Employers' and Workers' groups. Particular attention should be paid to the application of women's rights at work, as well as to child labour of both boys and girls.

The Organization's activities depended largely on the technical departments and regional structures, and multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) should be encouraged to devote considerable effort to women's questions and should include a specialist in gender issues. She supported efforts to secure the necessary resources and to strengthen national capacity with a view to promoting women's rights at work. She also supported the point for decision in paragraph 16 of the paper.

Ms. Morgan (Government, United Kingdom) stated that the Government of the United Kingdom attached major importance to the implementation of the Platform for Action. It had already taken several initiatives to achieve this goal in consultation with all interested parties, including women's non-governmental organizations. She welcomed the plans for ILO follow-up and endorsed the emphasis placed on the need for a multidisciplinary, comprehensive and integrated approach. The plan was ambitious and wide-ranging, and priorities had to be carefully identified. The ILO had an important role to play in providing technical expertise and support to countries to help them implement the objectives set out in the Platform for Action, and she welcomed the strategic objective of integrating a gender perspective in all ILO programmes and projects. Her Government was committed to the principle of mainstreaming and believed that the integration of this principle into the work of the ILO and other international organizations would be the most constructive approach to follow-up on the Conference. She supported the proposal in paragraph 14 on the basis of the interpretation provided by the representative of the Government of Italy.

Mr. Sherdil (Government, Pakistan) described a number of measures taken by his Government to protect the rights of women and promote their economic development, including the creation of women's police stations and the appointment of women judges to provide social protection to women. Pakistan had also established the first women's bank to encourage women entrepreneurs and to promote employment for women. The country also had a Ministry of Women's Development, and the Prime Minister herself had become a role model for women. His Government hence strongly supported the ILO's plans for follow-up on the Beijing Conference, which were ambitious, as their implementation largely depended on the capacity to coordinate activities. The integrated approach required to implement the objectives of the plan required existing institutional arrangements to be strengthened. He therefore supported the proposal to set up a task force with a view to coordinating field activities and promoting the integration of gender issues in all programmes, and supported the point for decision in paragraph 16.

Mr. Trajano (Government, Philippines) attached great importance to the ILO's activities giving effect to the Declaration and Platform for Action adopted in Beijing. The objectives of the ILO plan of action concurred with the commitment by his Government to adopt strategies and pursue activities to integrate gender issues in policy formulation, planning and programming in all areas of social and economic development. He therefore supported the objectives of ILO follow-up on the Fourth World Conference on Women, as outlined in paragraphs 4 and 6 of the Office paper. An interregional programme was needed on women's concerns, and it was necessary to strengthen information dissemination and awareness-raising, pursue dialogue and collaboration with the tripartite constituents and mobilize adequate resources to ensure effective implementation of the ILO follow-up plan.
The representative of the Director-General (Ms. Chinery-Hesse) thanked speakers for their statements, which underlined the importance the Governing Body attached to women workers' questions and the work of the Office in that regard. The points made were of extreme importance. Special attention should be given to the link between follow-up on the Beijing Conference and that on the Social Summit. However, this would not lead the Office to cover the whole field, but rather to concentrate on issues within the core mandate of the ILO. The comments on priorities would therefore be taken very seriously. The aim was to identify a few themes that would give visibility to the unique work of the ILO, especially at the field level.

As regards the proposed task force, which had been addressed by Mr. Oechslin and the representatives of the Governments of the United States, Italy, the United Kingdom and others, she conceded that confusion might have been caused by the use of the term “task force”. This had given the impression that additional costly machinery would be established, whereas the idea was simply to assemble the already existing focal points in an interdisciplinary manner to work on general issues. This way of drawing on existing structures and staff would facilitate the task of mainstreaming and ensuring that the Office as a whole advanced the status of women workers through all its activities. More innovative and imaginative use of existing machinery would also enable the Office to draw up specific programmes to be used for fund-raising purposes. The Office intended to turn to the Governing Body, and particularly to donors, to ask for additional resources for special programmes.

The long list of activities appended to the Office paper might give the impression that considerable resources would be needed, whereas many of the programmes outlined there had already been approved for the 1996-97 biennium and funding for most of them had been secured. No additional resources would therefore be requested concerning those items.

She welcomed the idea that the ILO should reflect on activities in member States as part of follow-up on the Beijing Conference. The Office could do this in a very cost-effective manner, but would have to rely on information provided by member States in order to be able to share the information with others. Information could be disseminated through the Internet. She reassured the Governing Body that the comments made under this agenda item would be taken very seriously.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 16 of the report.

Third item on the agenda

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION ON THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 1998-99

The Director-General, introducing the paper, explained that it gave indications of what the Organization should be, which was of particular importance in times of uncertainty. This was the sense of paragraph 9. The Organization had to ensure that it was a centre of excellence and reference in the field of employment and labour whose work and views were authoritative at the international level, the focus for the elaboration, implementation and supervision of workers' rights, and an organization offering services to all its constituents in the member States. This was the basic raison d'être of the Organization.

Besides indicating what the Organization should be, he had also described in the Office paper what it should do in the years to come. Here he had drawn on decisions taken in previous years: over the last two biennia some priorities had already been identified, and there was no reason to alter any one of them: to promote democracy, human rights, international labour standards and employment, to combat poverty and to protect workers remained the priorities and major objectives.

He had also remained aware of the expectations of the international community: the ILO was expected to follow up on the World Summit in an appropriate manner, to implement its part of follow-up on the Beijing Conference, and to live up to its responsibilities in protecting workers in the context of the globalization of the economy. The statement on the programme and budget proposals presented by the Government group was of great importance, and it had much in
common with the paper before the Governing Body. It included a number of important proposals to review the methods for managing the Organization's budget.

*Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman)* reiterated his desire, already expressed in previous discussions, for the programme and budget discussions to serve as a method of identifying the strategic orientations of the ILO. Such ambition was necessary. The Director-General was correct in pointing out that the Organization had to respond to the changing needs of its Members, but that was not incompatible with the elaboration of a strategy: the ILO was like an enterprise that could not clearly identify its market but which, as a result, had even more reason to develop strategic options with a view to anticipating its future market. The ILO had to prepare itself to face a world which was less clear and predictable than in the past. It also had to keep in reserve a number of means — basically human resources — to be able to respond to the needs of its constituents.

The crisis experienced by the Organization at present was sometimes overemphasized. Recalling that the word "crisis" in Greek meant "decision", he preferred to describe the present situation as a time of decision. It was also time for the staff of the ILO to regain confidence in the future of the Organization, in which he firmly believed.

The Governing Body wished to be more broadly involved in the preparation and implementation of the programme and budget. This should lead to a real partnership between the Governing Body and the management, in which each of the partners played its part in ensuring that the activities of the Organization reflected the concerns of its Members. The present discussion should be used to find areas of common concern, rather than differences, so that at the end of the debate a precise conclusion could be drawn reflecting the concerns of all groups.

It was advisable to foresee an interim period between March 1996 and March 1997 which would enable the Governing Body to examine the budget and take decisions concerning the possible options. There was the danger that additional demands deriving from the present discussion might exceed the level of the budget. Therefore, in November 1996, the Director-General should present the difficulties he experienced in trying to accommodate all requests in a restricted framework. This would enable the Governing Body to help him take some probably painful decisions.

As a first step, each group should list its priorities, which could be synthesized at a later point. The priority of the Employers' group was the question of employment. In the final instance, fighting poverty depended on how much improvement could be achieved in the level of employment. The term "employment" should be taken to mean freely chosen employment. This was highly significant, as in some countries the transition from a totalitarian situation, in which people were assigned to a certain task, to a democracy and a market economy had resulted in problems of adjustment in the employment field. That was not a disaster, but rather the consequence of a positive spirit.

The first priority of employment policy was the development of enterprises, and particularly that of small enterprises, which were the most important sources of new jobs. The ILO had already started acting along these lines. Towards the end of 1996 the ILO was to organize an Enterprise Forum, which would be a success as employers' organizations, together with other parts of the Organization, would do their utmost to ensure its success. Employment creation and small enterprises was also on the agenda of the next two sessions of the Conference.

The next step should be the preparation of a coherent and integrated programme on enterprises and employment creation, bearing in mind that the question of employment policies in a global context was on the agenda of the Conference in June. This required both preparation and follow-up, including an assessment of the contribution of enterprises, regardless of size, to the aims of the ILO. Finally, the programme should include the provision of operational assistance to small enterprises, including very small enterprises and those in the informal sector. In this context the proposals concerning the informal sector seemed to be based on an error of judgement: the informal sector could not be regulated by special rules. Labour legislation in general needed to be made applicable to the informal sector.

The implementation of this programme concerned the Assistant Director-General responsible for ILO activities towards all types of enterprises, who should have closer links with the
Enterprise and Cooperative Development Department, which in turn should be revitalized. Moreover, all departments should make a contribution, together with the field offices and particularly the multidisciplinary teams, which should include persons with competence in small-enterprise development. The role of the Turin Centre, which had excellent programmes on the management of small enterprises, should also be increased with a view to becoming a vital element of the Organization's efforts to develop small enterprises.

Training was another important aspect of employment creation. It was essential to adapt training to the needs of enterprises, otherwise the educational and training systems would continue to produce unemployed people. Here too there was an obvious link between enterprises and training activities. Another argument in favour of adapting human resources to the changing economic environment was the need for countries and enterprises to prepare themselves to respond to international competition.

Such activities were part of what was termed active employment policy. The ILO's employment policy should be the result of dialogue and, if possible, a consensus between its different constituents. This dialogue should take place in the Commission on Employment, which should draw up a programme to cover all aspects of employment policy, thus ensuring a consensus on employment policy. Such a well-organized tripartite dialogue would benefit both the Director-General and the officials of the ILO.

All employment-related activities should be based on practical experience. The World Labour Report had met with some reservations on the part of the employers precisely because the latest issue, and probably also the next one, was more descriptive than prescriptive. All valid ideas on employment should be compiled. In particular, the ILO should follow the ideas outlined in a book on employment policy by a well-known former Minister of Labour of Belgium.

In addition to these priorities, there was a need to promote human rights at work, to strengthen the different parties involved in tripartism and to advance social security so as to help workers and enterprises adapt to the changing environment. The question of democracy was more difficult, mainly because the word had been so often discredited, but the Director-General's intentions here were understood.

The modernization and updating of the Organization's standard-setting policy was an important related need. In this regard, the Social Summit and the discussions in the Working Party on the Social Dimensions of the Liberalization of International Trade had added new elements to previous discussions, in that they had stressed the fundamental rights of workers. The Organization should follow this lead, which did not exactly coincide with the direction taken by standard-setting activities. Since standards were based on the principle that States were free to ratify them on a voluntary basis, which left unratified Conventions in a vacuum. Nor were all Conventions necessarily oriented towards fundamental rights. Consequently, there was a need to reflect on these issues through tripartite dialogue, particularly between employers and workers.

The revision of Conventions should be pursued by focusing work on the most problematic issues: the programme established the previous day for future work on child labour was an example for future standard-setting activities.

As regards strengthening the different parties involved in tripartism, there was a need to develop, strengthen and defend the organizations of workers. The work accomplished lately in this respect was remarkable, and 20 years previously would have been difficult to imagine.

Employers' activities were partly funded from specific external sources, and this explained how the Bureau for Employers' Activities implemented an important programme in spite of its limited staff. Despite some remarkable improvements — for which he thanked the Director-General — the Bureau remained the poor relative by comparison with other programmes, in particular those for workers. He therefore asked the Director-General not to reduce the number or grade of the Bureau's small staff.

The Organization should be much closer to its constituents. Apart from questions of decentralization and publications, this also involved sectoral activities, which brought more direct contact with employers and workers and their concerns and with reality in the workplace. Research should also focus on analyses of empirical data rather than compilations of facts, which was often the case in the ILO. The role the Institute could play in this respect was not mentioned in the
Office paper, which was astonishing. It had much easier access to the realities of the world of work than the ILO, with its heavy administrative structures. The Turin Centre was also an excellent means to keep in touch with the outside world, as it functioned on the basis of demand from constituents. The resources provided to that Centre therefore had a multiplying effect. He paid tribute to the contributions from the Government of Italy and other sources, and care was needed in determining the necessary adaptations.

The programmes presented in the paper required a real personnel policy, which was extremely difficult in the present context. However, the staff needed to be motivated and mobilized even in present circumstances. It seemed, however, that there were still a number of imperfections in the various components of personnel policy, in the forward-looking staff management, employment, career development, policy governing promotions, recruitment, communications — above all from staff to management — and the development of team spirit and technical skills. Much remained to be done, and he suggested that a small number of experts from outside the ILO might be found, through members of the Governing Body, who could advise the Director-General by taking a fresh look at these problems.

Turning to the question of new resources, and in particular to paragraph 88 of the paper, he welcomed the proposals by the Director-General to seek voluntary contributions from various organizations, including private funds, and encouraged the Office to develop a more positive attitude in this respect.

The action programmes were somewhat lengthy. Some seemed misplaced, while others were too theoretical or inadequately defined. Were they all necessary? Could they not be carried out within the usual structures?

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) acknowledged the fact that the basis for the decisions to be taken included past decisions on priorities and the commitment of the ILO to the international community, including follow-up on the World Summit and the Beijing Conference. The paper should perhaps have been less discursive and more analytical: at the present stage a simple condensation of intended proposals was not the most useful.

The starting-point for the budget discussion was zero real growth in terms of the current budget as it stood after the cuts approved in November 1995, even if that was not what the Workers' group would have preferred. Such realism, however, should not mean dogmatism: the budget should be established according to the needs of programmes, and no concrete figure should be set which then could not be overstepped. The Governing Body should first arrive at a sensible choice of programmes and activities and only then decide on priorities in case the available resources proved to be insufficient. The Governing Body naturally sought efficient administration and use of resources. Attention should be given to possible new resources, and a positive attitude was needed on this point in the Organization. There was also a need for a clear statement of what was acceptable and what was not in relation to funding from private sources.

As regards the question of procedures, he welcomed Mr. Oechslin's suggestion to engage in an intermediate discussion in November 1996 for two reasons: it was too early at the present session of the Governing Body to take any final decisions for the 1998-99 biennium, whereas in March 1997 the budget would be close to its final form and it would be difficult to propose modifications; secondly, some aspects of the current paper were questionable, and required further examination. Those inadequacies could, however, be corrected in November if the present discussion resulted in guidelines and principles that would enable the Director-General to produce proposals.

He expressed surprise at the statement by Mr. Oechslin questioning the usefulness of action programmes, as the decision to include them had been taken by the Governing Body itself. A larger number of action programmes should be proposed, even if the choice was painful. The Director-General should therefore propose some 15 to 20 programmes, of which the Governing Body could chose a dozen or more, or whatever the level of the budget would permit. Broad costing estimates would also be helpful. Without considering these cost estimates as final, they would show whether programmes at a lower cost could bring greater value than more expensive ones. It was important for the Governing Body to be able to make such strategic choices. Progress was also needed with regard to the transparency of operational activities. While he welcomed the
emphasis placed by management on monitoring, evaluating and reporting systems, it was desirable to understand how the resources assigned to a particular region or subregion were used. The work of the multidisciplinary teams should also be reviewed.

While he held no objection to discussing the programme and budget in 1997 under four headings rather than 35 major programmes, the discussion in November should help define priorities. Among the priorities of the Workers' group were the retention of the three basic objectives of the last biennia, namely promoting democracy, human rights and international labour standards; employment promotion and the alleviation of poverty; and the protection of working people. The notion of a “centre of excellence” in the field of employment and labour was important, especially at a time when society was questioning the validity of international organizations. He also welcomed the emphasis placed on the elaboration, application and supervision of workers' rights, with particular reference to respect for fundamental rights in the globalized economy.

The Workers' priorities also included the consideration of new standards, the question of more effective supervision and enforcement, increasing promotion of fundamental human rights standards, concrete action to deal with the issue of globalization, questions related to multinational enterprises, regional integration, training and labour standards, structural adjustment and its social aspects, and ILO cooperation of the ILO with other international organizations, including the Bretton Woods institutions and the World Trade Organization. Like the other groups in the Governing Body, the Workers expressed keen interest in follow-up on the World Summit for Social Development. They shared with the Employers also the desire to promote full, productive and freely chosen employment, which for them meant employment of quality, with dignity, with adequate remuneration and in healthy and safe conditions. Seventy-seven years of building up the international labour code could not be discarded for the sake of having jobs at any cost.

The Workers' group gave clear priority to the issue of promoting democracy, human rights and international labour standards. The work in the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards was important, but it could be further advanced during the next biennium. The Office paper should propose additional innovative measures, particularly in relation to fundamental workers' rights. In addition to the three action programmes suggested under the heading of promoting democracy, the Workers' group wished to add a programme on the promotion of the fundamental rights of workers. Moreover, the action programme on migrant workers should address the question of the persistent mistreatment of migrant workers.

Stressing the importance of the development of tripartism, social dialogue and sound industrial relations, he supported the idea of establishing a major new industrial relations capacity in the secretariat. This could bring the Organization closer to its constituents, to the reality of wage bargaining, industrial relations, human resources and management issues, and could serve as a springboard for building a unique centre of excellence concerning related practical experience. A number of academic institutions claimed to be centres of excellence on industrial relations policy, but there was no body of knowledge concerning practice or changes. He also expressed support for a major report on industrial relations in 1997.

Employment promotion and the alleviation of poverty involved a host of important issues such as globalization, financial, monetary and trade policies, the working relationship between the ILO and the World Trade Organization and World Employment. However, the programmes proposed under this heading, such as local employment strategies or the competitiveness of enterprises, examined an important area, namely the role of the private sector. The Office should also devote attention to multinational enterprises, which were the most important agents of foreign direct investment. It was crucial to know where companies moved and why and whether anything could be inferred from this. Many such companies had good reputations at home for human resources management or their involvement in works councils. Attention should also be given to the question of international structures for workers' representation in multinationals.

Further areas of inquiry should include the social dimensions of structural adjustment and institutional arrangements for labour questions in regional integration processes. It seemed that the questions of workers' rights and social rights had been discussed in practically all regional
integration fora, such as MERCOSUR, the European Union and NAFTA, and it would be of interest to know how they addressed social issues and how they arrived at their conclusions.

He also supported the call to ensure adequate provision for the involvement of the ILO in international policy coordination, including follow-up on the Social Summit and cooperation with the Bretton Woods institutions and the World Trade Organization.

As regards the internal administrative changes suggested by the Director-General, he supported the regrouping of four departments into two. However, the Development Policies Branch of the former Development and Technical Cooperation Department should not be merged with the Enterprise and Cooperative Development Department, but rather with the Bureau for Active Partnership: technical cooperation should be addressed as a whole, and not in separate parts.

He expressed serious concern at the reference to a "demand-driven process towards the elimination of child labour": the elimination of child labour was not a demand-driven process, and it was not clear whether the expression "demand-driven" referred to those countries that were genuinely seeking assistance or to the ILO's identifying those countries that should. The drafting should therefore be improved.

Meetings were of considerable value to the social partners. Consultations should be held and proposals should again be discussed in November.

In conclusion, some difficult choices had to be made, but they would serve to minimize the damage caused by present circumstances and enable the Director-General to make better proposals in March 1997.

Mr. Palma (Government, Philippines) presented on behalf of the Government group those points on which the group had reached consensus. Two Governments had indicated that they would express reservations on certain aspects of the consensus. In any event, the presentation of these consensus views was not intended to pre-empt any Government representative from presenting their own views, particularly on matters not covered by the consensus or on the consensus itself.

He reaffirmed the Government group's commitment to the fundamental values enshrined in the ILO Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia, which should continue to guide the ILO in implementing its basic mandate, that is, to promote social justice. Within that mandate he underlined the importance of the ILO's three priority objectives: the promotion of democracy and human rights in the world of work; the promotion of employment and alleviation of poverty; and the protection of working people. The ILO had to pursue these objectives in a context of rapid political, economic and social changes worldwide. This required constant adaptation to the evolving and growing needs of ILO constituents. Much had already been achieved in adapting the Organization's means of action to the new context, but much remained to be done in the 1998-99 biennium and beyond. The Governing Body should be prepared to play a more constructive role than before in helping the Director-General and the Office to accomplish the necessary changes. It should — within the framework provided by the ILO's founding texts and objectives — agree on a set of policy and management priorities as well as on future action to implement them. The Government group had agreed on a set of suggestions for policy and management priorities, which he invited Ms. Hartwell to present.

Ms. Hartwell (Government, United Kingdom) stated that the priorities were divided into three parts: policy and programme priorities; management priorities; and future action.

The ILO's policy priorities for the biennium 1998-99 should be:

(a) the promotion of employment and the alleviation of poverty, particularly in carrying out the mandate given to the ILO by the World Summit for Social Development within the wider UN system and in cooperation with other international organizations. This should include —

(i) the formulation and promotion of effective strategies and labour market policies aimed at employment generation, social welfare and poverty alleviation;

(ii) technical cooperation and the dissemination of information;

(iii) analysis and research of employment issues and structural adjustment processes, including through a biennial world employment report;
(b) the effective evaluation and continuing enhancement of technical cooperation programmes and the Active Partnership Policy, by seeking the views of users of ILO services and by ensuring effective feedback from the field to headquarters and between the ILO, the wider UN system and other international organizations;

(c) the promotion of the ILO’s fundamental human rights Conventions through all the appropriate means of ILO action, working actively with constituents in member States;

(d) the revision, rationalization, simplification and updating of standards with a view to facilitating ratification and implementation, drawing both on research and operational experience;

(e) strengthening action with the constituents of member States in favour of the elimination of exploitative child labour, including through technical cooperation and the IPEC programme;

(f) working actively to combat social exclusion and improve conditions of work and social protection, especially for women and the most vulnerable groups, such as young workers, the disabled, ethnic minorities and migrant workers;

(g) continuing discussion of the impact of globalization on the ILO’s mandate to secure social justice, and continuing the work of the Working Party on the Social Dimensions of the Liberalization of International Trade;

(h) continuing enhancement of the ILO’s technical capacity for analysis and research.

The ILO’s management priorities for the biennium 1998-99 should be —

(a) to continue to review personnel policies and procedures to ensure that these enabled the ILO to respond to constituents’ needs and aspirations, while maintaining equity and efficiency;

(b) to develop a public relations and communications strategy that would increase the visibility and credibility of the ILO and public awareness of its work, in order to reinforce its relevance to all member States and the international system;

(c) to mobilize extra-budgetary resources for the ILO, in addition to regular contributions, through closer coordination and collaboration with relevant multilateral and bilateral agencies, and individual member States;

(d) to continue to keep under constant review the scope for economies, cost recovery and improvements in operational efficiency.

The Government group agreed that there was a need for a publications strategy taking full account of the above priorities. It similarly endorsed the need to examine the ILO field structures with a view to rationalizing and strengthening them, with decentralization and increased flexibility where appropriate. It welcomed the opportunity to discuss both these issues in detail at a later point.

Concerning future action, it was essential to introduce a new programme and budget procedure that bridged the gap between the preliminary consultations and the final decisions the following spring, which meant that a further discussion should be held at the November 1996 Session of the Governing Body on the basis of a succinct and strategic document produced by the ILO secretariat, which —

— focused on policy, programme and management priorities, and offered options for action programmes and activities for their implementation;

— showed shifts in resources towards priorities, to the extent possible;

— indicated the degree of flexibility that would be available to switch resources during the biennium depending on emerging needs.

The Government group also accepted the specific proposals in paragraph 91 of the Office document for a new structure for the discussion of the programme and budget proposals in March 1997, on the understanding that, while adopting the new order and grouping of programmes, the Governing Body would retain the possibility to discuss details of each individual programme as it deemed appropriate.

Ms. Perlín (Government, Canada), speaking on behalf of the IMEC group of governments, fully supported the statement by the Government group. She expressed appreciation for the Office
paper, which presented a variety of possible initiatives reflecting the energy and imagination of the Organization. It also indicated the increasing scope of the issues that the ILO should address as national and international capacities were struggling to respond to the effects of the globalization of the economy and the liberalization of trade.

She supported the general direction of the Office paper, which reaffirmed the mandate and fundamental values of the ILO while recognizing the need to adapt its means of action to the requirements of the world of work in a globalized economy; to assume the responsibilities given to it by the World Summit and the Beijing Conference; and to strengthen its role as the lead multilateral institution within which social dialogue took place at the global level.

Many proposals contained in the Office paper built on the process of change and adaptation that was already under way in the Organization, the direction of which could be fully endorsed by the IMEC countries for continuation and consolidation. Among these were the revision of standards, the reorientation of technical cooperation, the establishment of multidisciplinary teams, and reforms in the Conference and Governing Body proceedings.

In the current climate of limited resources the expectations and demands on the ILO were at their greatest, both from its constituents and the international community. The Governing Body hence had to exercise its responsibilities in defining the priorities and strategic directions of the Organization as it pursued its primary objectives of human rights and democratic development, employment and poverty alleviation, the protection of workers' rights and social protection in the changing world of work. The greatest challenge was, however, to assume a lead role in the dialogue on the social aspects of economic globalization and trade liberalization. Given its mandate, tripartite structure and expertise, the ILO must strengthen its image in order to be recognized as the authoritative voice on these issues.

The key element in responding effectively to the needs of constituents and to the interests of multilateral institutions was to strengthen the analytical and empirical research capacity of the Organization. Through its global membership the ILO covered a wide range of experience and knowledge at the country level that was unequalled in the international system. This was the ILO's real comparative advantage. This knowledge base had served the Organization well in its standard-setting and technical cooperation activities, and with some adaptation and reorientation would effectively support its role as the primary interlocutor at the global level on issues related to the changing world of work.

In this context, she supported four main strategic orientations: (1) to make the ILO a centre of excellence and reference in the field of employment and labour through strengthened capacity in analysis, empirical research and communications; (2) to reinforce normative activities for the protection of workers' rights, conditions of work and social welfare through the promotion of ratification of fundamental human rights Conventions, and through guidelines that would extend the underlying principles on standards regarding conditions of work and social welfare to non-state and international entities; (3) to support member States and social partners in adapting to the changing world of work by promoting social dialogue within States and through assistance to tripartite constituents; (4) to mobilize resources at the global and national levels through closer policy and programme collaboration with the relevant multilateral and bilateral agencies.

As the Governing Body had to make a selection, from among the action programmes proposed in the Office paper, those that would result in maximum impact for limited resources, she supported the proposal for an interim discussion on the programme and budget in November. Such an interim step would provide the Governing Body with an opportunity for a final intervention at the policy and strategic levels at a stage in budgetary preparations that still allowed for adjustments. The timing would also provide an opportunity to take into account the discussions at the International Labour Conference on child labour and on activities completed in the previous biennium.

The paper to be prepared for November 1996 should: (1) clearly indicate the ongoing commitments of the ILO and the level of resources available for new activities in the biennium; (2) it should be succinct; (3) it should present options or action programmes within five financial envelopes, three of which would correspond to the three priority themes, that is, democracy and human rights, employment and poverty alleviation, and the protection of workers' rights. The
remaining two would contain resources for Governing Body activities and meetings, on the one hand, and for financial, administrative, legal and other services, on the other; (4) it should indicate which action programmes and outputs would be achievable within the indicative resource level for each envelope, without providing detailed costing before March 1997; and (5) it should provide an indication of trends in the shifting of resources and allocations for priority areas.

Concerning other management priorities, the IMEC governments requested further details on personnel policies, outlined in paragraphs 18-19. With regard to institutional structures, they proposed a rationalization in accordance with the priorities outlined, both at headquarters and in the field.

The suggestion in paragraph 87 to prepare the Programme and Budget proposals for 1998-99 with a view to zero real growth was a realistic one. The Governing Body had learned, through experience with the 1996-97 budget, that it was easier to increase activities if resources exceeded expectations than to decrease expenditure once a budget had been determined. She also supported the possibility of investigating the question of cost recovery on services and publications, as well as other measures to mobilize resources, as outlined in paragraphs 88-90.

*The sitting closed at 1 p.m.*
The sitting opened at 3.15 p.m., with Mr. Chotard in the Chair.

Third item on the agenda

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION ON THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 1998-99 (concl.)\(^1\)

Mr. Guerbov (Government, Russian Federation) considered that the analysis of the rather complex international situation and the priorities identified in the Office paper offered a realistic basis for ILO activities in the 1998-99 biennium. He concurred with the Director-General that in order to be regarded as authoritative in its field of competence, the ILO had to be a centre of excellence and reference on employment and labour questions, a centre where work was conducted on fundamental workers’ rights, including the supervision of the application of standards by member States, a centre which served all member States. The ILO had a special role to play in follow-up on the World Summit for Social Development.

He supported the proposal in paragraph 31 of the Office paper that technical work in the ILO should first and foremost be directed towards the three priority objectives, that is the promotion of democracy and human rights; employment promotion and the alleviation of poverty; and the protection of working people. Assistance to member States through the Active Partnership Policy was of particular importance. In this context, he pointed to the very positive role played by the Central and Eastern European Multidisciplinary Team and the Regional Office for Europe, the activities of which should be extended over the forthcoming biennium.

With regard to the changes in internal structures, as outlined in paragraph 16, such measures were understandable. He approved also the realistic approach taken concerning the preparation of the budget on a zero real growth basis. This had to be seen within the framework of the financial difficulties experienced by member States which forced them to apply very strict financial policies. He supported the proposal for the Programme and Budget proposals for 1998-99 to be discussed at the March 1997 Session of the Governing Body in a more coherent manner, concentrating on four main areas of work, as outlined in paragraph 91 of the Office paper. This approach would enable the Governing Body to avoid unnecessary detail and to concentrate on the main parameters of the proposals.

Mr. Ennaceur (Government, Tunisia) expressed appreciation for the Office paper which, through the information, details and precisions it provided, demonstrated a clear desire for transparency and dialogue between the Office and the Governing Body. As a result of the political, economic and social changes of the last five years, the ILO had to respond to new and increased needs in its relationships with member States, the United Nations system and public opinion.

As regards the first, the ILO should continue assisting developing countries to accelerate their development and facilitate the transformation of those which were in the process of transition from a centrally planned to a market economy. At the same time, the ILO had to respond to new needs emerging from the globalization of the economy and the liberalization of trade. Most, if not all, countries tried to adapt their production systems and the level of their enterprises, which in turn necessitated increased efforts on the part of the ILO concerning training, the adaptation of human resources and the improvement of productivity. In view of these developments, it was necessary to examine the importance that had to be accorded to the ILO’s technical cooperation activities in the 1998-99 biennium. ILO technical cooperation and the Active Partnership Policy had a particular significance for African countries, as through collaboration with member States and the social partners they helped define perceived needs and prepare national programmes.

\(^1\) See also fourth sitting.
The Programme and Budget proposals for 1998-99 should be based on a qualitative and quantitative estimate of the needs of member States and employers’ and workers’ organizations. This should help the ILO determine both the extent of its involvement and the amount of additional resources needed. Such an evaluation should take place as soon as possible, so that the proposals could highlight these aspects. For the time being, the level of technical assistance had fallen compared to previous biennia. This concerned less the regular budget — the drop in RBTC was small — than activities financed by extrabudgetary sources. This trend should be reversed in the next biennium.

As regards the shifting of resources during the next biennium, care should be taken to ensure that ILO action responded to the needs of its constituents; that technical cooperation received high priority; and that meeting the new needs deriving from the adaptation of production processes to the requirements of the liberalization of international trade did not diminish efforts by the Office to assist developing countries, and particularly the least developed ones. The Active Partnership Policy should be strengthened and the initiative by the Office to decentralize its activities and move closer to its constituents should be encouraged.

Three years after its implementation, it was time to evaluate the Active Partnership Policy with a view to improving its efficiency. User satisfaction should be assessed; the technical assistance available should be examined to check whether it corresponded to the requirements of member States and the social partners; and the evaluation should verify whether the resources available at the regional level permitted the necessary mobility of multidisciplinary teams.

Functions concerning the assessment or evaluation of a situation should be separated from those concerning the implementation of assistance. Multidisciplinary teams had to engage in both types of activities, but it seemed that their mobility was inadequate and their specializations were not sufficiently diversified to permit an efficient response to demand for action in the field. A redeployment of the multidisciplinary teams should therefore be envisaged during the 1998-99 biennium.

The diversity and volume of activities in the field should also be increased. To this end, the ILO could compile a bank of regional and local expertise that could be drawn on in technical cooperation activities. The subcontracting of activities to groups of independent experts or external collaborators should be encouraged in order to reduce the cost of technical assistance.

As regards major orientations for programmes in the regions, resources allocated to the administration of field services should not be confused with technical cooperation activities: field offices accomplished mainly public relations and information activities and programming, technical backstopping of projects and administrative and logistic support activities. Strictly speaking, these were not technical cooperation activities.

Since the first function of external offices was to bring the Organization closer to its constituents, this should be reinforced by increasing the number of national correspondents. This would also strengthen the activities of the regional offices. Area offices, they did not always show the necessary efficiency: it might therefore be envisaged to reduce their numbers progressively and to keep only those that were really indispensable.

As regards ILO collaboration with other international organizations, he encouraged the Organization to play a leading role in those fields which fell within the framework of its competence, including employment, social development and the advancement of women. In addition to these, the ILO had to safeguard the values enshrined in its Constitution, namely social justice, equality, freedom and social dialogue, and should ensure that they continued to inspire the social policy of member States. It should also ensure that its principles were not threatened by the globalization of the economy or the liberalization of international trade. These two roles, namely leadership in social policy and safeguarding values required adequate strategies and structures centred on the collection of data on social development and, in particular, employment and social protection; the analysis of such data; and permanent and structured cooperation with other international organizations, such as the UNDP, UNHCR, the World Trade Organization and the Bretton Woods institutions.

The Organization faced a lack of public credibility at a time when it needed to strengthen its financial base and mobilize new resources. The Governing Body, governments, employers and
workers had a responsibility to contribute to the improvement of its image and its credibility. The ILO was undergoing a delicate phase of adaptation, but it was far from moribund: its problems in adapting to changes in the international environment could not be attributed to internal factors, nor could responsibility be assigned to any one arm of the Organization. It had to be shared by the Governing Body, the Office and the Director-General. The alarmist declarations in the press should not detract from the collective responsibility of all involved. Rather, practical proposals should be made concerning the contribution of each group within the Governing Body to improving the ILO's public image and mobilizing extrabudgetary resources.

He agreed with the recommendation by the Director-General to modify the structure of the discussion of the programme and budget proposals in March 1997, as outlined in paragraph 91 of the paper. In this respect he held a number of reservations concerning the statement by the Government group.

Mr. Shamuyarira (Government, Zimbabwe) supported the measures proposed to restructure the Office with a view to making it more efficient and competent. Many of the ILO's technical cooperation activities were directed at the African region, and he therefore proposed that more Africans be appointed to key positions. He expressed appreciation for the work of those two Africans who were at present in such posts.

Regional offices and multidisciplinary teams were important agents of technical assistance, whose work was greatly appreciated. Therefore, any restructuring should aim to strengthen them.

The ILO's drive for greater observance of human rights and democracy was very welcome. The Harare Commonwealth Declaration, issued by Heads of Government in 1991, had placed Zimbabwe at the centre of various activities aimed at enhancing the observation of human rights and democracy within Commonwealth countries, and had made Zimbabweans aware of the need to promote these issues through several international organizations. Problems arose in the prevention of violation of human rights and democratic practices. He therefore supported all measures that might be taken in this respect. Declarations by international organizations on related issues could be helpful.

In view of the emphasis placed in the Office paper on the role of the private sector, the importance of the public sector in the economic management of developing countries needed highlighting. Certain functions could be better performed by the private sector, while others were more efficiently accomplished by the public. Privatization was therefore not a panacea that could cure all economic ills.

Employment policies in developing countries were aggravated by the policies of structural adjustment emanating from the Bretton Woods institutions. As observed in paragraph 47 of the Office paper, structural adjustment programmes had had many negative consequences for developing countries. Those countries could hence not accept any partnership with the promoters of programmes that increased unemployment and retrenchment and aggravated the situation in many ways. The task of the ILO should be to counteract the adverse effects of structural adjustment policies.

Finally, he requested the representative of the Government of Colombia, in his capacity as the representative of the country which currently chaired the Non-Aligned Movement, to take steps to coordinate the position of developing countries concerning many of the important issues raised in the document.

Mr. Callorda (Government, Uruguay) concurred with the statement by the Government group. He welcomed the proposal by the Director-General not to change the structure of the International Labour Standards Department. However, should there be any change in the number of sub-units or the distribution of tasks within the department, it should be ensured that this served to strengthen its operational nature, particularly with respect to the Organization's supervisory machinery.

He deplored the fact that in paragraphs 32-38 of the paper, concerning the promotion of democracy, human rights and international labour standards, the only specific mention of the promotion of labour standards concerned freedom of association, women's work and non-discrimination against migrant workers, whereas the question of standards should be raised also in conjunction with the globalization of the world economy. Future activities should therefore
include the revision and adaptation of existing standards to changes in the structures of the world economy and the introduction of new technology.

As regards the rationalization of the Office's field structures, it was preferable to ensure that the multidisciplinary teams had a sufficient range of experts than to maintain a large number of offices that could not meet the needs of the regions.

Mr. Perez Vega (Government, Chile) supported the statement by the Government group. The ILO's financial difficulties had been created by a reduction in real terms of the contributions from member States and by unfavourable exchange rates, and he praised the Director-General's efforts to make optimum use of the material and human resources available to the Organization. However, he would have welcomed an empirical study of the situation, including specific data on the standing expenses of the Organization, which were distinct from the resources needed for the activities planned for the coming biennium. This would have facilitated the identification of priorities.

He agreed with the general criteria for selecting priorities outlined in the paper, and stressed the importance of finding ways to optimize employment creation without diminishing productivity. It was important to understand the implications of globalization for the challenges posed by the ILO's mandate, the Beijing Conference and the aim of eradicating child labour. He concurred with Mr. Brett that the same emphasis should be laid on the promotion of tripartism, the modernization of labour relations and developing alternative ways of enhancing training, industrial reconversion and youth employment.

As regards paragraphs 16 and 17 of the Office paper, the Organization would be better served by the introduction of new management styles and new methods of work rather than by merging two departments. The links between training and employment were relevant here: there was a tendency to subordinate training to employment on the assumption that training was an investment in human capital and thus had to be determined by the requirements of the labour market. This concept carried two risks. Training should not address merely short-term needs, as this resulted in skills which easily became obsolete. Identifying whom to train and how was also important. There was an obvious link between these two aspects, but it was necessary to maintain the specificity of both fields.

Mr. Ngare (Government, Kenya) welcomed the opportunity to provide strategic guidance on the future activities of the Organization, including the setting of priorities concerning the use of scarce resources. Priority should be given to fundamental issues that derived directly from the ILO's mandate, and the Organization had to be a centre of reference in the field of employment and labour and had to improve the relevance and quality of its related activities. It also had to live up to the role conferred upon it by the World Summit for Social Development through the provision of authoritative analysis and opinions in the field of employment.

Furthermore, emphasis had to be placed on the safeguarding and supervision of workers' rights in general and fundamental rights in the context of a globalized economy. Standard-setting activities should therefore be improved with a view to facilitating the quick ratification of Conventions. Attention should also be given to the revision of existing standards in order to take account of current trends, as well as to their effective supervision.

He further endorsed the three priority objectives of enhancing democracy, promoting employment and alleviating poverty, and protecting working people, in particular vulnerable groups. The programme and budget proposals should make adequate provision for recurrent and ongoing technical work, and build into the programme of each technical department sufficient flexibility to respond to requests from member States. They should give high priority to accomplishing more in the field of training and human resources development and should include an action programme on child labour.

The Office should continue organizing sectoral meetings to encourage the exchange of views between ILO constituents in various economic sectors and industrial branches as well as provide technical advice, practical assistance and concrete support to them.

Regional programmes should take into account the priority needs expressed by the ILO's constituents in the context of the Active Partnership Policy, as well as the role assigned to the ILO regarding follow-up on the World Summit and the Beijing Conference.
Concerning the African region, serious attention should be devoted to various regional programmes. Central to the approach adopted should be the formulation of policies and programmes to stimulate higher levels of economic growth and productive employment, including the strengthening of the capacity of countries to develop programmes on employment promotion, enterprise development, management training, vocational training, and the provision of support to ministries of labour and to employers' and workers' organizations.

He further endorsed the proposal to consider alternative sources of income by charging for the services it provided and seeking financing in the form of sponsorship. The Office should also make a determined effort to mobilize extrabudgetary resources. He supported the proposal concerning the new structure for the discussion of the programme and budget proposals in March 1997.

Mr. Boateng (Government, Ghana) took note of the wide-ranging suggestions in the Office paper for the revitalization and restructuring of the ILO, and supported the position taken by the Government group. While endorsing the objectives outlined in paragraphs 9 and 36 of the paper, he questioned the usefulness of merging four departments into two, as this might lead to the marginalization of some of the vital and high-profile units involved in technical cooperation. The doubts noted in paragraph 6 about the effectiveness of technical cooperation would need to be carefully examined. In most developing countries in Africa, technical cooperation was the most visible and active contribution to development. Therefore, in order to allay existing fears, the ILO had to demonstrate the continuing validity of its technical cooperation strategy.

He was pleased to note the commitment of the Office to improvement in personnel policy and human resource development, as described in paragraph 18 of the paper. This was of particular importance in view of the Staff Union's dissatisfaction with the ILO as an employer. The feeling of distrust, frustration and lack of consultation in negotiations should be seriously addressed as any restructuring could be undermined by an unmotivated, frustrated and uninspired staff.

The emphasis on the role of the ILO in encouraging democracy was most welcome. The spirit of consensus which characterized the work of the ILO with the social partners could be regarded as an expression of that role. This spirit of consensus, understanding and negotiation should feature strongly in all field programmes and activities, thereby making a genuine contribution to the promotion of democracy.

Mr. Mishra (Government, India) expressed appreciation for the broad consensus reached by the Government group. He also noted with satisfaction the candid manner in which the Director-General had described the changing perspective in which the ILO had to carry out its work. The challenges posed by the present situation created difficulties, but enabled talent, ingenuity and innovation to come to the fore. This was particularly welcome at a time when the ILO had to face many challenges and the tasks ahead had to be accomplished in spite of the dwindling resources.

The following principles had to be maintained: there was a need to set priorities, even if this meant painful choices, and this involved alternative strategies, adjustments, reconciliation and much balancing; standard-setting development activities had to be regarded as equally important; rationalization, decentralization and functional autonomy had to be encouraged. He accordingly endorsed the presentation of problems, concerns and strategies in paragraphs 3-15, 18-20 and 21-29 of the paper, and agreed with the orientation of technical work towards the three priority objectives outlined in paragraphs 32-57. He supported the Active Partnership Policy. While broadly agreeing with the suggestions in paragraph 82 of the paper concerning the major orientations for programmes in the Asian region, he requested that priority should be given to the following concerns.

The first concerned the situation of unorganized labour, which represented the overwhelming percentage of the workforce in India, and which included numerous categories and subcategories of the workforce, such as workers in the building and construction industries, stone quarries, loading and unloading operations, leather workers, salt workers, landless agricultural labourers, sharecroppers and those who lived on the collection and processing of minor forest produce. India had ratified the Rural Workers' Organizations Convention, 1975 (No. 141) as early as 1977, and a series of initiatives had been taken both by the Government and non-governmental organizations...
to promote economic activities in the unorganized sector. However, the magnitude and complexity of the problem was such that major efforts were required in promoting training, small enterprise development and social integration, and in developing complementarity between financial and developmental institutions for the sake of poverty eradication and economic self-reliance in the unorganized sector.

The second concern related to the social security of unorganized labour, which suffered from insecurity of tenure, the irregularity of wage payments, the fluctuating nature of employment and the lack of retirement schemes. Appropriate mechanisms and procedures should therefore be found to progressively introduce some minimal level of social security and thus create a more stable and contented workforce.

Thirdly, there was a need to improve the conditions of migrant workers, who often faced an unfamiliar climate, customs, language or legal procedures and who were left alone to fend for themselves. The ILO should play a leading role in assisting migrant workers through counselling, training, testing and facilitating their adaptation, and should create a forum at which sending and receiving countries could jointly resolve some of the outstanding issues of human concern.

The last issue related to those workers, mainly women, who as a result of structural adjustment had lost their employment and had to be rehabilitated through a variety of measures concerning counselling, training and retraining. Whereas such activities were referred to in the Office paper, it was necessary to re-emphasize the importance of human resources development in this context.

Mr. Hiromi (Government, Japan) noted that the role to be played by the ILO could be expected to expand at a time when there was no room for optimism concerning the financial situation of the Office. It was therefore essential that activities be implemented in accordance with set priorities. The views expressed by the Government group and the IMEC group had been useful in identifying the fundamental direction, strategies and the priorities, and had helped move closer to a common understanding.

As the discussions in November 1996 would have to be even more concrete and constructive, zero real growth, as envisaged by the Director-General for the 1998-99 biennium, should be regarded as the most optimistic scenario. However, neither the level of contributions nor exchange rate fluctuations could be foreseen accurately, and it might be necessary to face zero nominal growth. While not advocating such a tight budget, he encouraged the ILO to prepare itself for a severe situation. The programme and budget had to adhere strictly to the priorities identified by the Governing Body: 20 per cent of the budget had had to be earmarked for possible savings in the present biennium. He welcomed such prudence.

Mr. Anand (Employer, India) regretted that the Programme and Budget proposals for the 1998-99 biennium had been based on the priorities identified in the Director-General's Report to the 1994 session of the International Labour Conference. Consequently, the proposals had placed inadequate emphasis on the eradication of poverty and the promotion of full and productive employment. They also failed to give due priority to the promotion of a stable social order, advocated by the World Summit for Social Development, even though the ILO had played a major role in its preparation.

The feeble reference in the opening paragraphs to the world of work should be strengthened by a reference to the post-Social Summit commitments of the ILO. Paragraph 9 should also be redrafted in order to place specific and due emphasis on the ILO's primary role and obligations in relation to poverty eradication and employment creation. In the same paragraph, the concept of workers' rights had to be balanced by introducing the concept of duty towards the enterprise in which they were engaged. The same was true for employers, who also had both rights and duties. This complementarity between the two concepts enabled enterprises to remain healthy and financially strong. It was time to reflect on whether the concept that workers' rights — without duties and obligations — were a precondition for social progress. Paragraph 9 should be changed with a view to promoting cooperation, and not confrontation, between employers and workers. As regards internal administrative changes, outlined in paragraph 16, enterprise development and human resources development should be under the same direction.
The observation in paragraph 27 that research activities did not necessarily lead to immediately usable output, could be interpreted as an indication that the work accomplished by the International Institute for Labour Studies and the Turin Centre were insufficiently taken into consideration. This was a cause for great concern, as the linking of research with the knowledge accumulated by social research and training institutions was an asset. The Institute and the Turin Centre should not be marginalized. As regards paragraphs 39-47, concerning employment promotion and the alleviation of poverty, the programmes of action should receive adequate resources, as their implementation was essential for socio-economic stability. The practical application of labour legislation in the informal sector, referred to in paragraph 51, was a sensitive area necessitating empirical studies in the regions, before being proposed as a worldwide programme. Employment creation in the rural and informal sectors was the top priority, and nothing should be undertaken which might prevent small or micro-enterprises from creating new jobs. The initiative concerning labour protection and labour inspection should be left to governments, which could judge the feasibility of such measures.

The examination of the extent to which the sustainability of the welfare state was limited by macroeconomic constraints, mentioned in paragraph 56, was welcome, but should be undertaken by an independent research institution. The shifting of the ILO’s attention to the needs of the ageing population, including a review of retirement age levels, seemed however ironic in view of the high levels of unemployment among both educated and uneducated youth. Coming from a region where youth unemployment was a recurring factor of social instability and a threat to law and order, he asked the ILO to concentrate on its obligation towards youth.

Concerning the programmes for the Asian region, the content of paragraph 82 should be developed further in supplementary papers. He welcomed and appreciated the continuous services rendered by the area offices and multidisciplinary teams in the region, and commended their performance: in particular, the prompt identification of country objectives in the Asian region, accomplished in consultation with the ILO’s tripartite constituents had been impressive, and illustrated the value of timely consultations in setting programme priorities. They should also continue during the various stages of implementation. The statement in paragraph 82, that in many countries of the region the most important problem was that of widespread poverty, confirmed the relevance of his earlier request to redraft the parts of the paper related to the basic objectives for the 1998-99 biennium.

Since one of the Organization’s roles was to provide services to its constituents, it was important to analyse their needs with a view to making optimal use of available resources, and the present discussion was a unique opportunity to develop a strategy and a plan in that respect. However, the Office papers, despite their merit, did not inspire full confidence in the Office’s capacity to define the objectives for the closing years of the twentieth century, and even less to lay the foundations for the ILO’s obligations in the twenty-first.

Mr. Lin (Government, China) stated that careful attention needed to be given to defining the ILO’s key objectives, designing effective activities to implement its objectives and adjusting the structures of the Organization with a view to increasing its efficiency. Employment promotion and poverty elimination should remain the ILO’s priority objectives, and should be the basis for the programme and budget. Societies throughout the world were affected by the unemployment, underemployment and poverty brought about by the globalization of the economy, technological change and industrial restructuring. The Secretary-General of the United Nations had pointed out that 1.3 billion people in the world were living in abject poverty and 1.5 billion had no access to basic medical services, and had appealed to all member States of the United Nations to wage a war on poverty. The Social Summit had aimed at making social development a chief priority for the international community, and governments had committed themselves to full employment as a priority objective for their economic and social policy. As an international tripartite organization responsible for employment and labour issues, the ILO faces both a challenge and a real opportunity to play an important role in employment creation, and should refocus its work on employment generation and poverty alleviation.

Since a majority of the ILO’s member States were developing countries confronted by unemployment, poverty, mounting debts and inadequate supplies to cover basic needs, the Organization should assist them in increasing employment opportunities, improving living and
working conditions and developing their human resources, employment services and labour markets. Only by working towards these central priority objectives could the ILO raise its stature in the international community.

While standard setting and promoting the ratification and application of labour standards were important, they should promote socio-economic development: low levels of development might restrict the ability of States to ratify Conventions. The ILO should provide them with technical assistance and advice, while introducing greater flexibility in standards to facilitate their ratification and application. It should also be ensured that the ratification of Conventions did not become a precondition for technical assistance, as that would hinder socio-economic development.

Ms. Morgan (Government, United Kingdom) expressed appreciation for the Director-General's positive response to the Governing Body's request for greater involvement in the preparation of the programme and budget proposals. She endorsed both the statement by the Government group and the IMEC governments, which showed considerable similarity with the Office paper and welcomed the proposal for a further discussion in November.

Within the strategic framework that had been set out in the IMEC statement, the Government of the United Kingdom identified three key priorities. Firstly, to take urgent action on exploitative child labour, including the development of a new Convention. Secondly, to build on the outcome of the discussion in the Working Party on the Social Dimensions of the Liberalization of International Trade by designing a concrete work programme focused on the identification and promotion of effective action that could serve as a basis for the ILO and its constituents in promoting respect for human rights. Thirdly, to strengthen the links between standard setting and technical cooperation activities, in particular by focusing the ILO's technical assistance more closely on helping countries to progressively reach fundamental human rights standards.

Mr. Diarra (Government, Mali) supported the statement by the Government group and welcomed the emphasis on employment generation in paragraphs 77-79 of the Office paper. The formulation of paragraph 77 revealed, however, a very pessimistic vision of Africa's future. Instead of "prospects for change" the phrase should have referred to "major quantitative changes" which were presently occurring in Africa. The part of the sentence which referred to Africa as "offering grounds for optimism" should have been formulated in a more positive manner in view of the major efforts being undertaken at present, as this was of importance for perceptions of Africa. He endorsed the priority objectives identified in the paragraphs concerning Africa, but the reference in paragraph 79 to "activities involving high manpower levels" should be accompanied by a mention of "quality employment" or "productive employment", since it was understood that the eradication of poverty would be obtained through activities that permitted the economy to develop.

Mr. Otero (Government, United States) welcomed the present constructive and transparent dialogue on the long-term future of the ILO, which would guide immediate financial decisions and the restructuring that would take place in the medium term. He supported the statement by the Government group which represented an important step in a process of tripartite consultation and consensus on a set of goals. The next step would be the identification of the highest priority programmes under each strategic objective, namely the advancement of democracy, promotion of employment and protection of working people. The number of programmes chosen should be limited in order to concentrate on the ILO's core mandate.

Concerning the promotion of democracy, the most important activity was follow-up on the World Summit, as its Programme of Action was closely related to the ILO's core mandate of promoting social justice. The next priority was to accelerate and improve the effectiveness of the application of the recommendations made by the Committee on Freedom of Association by means of advance contacts. The action programmes proposed in the paper would pursue that objective.

As regards employment promotion and the alleviation of poverty, the publication of a further issue of World Employment would serve the aim of establishing the ILO as a centre of excellence and reference on employment questions. The focus on the international dimension of employment was both appropriate and timely. Employment creation in the twenty-first century would largely depend on the private sector, and the programmes on enterprise development and local employment strategies were most welcome.
Turning to the protection of working people, he strongly supported the development of a code of practice on national strategies for the progressive elimination of exploitative child labour. Child labour should be a top priority for the Organization, and resources should be brought to bear on this issue from all disciplines in order to bring quick and comprehensive results. The action programme on the practical application of labour legislation in the informal sector was also important in view of the large number of people employed in that sector.

As regards meetings, further restraint was needed, and six sectoral meetings and three technical meetings should be held, in addition to the meetings of the Committee of Experts. Instead of regional meetings, less expensive means of action should be used for the discussion of subjects that otherwise would have been dealt with at such meetings. When concentrating resources on the highest priorities, some current activities had to be dropped. The identification of the latter should be the subject of intensive tripartite consultations with a constructive approach.

While noting with appreciation that the budget level proposed was below that adopted by the Conference for the present biennium, it should be realized that zero real growth was no longer tenable at a time of fiscal restraint. International organizations, like governments, would have to absorb cost increases for inflation and salary increases. The revised budget of US$557 million for 1996-97 should be further reduced. Such cuts should be introduced in 1997. Overheads should be the major target, starting with travel expenses, including a re-examination of the Office’s travel policy to take advantage of wholesale prices, a review of the class of travel used and of the per diem scale, and a significant reduction of the number of staff sent on missions.

The Programme and Budget proposals for the 1998-99 biennium should be based on a level of US$525 million. Without prejudging the acceptability of that budget level, he believed that it would enable the Office to plan sensibly for the coming biennium, and recommended full transparency in that process. From there on, for the next seven or eight years, the trend should be downwards, as the contributions of governments were expected to be limited. For the ILO to survive and prosper, it must reach a sustainable budget level that did not force major contributors into significant arrears.

He supported the proposed new structure for discussion of the programme and budget proposals. This should enable the Governing Body to discuss programme areas first, and to devote attention to the activities of greatest importance to the largest number of constituents. Another important step was the Government group’s proposal for a discussion in November 1996. The paper presented at that time should analyse proposed expenditure in terms of the three priority objectives of human rights and democracy, employment and the protection of working people. It should include cost estimates for continuing activities and projections for new activities, and should enable the Governing Body to make choices and to shift resources realistically. The ensuing discussions would give the Director-General the benefit of early Governing Body input on key programmes, subject to a fuller discussion on details in March 1997.

The other major variable affecting the budget level was the exchange rate. In November 1995 the Government Body had reviewed the denomination of the budget, and noted that, as a result of exchange rate fluctuations, the 1996-97 budget was 25 per cent above the previous biennium level in terms of dollars, whereas in Swiss franc terms the level was the same. It was therefore essential for the ILO to find ways to deal with exchange rate fluctuations and to divide the risk more equitably.

He presumed that some budgetary savings and improvements in efficiencies would result from the proposal to regroup four departments into two new ones, as outlined in paragraph 16. While in principle not opposing immediate action to restructure the departments in question, he wished to know the extent of the savings thus obtained and requested more information on the senior staff responsibilities, if not at the present, then at the next session of the Governing Body.

Until now, the Active Partnership Policy had concentrated on technical cooperation in recipient countries. However, industrialized countries could also benefit from the APP, in particular their public relations strategy, as it would help people, especially in donor countries, to understand the importance of the ILO’s role and work. A good media strategy must have content as well as style in order to be effective. By working with constituents in industrialized
countries through the Active Partnership Policy, the ILO could become a well-known, trusted forum for the discussion of workers' concerns.

Ms. Voskuhl (Government, Germany) supported the statements made by the Government group and the IMEC group, and expressed agreement with the general considerations outlined in part I of the paper.

The question of restructuring raised, however, a number of concerns. In November 1995 the Director-General had been asked to present an overall plan, including an organizational chart, to the Governing Body. Without wishing to examine the details of the chart, the Governing Body wanted to see whether the proposed restructuring had taken into account the objectives, tasks and order of priorities of the ILO's future activities. The Governing Body was jointly responsible for decisions that had an impact on the structures of the ILO. Therefore, she expressed surprise at the fact that instead of responding to the request of the Governing Body, the Director-General had simply informed it of changes that would take place.

It was not at all clear whether the total fusion of the employment and training departments was advisable. In Germany and in many other countries questions related to employment and training were treated separately, even though they were related to a certain extent. Training was expected to gain importance as a result of changes in the world of work. Initial training would be completed by on-the-job training throughout working life, and this spoke also in favour of maintaining a separate training department.

She asked the Director-General to explain the reason for believing that the two subjects could only be dealt with in one department. Could they not continue as separate departments under the leadership of one Assistant Director-General, who could eventually have the responsibility also for a third department devoted to employment creation? During an initial period, reorganization usually resulted in a deterioration in the quality of work, therefore the reason for restructuring really needed to be explained. Nor was the establishment of a new Enterprise and Job Creation Department convincing. However, Mr. Brett was right in saying that the Development Policies Branch of the former Development and Technical Cooperation Department should not join this new entity. It should remain separate from the others.

Turning to Chapter II of the Office paper concerning strategic considerations for the technical programmes, she approved the orientation of the ILO's technical work toward the three priority objectives. She welcomed the fact that paragraph 37, on migrant workers, raised the question of improving employment conditions in migrant-sending countries. This aspect of the question should receive priority consideration, as it was better and more human to bring work to people than move people to work. Moreover, the improvement of employment conditions in sending countries could reduce the level of migration.

It was recognized in paragraph 39 that employment creation increasingly depended on economic, financial, monetary and trade policies, for which other organizations were responsible. Paragraph 43 also included reference to the need to improve the competitiveness of enterprises. Whereas it was evident that employment generation was facilitated by an improved economic context, the ILO should concentrate on issues related to the labour market and social policy, including social marginalization, discrimination and the adaptation of human resources, and should leave questions concerning the wider economic context to organizations already dealing with those subjects, such as the OECD. However, the obvious links between these issues required cooperation and close cooperation between the ILO and these organizations.

She welcomed the proposals in paragraph 49 to undertake research on the development of non-traditional forms of employment, including flexible working arrangements, "virtual enterprises" and mobile offices. Issues related to multimedia could also play an important role in the creation and maintenance of employment. It was, however, important to examine the impact of these developments on working conditions. The German Ministry of Labour was planning research on these questions and the European Union had created a working party. She appreciated the ILO's intention to make a contribution in this area.

Mr. Vidnes (Government, Norway) expressed satisfaction at the large degree of consensus within the Government group that permitted the Governing Body to give the Director-General the kind of guidance that had not been possible before. The consensus reached by the Government
group had been facilitated by the fact that the papers before the Governing Body presented a wide range of activities without setting strict priorities. Whereas the papers were an excellent starting-point, the economic realities of the future obliged the Governing Body to be more selective and to set priorities even among those items it already perceived as priorities. To enable the Governing Body to make realistic strategic decisions at its November 1996 Session the Office should present a paper offering a wide range of programmes.

The top priorities of the Government of Norway included the promotion of workers’ basic human rights combating exploitative child labour and the promotion of employment.

Mr. Sherdil (Government, Pakistan) supported the statement by the Government group. The rapid changes occurring in the three troubled areas referred to in paragraph 3 of the paper had made economic and social patterns uncertain and unpredictable. Moreover, changes such as the globalization of world economy, structural adjustment, economic integration programmes, the introduction of new technology and the modification of industrial relations systems brought the ILO new challenges. The employment crisis affected all spheres of economic activity, and new forms of work and working relations were emerging. Neither the institutions of dialogue nor social security nets were able to meet these challenges. The dissolution of certain economic blocks had created a new relationship between States, economies and the partners in production. The ILO could not remain indifferent to such changes, and had to respond to the changing values and realities. The programme and budget proposals would have to take into consideration future prospects and requirements in order to enable the Organization to make a visible and positive contribution to the solution of problems in the employment and labour fields.

The scale of the ILO’s technical cooperation activities had to increase, as developing countries were turning to the Organization for technical advice and services in order to cope with their many and varied problems. He supported the role envisaged for the ILO, as outlined in paragraphs 9-12 and 32, and agreed with the recommendation in paragraph 91 concerning the discussion of the proposals in March 1997.

Mr. Durling (Employer, Panama), speaking on behalf of the Latin American members of the Employers’ group, rejected the content of paragraph 80 concerning the Americas region. In spite of some limitations in the freedom to choose a government, the continent enjoyed a feeling of liberty. In this respect, particular attention had to be paid to the revision of outdated legal and judicial systems with a view to laying a solid ground for the consolidation of the achievements obtained during the present decade.

The ILO’s activities concerning industrial relations should be directed towards promoting voluntary negotiations between employers and workers with a view to maintaining sources of employment and promoting competitiveness within the framework of a globalized economy. Particular attention should also be paid to strengthening the capacity of ministries of labour to cooperate with the social partners and to design activities with a view to generating employment. Multidisciplinary teams should analyse infrastructure, services and training, which led to investment and promoted employment.

Among the problems faced by young people in South America were vulnerability, orphanhood, malnutrition, inadequate access to schooling and deficiencies in the educational system, the breakdown of families, violence in the media and the resulting delinquency in urban areas. Child labour was omitted from this list for the moment, as he resented the fact that the Office paper had referred to the problem as if it was specific to Latin America. Since it was much more acute in other parts of the world, he requested that the reference be deleted from paragraph 80, or else the names of all countries in the world be mentioned where the problem had been detected.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) associated himself with the statements by the Government group and the IMEC group. In paragraph 9 of the paper, reference should be made to the structure and efficiency of services rather than an organization offering services.

The proposal in paragraphs 15 and 16 to regroup four departments into two was acceptable, provided that it resulted in improvements in efficiency and savings for the Office.
He supported the points made in paragraphs 18 and 19 concerning personnel policy, including the proposal to subcontract some functions, as long as it was not in contradiction with the rights of the Office's staff.

Turning to the question of research in paragraph 27, he stressed the need to undertake technical and empirical research and to take into account the work of the International Institute for Labour Studies and the Turin Centre. Although research did not always have immediate results, it should always have a well-defined objective.

He supported the points made concerning the rights of women workers. He concurred also with the concerns expressed by the representative of Government of Germany with regard to migrant workers. The question had to be addressed in migrant-sending countries, and not only in receiving countries. The latter should be involved only if the problems could not be resolved in the sending countries.

Paragraph 44 included a reference to the "social economy": activities in this field should include the strengthening of the public sector, not as the only sector involved, but complementing the others.

As regards the protection of workers, he underlined the statement in paragraph 49 concerning "contingent and atypical workers", and encouraged the Office to address the problem of the informal sector more efficiently.

Concerning the question of "safety culture" in paragraph 50, he drew attention to the 14th World Congress on Occupational Safety and Health, to be held in Madrid, Spain, from 22 to 26 April 1996, the conclusions of which would have to be taken into consideration when examining questions related to that subject.

The concept of the welfare State, which was considered in paragraph 56, was often misinterpreted. The term was first used by St. Thomas Aquinas and denoted the State which served the common good. That was the role of the State. There should be as much or as little state intervention as necessary to accomplish this role.

Concerning the question of meetings, he supported paragraphs 58-61. Referring to paragraph 66, concerning technical cooperation, he stressed that technical cooperation programmes should respond to the need of the majority of member States. Awareness of technical cooperation was needed in both donor and receiving countries. The sustainability of technical programmes was not the only criterion for their adoption: they should also help promote sustained economic growth.

He supported both paragraph 87 and the proposals made concerning the seeking of new resources in paragraphs 88-90. He welcomed the recommendation in paragraph 91 concerning the discussion in March 1997. In view of the high degree of consensus in the Government group, the task would consist largely in determining priorities. Problems remained in relation to multinational enterprises, foreign direct investment, and the role of financial markets.

Ms. van Leur (Government, Netherlands) endorsed the statements made on behalf of the Government group and the IMEC group. She wondered whether the rapid implementation of the changes proposed in paragraph 16 referred to the 1998-99 biennium or to the immediate context.

Mr. Haidoub (Government, Sudan) endorsed the statement made by the Government group. The ILO had great aspirations in spite of its limited financial resources, and would hopefully be able to adapt itself to the existing situation by using resources in a rational manner. Paragraph 21 referred to direct services frequently provided by the ILO to member States on request. These services should continue to be provided in coordination with the multidisciplinary teams, particularly in countries where their presence was quite weak, such as the Arab countries. He regretted that the impact of the Active Partnership Policy could not yet be felt in those countries, and expressed the hope that practical programmes would be implemented in consultation with employers' and workers' organizations and that MDTs would be provided with sufficient financial resources to take effective action in the field with a minimum of bureaucracy.

He encouraged the Office to seek extra-budgetary funding for technical cooperation activities, as mentioned in paragraph 66. The ILO should mobilize resources for the implementation of projects in Africa focusing on employment creation, especially in the least developed countries in accordance with the conclusions of the World Summit for Social Development. Technical
cooperation financed under the regular budget should concentrate on those countries which needed it most.

Mr. Cavaglieli (Government, Italy) supported the statements made by the Government group and the IMEC group. Priority attached to employment and human rights Conventions, and particularly to the abolition of child labour. As regards personnel policy, he wished to add to paragraphs 18 and 19 of the Office paper the aim expressed in paragraph 4(i) of the statement made by the Government group, namely "to continue to review personnel policies and procedures to ensure that this will enable the ILO to respond to constituents' needs and aspirations, while maintaining equity and efficiency". Research should not be academic but should deal with real problems.

He endorsed the views expressed by the representative of the United States Government concerning the visibility of the ILO. However, public information activities should be carried out in all member States, and not only in industrialized countries. International organizations should also be targeted. Such activities required determination, as they were likely to bring concrete results. The ILO deserved to be as well known as UNESCO and UNICEF.

Mr. Fannizadeh (Government, Islamic Republic of Iran) welcomed the opportunity to set clear priorities and objectives for the future activities of the ILO. Their implementation should, however, be left to the Office in order to avoid a delay in the restructuring which would become necessary. He therefore endorsed the notion of strategic guidance as presented in the paper. Whereas the Governing Body should ensure that the size of the budget remained realistic, decisions should be determined by the relevance of the activities rather than by the budget in terms of the Constitution of the ILO, the Declaration of Philadelphia and the expectations of member States, particularly the developing ones. With regard to future orientations, he welcomed the new impetus given to the ILO's role in the field of employment. New economic policies and the impact of international trade on employment needed to be evaluated. The need for government intervention in economic development could also be examined. Trade union rights, freedom of association, the right to collective bargaining and protection of working people, which was the raison d'être of the Organization, should be promoted, as set out in paragraphs 48-57.

The Governing Body had already succeeded in making considerable savings in the programme of meetings. It now had to pay attention to improving the geographical distribution of participants in sectoral and technical activities. The further integration of sectoral activities with other activities, including research in the field of employment, could produce interesting results. The Active Partnership Policy should continue to be a key instrument in implementing the ILO's objectives through the strengthening of national capacity and direct service to the constituents. He supported the proposal concerning the merging of four departments into two. He also agreed to the proposal to move from managing big technical cooperation projects to supplying direct advisory services, including the dissemination of information, the organization of seminars and the administration of fellowships. These new types of technical assistance required a re-examination of field structures, but country objectives had not been prepared for all developing countries. The list of fundamental or priority standards had been expanded to include 11 Conventions, but some important areas had been omitted from the list. He supported the proposals in paragraphs 74-76 of the paper.

Mr. Ramona (Government, France) endorsed the statements made by the Government group and the IMEC group, and shared the views expressed by the representatives of the Governments of Italy and Norway. The statements made by the various groups within the Governing Body indicated that the Organization's constituents were aware of the importance of the ILO and had confidence in its future. Public opinion, however, did not necessarily concur with this view. When asking a group of 50 students about the function of the ILO, only five could give an answer, albeit an insufficient one. The activities of international organizations were being widely evaluated, yet the papers prepared by the Office, the Government group and the IMEC group — in spite of their excellence — could not be used for public information purposes, as they were too long, illegible and too ambitious. The Office should therefore prepare a brief paper setting out the basic functions and future directions of the ILO to convince donors of its value. It would suffice to refer to the fundamental rights of workers, child labour, freedom of association, the social dimensions of
international trade, the revision of standards, reforms, training and the exemplary experience of
the Turin Centre.

The present consultations were part of a longer process that had begun with the remarkable
Report of the Director-General to the Conference on the 75th anniversary of the ILO in 1994:
Defending values, promoting change. This Report had triggered off a series of changes and
reforms which were insufficiently known, such as the reform of the Conference and the revision
of the standard-setting procedure, all of which would result in savings. Moreover, the World
Summit for Social Development had assigned a lead role to the ILO in employment which should
prompt the Organization to concentrate its efforts. The Programme and Budget for 1998-99 was
merely a step in a process that should enable the ILO to take its rightful place in the system of
multilateral international organizations. The required efforts of adaptation had to take place in a
particularly difficult economic and financial context: all countries had to reduce their current
expenses, and it was probable that in ten years the United Nations system would have to face an
overall reduction in its resources. This perspective had to be kept in mind, even if it was hoped
that an improvement in the ILO's image, together with appropriate rationalization and control of
expenses, would place it among the international organizations that were the most needed and
therefore the best financed.

Mr. Trajano (Government, Philippines) associated himself with the statement made by the
Government group. In view of the emerging consensus on the immediate implementation of the
proposals made in paragraph 16, he would not oppose the consensus. He attached highest
importance to employment promotion, the development of small and medium-sized enterprises and
to training. The suggestion by the Workers' group to merge the Development Policies Branch of
the former Development and Technical Cooperation Department with the Active Partnership
Bureau deserved consideration, and its full implications should be discussed.

The main concern regarding paragraph 16 was not so much what the proposals were aimed
to achieve, but how. The suggestion to merge four departments into two was linked with the
proposal to increase the number of Assistant Directors-General and the overall restructuring of the
Office. It would have been more appropriate for the Office to disclose these facts, thus enabling
the Governing Body to take into account the full implications of the proposal. Only by taking well-
informed decisions could the Governing Body safeguard its credibility.

Ms. Perlin (Government, Canada) concurred with the statements by the Government group
and the IMEC group. As regards priorities in view of the fact that the available resources were
unlikely to allow the implementation of all the programme proposals outlined in the Office paper
or which had emerged from the present discussion and from the Working Party on the Social
Dimensions of the Liberalization of International Trade, she suggested that the Office provide, for
November, further information on the programmes proposed. This should include an assessment
of the level of the effort required, as well as the steps taken to avoid duplication and to reinforce
the complementarity of programmes. In order to facilitate this assessment, she proposed that the
Office consider whether the proposals related to other research or action programmes under way
in the ILO; whether other international organizations were undertaking work on the issue, and if
so, how the proposed ILO activities related to such work and whether the ILO could reduce the
level of effort by contributing to or coordinating its work with other agencies; whether the scope
of specialized research could be broadened to encompass more general issues or be linked to other
work under way within the ILO or in other organizations; whether the proposed programme or
output had a broad application to the needs of all constituents, to specific groups, to the
international community, or all of these. In addition to assisting in establishing a balanced work
programme, the requested information might also reveal possibilities to reduce the level of effort
and thus ensure greater output with available resources, and might help to avoid duplication and
enhance complementarity.

Mr. Swails (Government, Australia) supported the statements made by the Government group
and the IMEC group, which had many points in common with the Office paper. He supported the
objectives outlined in paragraph 9, as well as the explanations given and proposals made in
paragraphs 10-20, including the changes suggested to give a sharper focus to the ILO's action on
employment.
As regards the strategic considerations proposed for technical programmes, he supported the orientation of technical work towards the three priority objectives as described in paragraph 31, and the recognition of the need for flexibility in paragraph 26. Concerning the main priorities for the ILO’s work outlined in paragraphs 32-57, he emphasized the need to assist, through employers’ organizations, the development of private enterprises in order to generate new employment opportunities, as proposed in paragraphs 33 and 41; to develop closer links with other international organizations, including the Bretton Woods institutions, with a view to promoting the ILO’s objective of employment promotion and the elimination of poverty, as referred to in paragraph 39; to integrate women into all ILO programmes and to follow up on the Beijing Conference, as set out in paragraphs 32 and 36; to promote full respect for freedom of association, as referred to in paragraph 35; and to prepare a code of practice on the progressive elimination of child labour, as outlined in paragraph 54.

Furthermore, he supported the research proposed concerning flexible workplaces, as referred to in paragraph 49; and the consideration of an action programme on “safety culture”. Lower priority might be given to sectoral and technical meetings, especially at a time of financial stringency. He agreed with the approach to technical cooperation described in paragraphs 65-70. The vagueness of the proposals for ILO activities in Asia and the Pacific in paragraph 82 was a cause for concern, even though it had to be read in conjunction with paragraphs 71-76 introducing the major orientation for programmes in the regions.

Regarding the question of resources, he noted that in paragraph 87 the Director-General had suggested that the Programme and Budget proposals for 1998-99 should be prepared with a view to zero real growth in relation to the budget of expenditure for 1996-97 as adjusted by the Governing Body at its 264th Session. While the Governing Body was not required to determine the level of the budget for the next biennium at its present session, it had to establish a prudent basis on which planning for that budget could proceed. Aware that this planning exercise had to be undertaken at a time of considerable uncertainty, and that the budget for the current biennium was still evolving, the Director-General had taken prudent and responsible precautionary measures to safeguard the financial position of the ILO. Furthermore, the Governing Body might be required to consider budget reductions in June, if it seemed that the ILO could not end the 1996-97 budgetary period without a sizeable deficit. In view of the financial difficulties facing all international organizations — and more particularly the ILO — and many member States, and of the reforms under way in the Organization and the scope for further reform, the question arose of whether zero real growth was sufficiently rigorous or realistic for planning purposes. It would be more prudent to develop the budget for the next biennium on the basis of zero nominal growth, and to plan for the maximum absorption of cost increases. The proposed discussion in November would provide a further opportunity to assess the situation.

He supported the Director-General’s efforts to examine all reasonable avenues for seeking new resources for protecting priority activities, as described in paragraphs 88-90, as well as the proposed new structure for the discussion of the programme and budget proposals in March 1997.

Ms. Amin (Government, Egypt) endorsed the statement made by the Government group. The ILO’s priority attention should focus on the promotion of human rights, employment generation, the fight against poverty, the protection of workers and the strengthening of the social partners. Major emphasis should also be placed on considering the implications of the globalization of the economy and the liberalization of trade, and on developing the capacity of countries to promote employment and establish vocational and technical institutions. Regional specificities should be taken into consideration when developing programmes. Great importance attached to the points mentioned in paragraphs 42-44 concerning the development of strategies to bring together employers’ and workers’ organizations, government agencies and representatives of the private sector in order to promote local initiatives for employment generation. The proposed assistance to member States to improve their competitiveness at the local and international levels was also welcome. She concurred with the statement by the Employers’ group regarding the importance of the International Institute for Labour Studies and the Turin Centre. The preparation of a code of practice on the progressive elimination of child labour was also of great significance: member States should be encouraged to implement the Code, as they had the pilot programmes on avoiding abuse of medication by workers and their families. The role of the ILO should be increased
through the strengthening of the advisory and technical services provided by the multidisciplinary team serving Egypt and the Sudan. Turning to personnel policy and the development of human resources, she endorsed the statement made by the Employer Vice-Chairman concerning the maintenance of the number of staff in the Employment Department, and proposed that steps be taken to attract competent people who were able to adjust to changes in the labour market. She welcomed the ILO’s approach to assisting Africa, as outlined in paragraphs 77-79, the support that would be provided to the Palestinian Authority, and the assistance that would be given to employers’ and workers’ organizations in the region. The draft budget should be in accordance with the ILO’s needs, and the discussion in March 1997 should be properly structured.

Mr. Guapindaia Joppert (Government, Brazil) fully endorsed the statement made by the Government group. He expressed doubts about the merger of four departments into two, and especially about the merger of the Human Resources Department with the Employment Department. Unless it was proven that the fusion of the two departments would result in more efficient work, they should remain separate. The experience of Brazil indicated that these two sections of the Ministry of Labour functioned better separately.

Ms. Silberstein (Government, New Zealand) supported the statements made by the Government group and the IMEC group. She concurred with the representative of the Government of Australia that a zero nominal growth approach to the preparation of the Programme and Budget proposals for 1998-99 would be more realistic than the zero real growth proposed in paragraph 87 of the paper. In view of economic realities, cost or inflation-adjusted approaches to expenditure were no longer acceptable. Overhead administration costs should be carefully scrutinized, and efficiency gains identified. This call for greater efficiency was, however, not intended to restrict training programmes or the Organization’s ability to respond to new challenges.

Ms. Tosonotti (Government, Argentina) fully supported the priorities identified in the statement by the Government group, and welcomed the consensus reached. Nevertheless, in November 1996 some specific choices would have to be made on concrete programmes and activities. She welcomed the initiatives concerning the improvement of the competitiveness of enterprises, mentioned in paragraph 43, and the importance assigned to training in paragraph 45. The research proposed in paragraphs 52 and 53 on the impact of heightened competitive pressures in the world economy on labour relations, and on the relationship between labour regulation and economic efficiency, would also be most useful. The approach to the Active Partnership Policy in paragraphs 62-63 was equally to be commended. She endorsed the statement made by the IMEC group advocating zero real growth, as past experience showed that all adjustments were painful.

Summarizing the discussion the Chairman paid tribute to the work of the IMEC and Government groups, which had borne fruit. Whereas it was easy to note agreement, it was difficult to determine its strength. Nobody had questioned the mission of the ILO. However, it was a cause for concern that some members of the Governing Body believed that the ILO lacked credibility; on the contrary, the credibility of the ILO had never been so pronounced. Both the preparatory process and the outcome of the World Summit had demonstrated the credibility of the Organization in the eyes of the international community. The fact that the Director-General was shortly to attend for the first time a meeting of the G7 in Lille on employment could be interpreted as an extension of the Summit’s assessment of the ILO. On the other hand, it was probably true that the ILO lacked visibility. The IMEC paper was edifying in this respect, and encouraged a certain change of attitude.

There was also a convergence of opinions on priorities. A close examination of the priorities identified in the course of the discussions would probably permit the establishment of a hierarchy. However, it was not sure whether the Governments would join the Workers by giving priority to fundamental rights and standards, or whether they would side with the Employers by opting for employment. Nevertheless the Employers had affirmed the validity of fundamental rights, whereas the Workers had never minimized the importance of employment.

Without wishing to prejudice the Director-General’s reply on the points of disagreement, he indicated that they would be discussed in greater detail in November. The fact that the Governing Body had decided to have an interim discussion in November could also be regarded as an area of agreement.
Whereas there were no fundamental differences in considering the medium- or long-term perspectives of the ILO in the budgetary field, certain differences of appreciation could be detected. The representative of the United States Government had referred to savings to be made in 1997 and — probably rightly — expected reductions in the coming seven to eight years. These words were not pleasant to hear, but they certainly called for the elaboration of a medium-term policy and probably also of a long-term one. Over the last ten years, the Organization had functioned on a zero-growth budget and the situation in the coming years was unpredictable. This presented a problem for which the entire Organization had to take responsibility. The confidence expressed in the mission of the ILO should encourage all constituents to fight. This was particularly valid for governments within the United Nations system, which should ensure that in the reorganization of that system the ILO received priority.

Since its 75th anniversary the Director-General and the Governing Body had ensured that the Organization remained relevant to topical issues. However, while the ILO was not outdated, it still had problems. They would be solved by the Director-General.

The Director-General noted the consensus concerning the preparation of the Programme and Budget proposals for 1998-99 on the basis of zero real growth in terms of the adjusted budget for 1996-97. He took note of the comments made by the representatives of the Governments of the United States, Australia and New Zealand with regard to the need to ensure that this zero real growth was as close as possible to zero nominal growth. He assured the Governing Body that the Office would watch very carefully over the administrative costs, and hoped that the dollar would not fall compared to the main currencies in which the ILO operated. If everybody involved was ready to share the responsibility, the ILO would come through this difficult period.

Due to the efforts made by all groups, a very broad consensus had emerged with regard to the main objectives for the 1998-99 period. This was most useful. Although individual preferences had been expressed, no speaker had been inflexible. The ILO was a complex organization, but the divergent concerns of each of its constituents did not prevent the preparation of a budget which responded to the main concerns of all.

Mr. Oechslin's remark that the Office needed to be eminently practical would be borne in mine, as would all other comments. The Office had to produce a series of reports and documents that would confirm its authority at the international level. The ILO was, and had to be, a centre of reference, a status that could not be reached through operational activities alone. Consequently, a balance had to be established between the two if the ILO was to succeed in attracting public attention and thereby further contributions to its work, including resources for practical activities. Lack of success in operational activities would also result in low esteem for the Organization. A balance was therefore important.

The contradictions could probably not all be resolved, nor was any balance possible between all the calls for action: they largely exceeded the financial resources that the Office could legitimately hope to receive. There was a consensus on the need for a further, intermediary discussion in November 1996: this would make it possible to prepare the final proposals with less preliminary negotiation.

He was aware of the Governing Body's frustration at the relatively slim margin for manoeuvre in adjusting the original budgetary proposals for the current period. This showed that the Office had done its utmost to take into account the different views expressed by the Governing Body. The proposals presented in November would not nourish such frustrations. The more modest proposals contained in the Office paper had also been accepted, and an important part of the problem was hence postponed to November. The real political discussion would take place in November 1996: this required a careful restructuring of the discussion in the Governing Body so as to leave sufficient time for the final discussion in March 1997, which could then be shorter.

The Governing Body had provided some useful views on the level of resources, and there was a broad consensus that three major technical cooperation activities should receive priority: work on child labour, including the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour; follow-up on the Beijing Conference; and employment creation, particularly through the development of small and medium-sized enterprises. If the ILO succeeded in increasing its
visibility and credibility in these areas, and if the necessary resources could be obtained, then the Organization would take a considerable step forward.

In response to the questions concerning the merging of four departments into two, he recalled that the Governing Body, at its 264th Session, had received so much information concerning the various proposals on restructuring that it had decided not to proceed with the proposed changes. At the end of that session he had indicated that, instead of an in-depth reform, he would propose limited changes only. The Governing Body preferred to wait until March 1996.

It was not his intention to carry out a vast reform project, nor had it ever been. He would retain most structures the way they were, unless the Governing Body asked him to do otherwise. The only two exceptions related to the four departments referred to in paragraph 16 of the paper. However, in view of the statements by the Workers' group and various Government representatives, he would not proceed with the merger of the Enterprise and Cooperative Development Department with the Development Policies Branch of the former Development and Technical Cooperation Department. Should a consensus emerge on this point at a later stage, the question could be reopened.

Concerning the merger of the present Employment Department with the Training Department, he noted that, except for two Government representatives, those of Germany and Brazil, who had expressed clear reservations on the subject, speakers had either indicated support or had not stated their opposition. Consequently, the proposed merger seemed acceptable. He reassured the Government representative of the Philippines that the merger was in no way linked to the changes proposed with regard to the general management. The reason for proposing the merger had to be seen in the desire of the Office to live up to the expectations of the World Summit vis-à-vis the Organization. The task was a considerable one. In addition to the completion of country studies, practical assistance had to be rendered to a maximum number of countries. The technical staff of the Office that could be mobilized were, however, very limited in number. In assisting member States in the formulation of their employment policy, it was essential to address the dimension of vocational training, as several Worker and Employer members had emphasized. The merging of the departments would thus create a department with the necessary scope. This, however, did not mean that everything would be merged: a branch would be retained to deal with training questions, taking into account broader considerations such as those voiced by the representative of the Government of Chile. It nevertheless had to be pointed out that, contrary to UNESCO, the ILO was not to deal with training in the more general sense, but the perspective within which the question was approached in the ILO needed to be broader than the mere provision of vocational skills directly applicable to the needs of enterprises: there was a need for a department that could reflect upon the question of training and training structures.

The operational parts of the Employment and Training Departments had to be harmonized in order to enable the Organization to respond more adequately to the increasing number of requests it faced. The preparation of the country studies requested by the World Summit required additional funds which were not available. Therefore the reply to Mr. Otero's question was that the merger of the two departments would not lead to any savings. Savings in the technical branches would do a disservice to the internal organization of the Office and would endanger technical cooperation, which was virtually synonymous with the technical branches. Savings would have to be found in productivity and efficiency. The importance of the merger derived from the tasks assigned to the Organization by the World Summit. The Governing Body's approval was therefore essential, and could not wait until November. The merger should be implemented as soon as possible in order to ensure the smooth functioning of the Office, whereas any further changes could be considered when the discussion on the major objectives had been completed. In view of the statement made by the Government group that "the structures of the Office should reflect the priorities agreed by the Governing Body", the adequacy of the existing structures could be examined at a later point on the basis of the choices made by the Governing Body.

Turning to the request by the Workers' group for an evaluation of the efficiency of multidisciplinary teams, he asked why the Workers' group considered the teams inefficient, whereas many speakers had indicated their satisfaction. Rather than embark on a major review, he proposed that in November the Workers' group should indicate what kind of analysis it sought.
As regards the proposals by Mr. Oechslin and other speakers concerning personnel policy, he recalled that the Office was already engaging outside consultants to assist the Office in defining and implementing policies, in particular in the field of training. The main problem of the staff was that many of them did not know whether they would still be working for the Organization in June. Thus it was not surprising that they were perturbed. Yet it was impossible to give any guarantees. The second major problem faced by staff in the United Nations system was the fact that some common organs, contrary to established rules, had begun to modify the regulations concerning the fixing of salaries and salary increases and to attack in any way they could the conditions for post-adjustments. This lack of job security together with the uncertainties surrounding the question of salaries explained the fact that the staff were concerned. Other aspects of personnel policy were useful, but it was difficult to determine the conditions of career or promotion in an environment of uncertainty. Therefore the cart should not be put before the horse. The Organization should start by ensuring it could honour its most basic commitment to the staff before examining the ramifications of personnel policy.

Study on the rationalization of ILO field structures

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) considered the Office paper a good starting-point for a debate that would be difficult but necessary. There were 62 field units around the world, accounting for 25 per cent of the regular budget and 39 per cent of the staff. The Active Partnership Policy had added a new set of field structures and devoted 48 per cent of field funding to them. It was important to examine how these various structures interacted and to ensure that there was no waste or overlap. Whereas the work of the field structures was naturally appreciated in all regions, the question remained as to whether they could do a better job if they were rationalized, combined or approached differently. Paragraph 31 of the Office paper pointed to several signs that the existing structures were well adapted to the role of the field offices. There was also perhaps reason to suggest that they could be improved.

The evaluation of field structures should not focus on individual offices, but rather on types of offices, such as regional offices, area offices and MDTs. It should ask questions concerning the division of responsibilities between regional offices and area offices, both of which undertook tasks in the field of relations, programming and general administration. Similar questions should also be asked about the differences between area offices and MDTs. In theory, there was a precise division of labour between them, but in practice there were cases of overlap, such as in Port-of-Spain, which perhaps offered some lessons.

Political sensitivities should not keep the Governing Body from asking pertinent questions, such as "were the right offices in the right place to accomplish the required tasks?" A close look at the Office paper indicated that a number of anomalies existed. Some area offices covered only one country, while others covered up to 12. Some MDTs were located in cities where no other ILO structure was in place. Some regions had a high concentration of offices. Whereas some countries were served by more than one area office, one MDT covered countries falling under the responsibility of four different area offices. A long-standing anomaly related to the Central Asian and transcaucasian States, which were outside the coverage of existing ILO structures.

The review should not be seen as a cost-cutting exercise or an attempt to reduce technical cooperation. However, any improvements in efficiency or in the rationalization of resources deriving from it would be welcome. The question of field structures was a politically very sensitive issue and the Governing Body had to choose between dealing with it rationally and avoiding it for fear of losing something. The principal guidelines set out in paragraph 57 of the paper should form the basis of the discussion, as they satisfied the criteria set out by the Governing Body.

The closure of offices should be examined in two circumstances: in cases where an MDT and an area office could be merged, and in cases where the work could not justify retaining an existing office. Such situations could be examined without looking at particular cases. The review should also consider the possibility of reducing costs through host-country support and downsizing.

In view of the difficulties involved in the process, the Governing Body as such was not the right forum for the review. Another Committee of the Whole was out of the question: a smaller group was needed. He therefore formally proposed that an in-depth review be conducted involving...
the social partners and governments, and not simply a review by the Office. A small working party, with a composition decided by the Governing Body, should meet between, rather than during, sessions of the Governing Body. In the context of a changing world such a review would bring greater efficiency and release resources. In view of the statements on the budget and the need to examine all areas of work for greater efficiency, he expected support from both Employers and Governments for his proposal.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed admiration for officials in the field, who often worked in more difficult conditions than those in Geneva and who, in general, accomplished excellent work and maintained good relations with the ILO’s constituents.

He endorsed the principal guidelines in paragraph 57 of the Office paper, all of which were important, including the quality of services, the reduction of costs and the compatibility with the resolutions adopted by the International Labour Conference. The point in subparagraph 57(d), concerning awareness of constituents’ needs and keeping close contact with them, was of particular importance. Information flows between headquarters and regional offices should be in both directions, but those from the field to headquarters were particularly important, as they communicated perceived needs. The preliminary consultation paper would also have benefited from formal and informal consultations at the regional level regarding proposals for the regions.

All regional activities should be implemented in close collaboration with constituents. This could never be over-emphasized, even if in most cases the principle was respected. Representatives of constituents in Geneva should also be involved in the work of the regional offices as this would ensure links between the field and the Governing Body.

Concerning Mr. Brett’s proposal, it would be difficult for a multi-regional group to express itself in an intelligent manner on the structure of any particular office without some knowledge of that office. There were two pitfalls in this process: yielding to local pressure to set up ILO offices everywhere, which was neither possible nor rational, and failing to give sufficient consideration to local features and sensitivities.

Turning to section 2, Part III of the Office paper, concerning the closure of offices, he considered the title badly chosen, as it could be interpreted in an alarmist manner, for the issue was not the closure of offices but the merging or pooling of administrative services, where there was some duplication of effort.

With regard to the sharing of costs by host countries, he pointed out that many developing countries made important efforts to provide suitable offices for the ILO. The Building Subcommittee had dealt with the question of the Office in Islamabad for which the Office had received a generous help from the Government. The case of Spain had also to be remembered.

Mr. Ducreux (Government, Panama) drew attention to the proportion of the costs of field offices, paid by the ILO, especially in industrialized countries. As indicated by Mr. Oechslin in conjunction with paragraph 66, the participation of member States in the financing of the operating costs of field offices helped reduce expenses. This participation had several forms, including the provision of premises and staff or subsidizing operating costs. The decision to contribute to the financing of field offices remained solely with member States.

The information appended to the Office paper indicated that only a few offices received contributions in cash or kind from host countries. Budgetary savings could be made and resources could be optimized if the ILO took into account the offers made by member States seeking the establishment of ILO offices on their territory. Without proposing the creation of new offices, he encouraged the Office to make use of these offers.

Since 1981, the ILO had operated an office in Panama which had served as the subregional office of the Regional Employment Programme for Latin America and the Caribbean (PREALC). The Government of Panama had made an annual contribution of US$59,000. When PREALC ceased its activities in Panama, the Government had decided to maintain in that office a training and labour analysis system for Latin America and, as of 1996, had increased its contribution to US$175,000. This amount covered its operational costs and permitted it to extend its activities to all countries of Latin America.
Already in 1993, the Government of Panama had informed the ILO in writing of its decision to increase its contribution in cash and kind in order to permit the Organization to establish an office on its national territory if it so wished. The establishment of an ILO Office in Panama would benefit from the country’s strategic geographical position and would result in considerable savings in the regular budget, as the value of the contributions in cash and kind would be around a quarter of a million dollars. Through this arrangement the Government of Panama would make available to the ILO the premises which had served as United States military bases and which, since 1977, had little by little been handed back to the Government. These premises were not army barracks, but large, modern buildings with conference halls for meetings and training activities, which had their own electrical and water supply, international communications facilities, post offices, recreation areas, common housing services, schools, security and access to natural parks. The Governing Body should be aware of this offer in order to take it into account when considering the question of savings. He expressed the hope that the offer would be accepted.

Ms. Moehario (Government, Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Asian and Pacific Government members, welcomed the fact that the principal guidelines referred to in paragraph 57 were in accordance with the group’s previous statement. Rationalization measures should aim to promote decentralization and strengthen field structures where necessary. They should enhance the delivery of services, create savings and improve efficiency. The resulting savings should be used in the region where they were made. Field structures played an important role in the delivery of technical cooperation activities. She expressed concern at the present situation of the ILO Office in Teheran, and asked the Office to take the necessary steps to enable that office to resume its usual activities as soon as possible.

Ms. Voskuhl (Government, Germany) considered that more information was needed to enable the Governing Body to take decisions on particular external offices. She requested that information be provided on the number of staff serving in each field office, their grades, and on the particular tasks of external offices, including the number of technical cooperation projects they serviced, their part in the distribution of ILO publications and the number of fellowships they supervised.

The Chairman replied that the Governing Body was not expected to take a decision at its present session. In paragraph 71 of the Office paper it was invited to make known its observations and discuss the overall framework for any rationalization. It was not for the Governing Body to make decisions concerning the establishment or closure of external offices. The Director-General would make proposals taking into account the views expressed.

Ms. Anderson (Government, United States) considered that any rationalization must ensure that constituents’ needs continued to be met, while improving the effectiveness and efficiency of ILO activities. Whereas the Director-General’s proposals concerning the principal guidelines and methods for rationalizing the field structure deserved support, current fiscal realities required more sweeping and possibly more creative changes in addition to the options presented in the Office paper. This task could not be accomplished overnight, but should be a long-term effort extending over several biennial budget periods.

Table 2 indicated that there was overlap of functions between the existing field structures which called for consolidation: liaison activities were carried out by regional offices, area offices and multidisciplinary teams; administrative and logistical support for ILO programmes and projects were carried out by liaison offices and regional offices; information-sharing activities were undertaken by national correspondents and regional offices. These points should be taken into consideration when developing further proposals on the basis of the Governing Body’s comments.

Ms. van Leur (Government, Netherlands) endorsed the proposal made by the Workers’ group to continue the discussion on the rationalization of ILO field structures in a working party. Account should be taken of the fact that technical cooperation was the ILO’s most important means of action. This point had been emphasized in the statements made by the Government group and the IMEC group. The ILO’s field structure in developing countries should accommodate efforts to promote and strengthen technical cooperation activities and the Active Partnership Policy.

Mr. Hiromi (Government, Japan) noted with satisfaction that the allocation of resources and staff to field offices had been increasing. Nevertheless, some remaining imbalances had to be examined. When assigning human resources to the field, the Office should ensure that the staff
involved were among the most competent. Efforts had already been made in this direction, but they should be enhanced. Since the Office paper included sufficient information, adequate time should be devoted to the discussion of this issue.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) expressed satisfaction with the present field structures and their functioning. There were nevertheless certain shortcomings, such as the diversity of field structures. Was it really justified to have so many different types of offices? The explanation provided in paragraph 7 referred to a long history of reorganization and decentralization, but there was really no duplication of effort. The problem was rather that not all offices had the same functions. Although he had not visited the field offices, he had sufficient reliable information to affirm their usefulness to member States. The representative of the Government of Germany might be right in pointing out that some information was missing, as with the increase in technical cooperation activities there was an obvious need for a corresponding field structure.

Concerning information flows to and from the field, he stressed the need to give more importance to the information coming from the field, as the information provided by the Office to member States was already sufficient, generous and precise. The experience of Spain indicated that it was an advantage to receive all information via the branch office.

The ILO Office in Madrid also rendered valuable services in the field of relations with constituents. He appreciated the contacts established by the ILO Office with the social partners. The joint Spain-ILO Committee had enabled Spain to contribute, in 1995, US$17.8 million to multi-bilateral technical assistance projects, and thus to become, for that year, a major contributor to the ILO’s work. The work accomplished by the ILO Office in Madrid was benefiting both the country and the ILO itself.

The ILO’s publications policy was also highly successful in Spain: the offices in Latin America were supplied with Spanish-language ILO reports and various documents printed in Spain. These positive results could be reproduced in other areas as well.

The operating costs of field structures, including the expenditure on staff, were fully justified. While he did not deny that there was a need for some rationalization, he cautioned against any hasty measures. He endorsed the proposal by the Workers’ group to establish a working party, which, however, would need a substantial composition, as all regions had to be represented. The ILO’s field structures were essential to the functioning of the Office and had a great future. They had to be maintained.

Ms. Tosonotti (Government, Argentina) endorsed the principal guidelines in paragraph 57. However, the closure of field offices would be an extreme measure that would run counter to the policy of decentralization and the increasing demand for technical cooperation. Instead of closing offices, the Governing Body should examine the possibility of rationalization. With regard to the method of work, she had no objection to the proposal by the Workers’ group. Any working party would have to be open-ended, as the subject was of interest to the entire Governing Body.

Mr. Abou Sharbak (Government, Qatar) underlined the importance of the ILO’s role and commended the Office on its excellent work, and in particular the efforts made by the Director-General. He wished the Organization much success. He endorsed the principal guidelines proposed in paragraph 57, and supported the statement by the Government representative of Indonesia concerning the ILO Office in Teheran.

Ms. Morgan (Government, United Kingdom) considered that many of the options presented in the paper were worth exploring, especially that in paragraph 46 to adjust the size of field offices to the volume of their activities; and the idea in paragraph 65 of incorporating a small support structure in cooperation programmes as a temporary facility lasting for the duration of the programme. This innovative approach could increase flexibility and ensure well-targeted support. She endorsed the request by the representative of the Government of Germany for more information to guide the next stage of the discussion. It was important to examine outputs and results very carefully in order to avoid focusing on costs in isolation from effectiveness. The principal guidelines outlined in paragraph 57 provided an excellent framework for further discussion.
Mr. Perez Vega (Government, Chile) noted the three options proposed for rationalization, namely the closure of an office as a result of pooling of administrative services or extending the area covered by other offices; the transformation of existing structures as a result of change in the level or nature of their activities; and the reduction in operating costs. Various combinations were possible. In order to ensure the quality of work in the field and optimize the output of human and material resources, a more precise study should be carried out, on a case-by-case basis, which would highlight the particular characteristics of each office. The information contained in the paper indicated that a reduction in operating costs and expenses was possible. However, the rigorous application of the measures described would require more information. He supported the idea of establishing a working party and pointed to the need to consult the constituents of the Organization.

Mr. Diaz Infante Mendez (Government, Mexico) considered that the paper should be expanded by additional information. Since the closing of offices did not seem feasible, they should be transformed. This would be more in line with the Active Partnership Policy. He supported the continuation of the discussion in a working party and endorsed the principal guidelines contained in paragraph 57 of the paper.

Mr. Fannizadeh (Government, Islamic Republic of Iran) observed that, whereas the budgeted US$143 million might be considered overwhelming against the background of a financial shortfall, the importance of field structures could not be questioned, as they were the only contact between the ILO and its tripartite constituents, carrying the message of the Organization and promoting its activities in the field while providing headquarters with information about local situations. They were also instrumental in designing and supporting technical cooperation and in developing healthy labour relations and social dialogue. The discussion should avoid turning into a competition: a global solution should be sought. Once the Governing Body had agreed upon a certain formula, the Office could undertake the necessary study and propose modifications and savings. Therefore, instead of discussing savings, the Governing Body should rather define an acceptable formula. Any solution proposed should be global. Countries with similar conditions and requirements should be treated in a similar manner in order to avoid any discrimination. The future size of each office should be based on cost-benefit analyses, the volume and type of expected activities, the willingness of a government to participate in cost-sharing and other factors. This would determine whether the allocated resources matched the objectives and activities. Furthermore, for countries at a similar stage of development with similar needs, the criteria for government inputs should be similar. Developing countries could participate in various ways.

The term "rationalization" had to be clearly defined. Although it could result in savings, it should not be approached merely in terms of cost reductions, but should aim to eliminate unproductive expenditure, improve efficiency, and strengthen the field offices, if necessary. It should enable the field structures to promote ILO objectives more effectively, and respond more promptly to the requirements of constituents. This might mean the expansion of some field structures and the elimination of others elsewhere. In view of the fact that US$104 million of the US$143 million of costs of the field structure were spent on staff, more use should be made of local staff, thereby creating savings that could accrue to RBTC activities.

The transfer of the ILO Office in Teheran to the authority of the Regional Office for Europe had created an anomaly in the servicing of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Since it was an Asian developing country, it required services different from those provided in the European region. His Government had requested the resumption of the activities of the Teheran Office under the auspices of the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. Any revision of field structures should take this into consideration, in particular in view of the Government's willingness to cooperate with the ILO in this regard.

The Director-General considered that the discussion had not shed sufficient light on the issue. He sensed above all a feeling of fear and confessed to some apprehension. Field structures were a politically sensitive subject, and could not be discussed in a neutral manner. Ideally, there should be an ILO office in each member State to ensure close relations with the constituents, but this was obviously impossible. Field structures were the product of history. Today, it was impossible to justify the existence of an office in one place or the absence of an office in another, and the reasons which at one point justified their establishment could not always be understood. Moreover,
the constituents in each country seemed to have had the feeling that once an ILO structure was established there, they had the right to maintain it indefinitely. The statements made on behalf of the Asian and Pacific Governments and by the representative of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran indicated that there was some expectation that an ILO Office would reopen in Teheran because historically one had existed before.

Consequently, any decision to open, close or rationalize a structure was an extremely difficult one. He had personal experience of these difficulties when closing or downsizing field structures, and was sometimes exposed to pressure that lasted for several years. The main problem confronting the Governing Body was to determine who decided and how. If the Governing Body chose to take the decision itself or assigned it to a working party, it had to assume the responsibility. If it decided that it was the Director-General who had to take the decisions, then he would do so, but the Governing Body would have to determine the possible solutions open to the Director-General and the conditions in which he could apply them.

It would not be advisable for the Governing Body to engage in a discussion concerning the closing or downsizing of particular offices, as this could even present dangers to the Organization. When some members of the Governing Body requested more information on the volume of technical cooperation implemented in a given country or region, they were, without being aware of it, already determining the method of the decision to be taken.

While having no objection to the proposal by Mr. Brett to establish a working party, he thought that it would be wise for the Governing Body — on approving the guidelines in paragraph 57 which had received wide support — to agree on the modalities proposed, including the closure of offices, the transformation of existing structures and the reduction of operating costs. It should also indicate whether it could approve paragraphs 59 to 69, whether the criteria as described therein needed to be developed further, or whether other criteria had to be added in order to provide him with the criteria to enable him to take a decision. It would then be up to him to justify the decision. Or else the Governing Body could apply a set of rules that it established.

In the present state of affairs, he was not in a position to draw any conclusions. Whatever the modalities chosen by the Governing Body, it should abide by the approach set out in Part III of the paper and determine for each possible course of action the criteria for a decision. This did not preclude the Governing Body’s adding other measures to the three types outlined in the Office paper. Therefore three points had to be considered: who was to take the decision; what latitude should be allowed in taking a decision; and what criteria should govern the decision. Whereas he remained open to other proposals, this course of action seemed the only practicable one.

At the outset of his reply he had confessed to some apprehension, as failure to adopt the right course would lead to an insoluble situation in which neither the Governing Body nor the Director-General could take a decision. A solution was possible, but care had to be taken to avoid any pitfalls.

The Chairman proposed that the discussion be continued in November on the basis of a document that would develop further the paragraphs dealing with criteria.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) accepted the proposal made by the Chair and endorsed the reply by the Director-General who was in a no-win situation. The Governing Body would be pleased to give him the responsibility. That way, every time he tried to close an office or change a structure in one of the member States, the country in question together with its allies and constituent associations, that is workers’ and employers’ organizations, would oppose him. The idea of a working party had been put forward to avoid such a situation.

As the presence of offices in certain places could be explained by nothing but history, he proposed to examine the entire question on a blank slate, accepting immediately that the moving of regional offices was not sensible and looking at the world as it was and not as it had been. The idea of a working party could be pursued in November in order to enable the Employers’ and Workers’ groups to consider it more carefully. A further paper was welcome, but in view of the requests made by some Government representatives, there should also be more statistical information. The decision could then be taken by the Governing Body either to assume the responsibility itself or confer it on the Director-General. The Governing Body took seriously
questions of economy, efficiency and responsibility, and all members wished to provide genuine help in this respect.

The Chairman considered that the last proposal made by the Director-General was the wisest.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) proposed that a practical solution be found in November to deal with the problem.

Mr. Fannizadeh (Government, Islamic Republic of Iran) expressed the hope that the paper submitted to the Governing Body in November, regardless of whether the clean-sheet approach was accepted or not, would provide justifications of any proposals to relocate, establish or close offices. This should be elaborated on the basis of specific criteria and not on the basis of historical considerations.

The sitting closed at 7.50 p.m.
At this sitting, which was held in private, the Governing Body took the following decisions.

**Twelfth item on the agenda**

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

*Fifth Supplementary Report:*

Report of the Committee set up to examine the representation made by the All-Poland Trade Union Alliance (OPZZ) under article 24 of the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by Poland of the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122)

The Governing Body approved the report, adopted the Committee's recommendations, and declared closed the procedure initiated.

*Sixth Supplementary Report:*

Report of the Committee set up to examine the representation made by the International Organization of Energy and Mines (OIEM) under article 24 of the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by Congo of the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949 (No. 95)

The Governing Body approved the report, adopted the Committee's recommendations, and declared closed the procedure initiated.

*Seventh Supplementary Report:*

Report of the Committee set up to examine the representation made by the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) under article 24 of the ILO Constitution, alleging non-observance by France of the Labour Inspection Convention, 1947 (No. 81), and the Social Policy (Non-Metropolitan Territories) Convention, 1947 (No. 82)

The Governing Body approved the report, adopted the Committee's recommendations, and declared closed the procedure initiated.

*Eighth Supplementary Report:*

Report of the Committee set up to consider the representation made by the Seafarers' Union of Russia under article 24 of the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by the Russian Federation of the Seafarers' Identity Documents Convention, 1958 (No. 108)

The Governing Body approved the report, adopted the Committee's recommendations, and declared closed the procedure initiated.

* * *

In accordance with article 14, paragraph 5, of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the minutes of this sitting are published separately.
SEVENTH SITTING  
Thursday, 28 March 1996, morning

The sitting opened at 11 a.m., with Mr. Chotard in the Chair.

Sixth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

302nd Report

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), speaking as Reporter of the Committee, stated that the Committee on Freedom of Association had had before it 79 cases relating to 46 countries. It had examined 26 of these cases in detail, 20 were the subject of definitive conclusions, and interim conclusions had been presented on the remaining six.

The introduction to the Committee's report also contained information from governments on the effect given by them to the Governing Body's recommendations on 47 different cases. The Committee had, for example, noted with interest that the dismissal of union leaders in the Dominican Republic had been revoked; that progress had been registered in the distribution of assets between trade union organizations in Poland; and that it had been decided to reinstate a dismissed trade unionist in Turkey. The report's introduction thus bore witness to the fact that the Committee's recommendations frequently had a clear impact in countries against which complaints had been lodged.

As regards the cases regarding Colombia, Congo, Morocco and Venezuela, the respective Governments had still not responded either to the complaints themselves or to the last examination of their cases; the Committee therefore addressed an urgent appeal to them to reply. It was the Committee's intention to study the substance of these cases at the next session even if it were obliged to do so in the absence of any government response. As at previous sessions, he emphasized the importance for governments of replying to cases brought against them; the Committee was otherwise obliged to base its examination exclusively on the allegations contained in the complaint.

The Committee also drew the Governing Body's attention to a number of cases that had undergone detailed study. The complaint against Côte d'Ivoire related to the uncertain fates of trade unionists: this was a source of concern to the Committee and its response had been most firm. He expressed the hope that, in future, Côte d'Ivoire would adhere to its humanistic and liberal traditions. In the case of Belarus, there had been serious allegations of the dissolution of trade unions and of trade unionists having been imprisoned. The Committee had therefore requested the Government to set up an independent commission of inquiry to clarify all the facts relating to the matter. The case regarding Turkey was discussed in a separate report, as it concerned a representation made under article 24 of the Constitution, and revolved essentially around legislative reforms and the denial of legal status to public servants' organizations. The Committee had proposed that the Government avail itself of the Office's technical assistance in order to resolve these matters.

Finally, on a more general note, he stated his belief that the Committee on Freedom of Association was one of the Organization's most effective bodies; this was demonstrated by the results achieved. At a time when some voices claimed that the ILO had no means of enforcement, it was rewarding to observe that this Committee, even if it was not sufficiently well known, was capable of having a real impact. Efforts should therefore be undertaken to give greater publicity to such results in an endeavour to break through the wall of silence in respect of an activity which was one of the Organization's major assets.

Mr. Noakes (Employer, Australia) stated that the Employers' group supported the adoption of the report and endorsed the comments made by the Reporter, in particular with regard to
endeavours to publicize the Committee’s work and the effective results it had achieved. He also agreed that it was vital for governments to respond to requests for information.

At the same time, he indicated that several cases addressed in the report had been of special concern to the members of his group. The first such case was that of Iraq, referred to in the introduction, which concerned imprisoned or missing trade unionists as well as property confiscated from Kuwaiti trade unions and employers’ organizations. The Government’s attitude had, at best, been uncooperative, yet his group trusted that a way could be found to resolve these matters.

Secondly, he referred to the case concerning Paraguay, which had been brought by that country’s principal employers’ organization. The issue had been raised at the last session, and since then the Committee had been informed that the Court of Appeals had revoked the search warrant used to enter the organization’s premises to seize documents and materials. The Committee took note of this decision with approval, yet it emphasized that the documents and materials should also be duly returned to the employers’ organization.

Addressing a case concerning employers’ organizations in Burundi, he recalled that the Government had allegedly failed to take into account proposals from the Burundi Employers’ Association when appointing the employer member of the Board of the National Social Security Institute. The Committee had accepted the Government’s statement that it had taken the proposals made by the most representative organizations of employers and workers into account; the Committee wished, however, to reiterate the important principle that if the most representative organizations were prevented from taking part in the relevant joint or tripartite bodies, then the principles of freedom of association would have been infringed.

He then referred to a set of complaints regarding the right of public servants to organize and bargain collectively. The first of these had been lodged against Germany; aspects of it had previously attracted the attention of the Committee and of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. The Committee rejected the complaint made by salaried teachers in respect of unilateral changes made to their working hours; similar changes had been made to the hours of teachers with public service status, to whom salaried teachers were linked by a collective agreement freely entered into. Conversely, the Committee had found in favour of public service status teachers complaining that they were being denied the right to bargain collectively. Nevertheless, the Committee wished to draw the Government’s attention to the possibilities provided by Convention No. 151 (not ratified by Germany, though the principles underlying the text offered guidance in this field). He trusted that the Government would accept that suggestion as an attempt to develop a constructive approach to a complex issue.

Case No. 1848 (Ecuador) concerned the right of public sector workers to form and join trade unions, and the Committee had concluded that in present circumstances there was a danger of that right being violated. Case No. 1809 (Kenya) addressed the right of university lecturers to join organizations of their own choosing, and the Committee had requested the Government to ensure that this right was fully upheld — and to reinstate lecturers dismissed on account of legitimate trade union activities. The Committee did not endorse the Government’s argument that teaching was an essential service. The issue of essential services also arose in other cases, such as No. 1856 (Uruguay) in which the Committee had upheld the Government’s argument that workers in a mobile coronary unit intervening in emergencies were indeed performing an essential service. Conversely, the Committee had rejected the assertion made by the Government of Belarus (Case No. 1849) that work on the underground railway and trolleybus systems constituted an essential service and that consequently strikes there could be declared unlawful. Similarly, in respect of the complaint lodged against Peru, the Committee had dismissed the Government’s argument that it had been justified in imposing compulsory arbitration to end a strike in the footwear industry on account of the strike’s negative repercussions for workers and the enterprise.

The Employers also drew attention to Case No. 1826 (Philippines) regarding, inter alia, anti-trade union discrimination and a special trade zone being declared union-free. The Committee had presented a number of conclusions, yet it was mindful of various contradictions in the information supplied by the complainant and the Government; it had thus requested further details which would help clarify the case.
As happened all too frequently, a number of complaints concerned deaths and trade unionists who had been the victims of assaults and arrests, such as the cases brought against Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Morocco and Zaire. The Committee had condemned such violations of basic human rights, and the Employers fully endorsed that sentiment.

In respect of Indonesia (Case No. 1773, previously the subject of a report to the Governing Body), he recalled that the major outstanding issue was the fact that an alternative central trade union body had been denied the right of registration — with a resulting monopoly for the officially recognized organization. The Committee had repeated its request to the Government to allow registration. The case also involved other issues relating to the arrest, detention and trial of workers and trade union leaders on account of disturbances in Medan; the Committee had made a number of recommendations in this regard. It had also asked the Government to keep it informed of the police inquiry into the murder of a trade union representative, Mrs. Marsina.

In relation to the 303rd Report dealing with Cases Nos. 1810 and 1830 (Turkey), he pointed out that the Committee had acknowledged the extensive changes having been made to labour legislation in that country and the progress registered. The Committee had, however, requested the Government to ensure that this process continued.

Mrs. Engelen-Kefer (Worker, Germany), speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, supported adoption of the report and its conclusions. She also expressed concern that certain governments, despite repeated requests, increasingly failed to respond to the allegations brought before the Committee. Moreover, there had been a growing number of cases in which governments had been responsible for interference in trade union rights, mass violations of those rights and even the murder of trade unionists.

She drew attention to the report's introduction, which indicated the countries from which further information was required; there was also a list of urgent appeals addressed to individual governments. It was clearly indicated that, even if governments failed to respond, the Committee could still present a report to the Governing Body.

In respect of the wide-ranging complaint against Australia, she indicated that it had now been withdrawn.

She extended her group's thanks to the Office for having compiled complete information (contained in the introduction) regarding the effect given to the Committee's recommendations and conclusions. Addressing the individual cases listed there, she drew special attention to that of India, where workers had been unjustifiably dismissed on account of their trade union activities and to whom no remedy had yet been given. She also agreed with the previous speaker's comments in relation to Iraq and Côte d'Ivoire. The case concerning the United Kingdom involved blacklists of trade unionists who were thereby threatened with dismissal; the Government had remained inactive for some considerable time in respect of this worrying form of discrimination. She also expressed concern about the many Canadian cases stretching back over a number of years and relating to interference on the part of the federal and provincial governments in conditions of pay and work in the civil service. In many instances this was not justified; the Committee had therefore proposed an advisory mission and it was still awaiting a response from the relevant government bodies. The information relating to the case of Poland was highly useful, as it clarified the situation in that country; nevertheless, there was still no full agreement between the major central trade union organizations on the distribution of assets, and she trusted that an adequate solution would be found.

Turning to the cases that had been examined in detail, she referred, first, to Case No. 1820 (Germany): she was grateful for the comments made on behalf of the Employers' group, and endorsed the conclusions and recommendations presented by the Committee. She recalled that this was not the first time that the ILO had had to call on the German Government to implement the fundamental principles of freedom of association and collective bargaining in the public service, and she trusted that the Government would take this invitation seriously.

A number of cases of gross violations of trade union rights had been observed, involving death threats to trade unionists and their families, imprisonment and murders. As in the past, certain countries of Latin America were addressed in this regard, in particular El Salvador. She
noted that many cases had already been pending for some time, and that no improvement had been registered, as in Côte d'Ivoire. It was her hope that the Governing Body's conclusions would be heeded and that governments would take steps to end these unlawful circumstances and allow for the exercise of freedom of association in such a way that trade unionists should not have to expect to pay for their activities with their lives.

Certain Asian countries were also a source of concern for the Workers, in particular Indonesia and the Philippines. As regards the latter, it was essential for the ILO's fundamental principles to be applied in export processing zones: it was inadmissible for a country to endeavour to improve its competitive position by denying workers their fundamental rights. The conclusions and recommendations in the report had met with the Committee's unanimous approval; it was therefore important for them to be implemented.

She then referred to the two cases concerning Turkey (Nos. 1810 and 1830). She supported the comments made on behalf of the Employers' group: improvements had been noted in that country in labour legislation and practice with regard to trade union rights and free collective bargaining. There had, however, been set-backs, and violations continued; major efforts were hence still required to ensure that the positive process did not lose momentum. In that regard, the Committee had recalled the possibility of drawing on the Office's technical assistance.

In conclusion, she drew attention to the United Nations fact-finding mission to be sent to Nigeria. The Government had expressed its willingness to receive the mission, composed of high-level personalities and legal experts. The mission had been called upon to obtain clarification concerning legal procedures and also the recent execution of Mr. Ken Saro Wiwa, a human rights activist. The international community had been powerless to halt this act and it was now anxious to see whether Nigeria intended to return to a democratic constitution. Full support should be given to the United Nations mission, as it would inquire into the central ILO concerns: the protection of human and trade union rights.

Mr. Ramona (Government, France) fully endorsed the report and the comments of previous speakers. The recent discussions on the social dimensions of international trade formed an interesting backdrop to the report, as they had touched on workers' fundamental rights. The voluminous reports of the Committee covered, without differentiation, an entire range of issues: the dissolution of trade unions, the imprisonment and murder of trade unionists; whether civil servants' conditions of work should be determined by consultation or bargaining; and the nature of essential services. This did not facilitate their reading: in national legal systems distinctions were usually drawn between criminal acts, offences and misdemeanours, and the judicial system was structured accordingly.

The Committee was rightly called upon critically to examine cases brought against all countries, often with impeccable democratic traditions. Moreover, certain governments might feel encouraged to accept more readily the criticism laid before them if, in the same report, they observed the inclusion of countries generally regarded as exemplary.

He nevertheless wondered whether this approach still met the imperatives of the day and whether it might not be advisable to find some means of separating the more serious violations of fundamental rights. It would also be appropriate to single out countries where there were persistent violations, in particular murders. On the other hand, there were States where the rule of law was not yet truly established, but where legislative reform and other forms of progress were to be observed; such countries should not necessarily be treated together with the more serious cases. If all situations were treated without differentiation, the long-term result could be that the most serious offenders would escape more stringent scrutiny.

Mr. Tapiola (Worker, Finland) was concerned by the paradoxical situation in which governments gave heartening responses to complaints and yet the Committee subsequently discovered that circumstances were not so reassuring. There were, for example, contradictions in the information received from the Polish Government and Polish trade unions. He was also particularly struck by the case relating to Belarus: the Government's response had been relatively positive yet, on the other hand, there had been a Presidential Decree banning trade union activities and penalizing trade unionists. Although the Decree had been ruled unconstitutional, it nevertheless overrode the Constitution. An apparently independent investigation was being conducted, but the
Committee wished to obtain further information on the Government’s intentions. With reference to Nigeria, he was disconcerted that, whereas the Government had agreed to receive a UN mission, it was not willing to cooperate with the ILO in a similar manner.

Mr. Vidnes (Government, Norway) endorsed the comment made on behalf of the French Government in respect of singling out more serious violations, such as murders of trade union leaders. He also supported the Reporter’s suggestion that such cases should be given greater publicity. Some of the instances contained in the report would certainly be of interest to the public at large, but they would have to be presented in an appropriate manner. This would be an important way of enhancing awareness of what the ILO stood for.

Mr. Etala (Government, Argentina) also thought it appropriate to highlight the more serious cases of violations of trade union rights and to single out persistent offenders.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 1-67 of the report.


Mr. Aka Anghui (Employer, Côte d’Ivoire), referring to the complaints concerning his country, recalled that a direct contacts mission had been sent in respect of Case No. 1594, as indicated in the Committee’s 297th and 300th Reports. The Governing Body had asked to be kept informed of further developments and of the effect given to its recommendations. A recent communication (8 February 1996) from the Ministry of Employment and the Public Service had set out the Government’s present position. The letter asserted that the secretary-general of the “Dignité” Federation had rejected the reinstatement of workers who had been dismissed. The speaker indicated that 467 workers would already have returned to their jobs if the Secretary-General had not preferred to adopt an uncompromising approach. Referring to Case No. 1846, he pointed out that the report spoke of deaths; this alone indicated the seriousness of the case. Nevertheless, he was doubtful about a number of the allegations contained in the complaint, which did not always stand up to a critical analysis. He wondered whether there was some confusion regarding the identity of the deceased as reported by the “Dignité” Federation. In any event, he was struck by such assertions, as the rule of law was well established in his country. He intended, upon returning to his country, to approach the government authorities and trusted that, within a matter of months, it would be possible to obtain greater clarity in this regard.

In conclusion, he recalled that trade union activities did not imply indiscriminate social agitation. In this instance, he felt that his country had been the subject of unjustified criticism.

Mr. Tapióla (Worker, Finland) stated on behalf of the Workers’ group that it would be inappropriate to question the good faith of a trade union organization bringing a case before the Committee. The discussion of this case had been thorough; the results were clear and pointed to government responsibilities not having been met. This was a source of concern for his group.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 267, 281, 296, 328 and 354 of the report.

Mr. Ngare (Government, Kenya) reassured the Governing Body that his Government would continue to uphold and guarantee workers’ rights throughout the country. Moreover, he confirmed that the issues over which industrial action had been taken in the public universities had long been resolved and that the lecturers concerned had returned to work. In conclusion, he stated his Government’s intention to study carefully the Committee’s recommendations with a view to taking the necessary measures, and it would keep the Governing Body fully informed.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 385, 414, 439, 446 and 479 of the report.

Mr. Ben Seddik (Worker, Morocco) noted that complaints had repeatedly been brought against the Moroccan Government. The case now before the Governing Body addressed instances of harassment, provocation and repression affecting the trade union movement. These events had taken place more than a year prior to the present discussion, and in the meantime imprisoned trade unionists had been released following a show of national and international solidarity. Human rights and women’s organizations had associated themselves with this campaign, as the secretary-general
of the trade union in question was a young woman whose arrest and long prison sentence had provoked considerable concern. Although this pressure had been effective, other trade unionists had not been reinstated and acts of repression continued.

Trade union rights were guaranteed by the Constitution of Morocco; Morocco had also ratified Convention No. 98 and the relevant law had been enacted giving an entitlement to collective bargaining. Nevertheless, his country had consistently declined to ratify Convention No. 87, with the result that his Government was not obliged to adopt legislation defending trade unions in their exercise of this right. Hence, a paradox was observed in which unions were entitled to engage in collective bargaining, on the one hand, but when, on the other hand, this right was demanded by a trade union, that organization suffered repression and its members were dismissed from their employment. These complaints reflected a policy of continuing interference in trade union affairs, and collusion had been noted between the Government and employers in this respect.

With reference to the statement made by the representative of the Government of France, he also believed that it would be useful to consider the possibility of drawing greater attention to countries that were repeatedly the subject of complaints. A more effective response should be devised than a compilation of facts set out in a report discussed months after the events in question: consideration should be given to resuming the practice of sending direct contacts missions to investigate the facts; at the very least, the Governing Body should make official statements reminding governments that it did not suffice to proclaim rights in abstracto if the effective exercise thereof was not guaranteed.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 494, 518, 534 and 554 of the report.

303rd Report

Mr. Seref (Government, Turkey) stated his Government’s intention, in respect of Cases Nos. 1810 and 1830, to pursue the adjustment process introduced as a consequence of amendments made to the Constitution in 1995.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 69 of the report.

Seventh item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE PROGRAMME, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

First report: Financial and general questions

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the report.
The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 6-30 of the report.
The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 35 and 38 of the report.

Second report: Personnel questions

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 2-29 of the report.
The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 30 of the report.
The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 31-48 of the report.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) indicated that his group supported the recommendation to the Conference to approve the regrading of the post of Director responsible for ILO activities in Europe from D.2 to Assistant Director-General.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 72 of the report.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman), speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, recalled that a demonstration of staff from all Geneva-based United Nations agencies had taken place earlier in the week. He knew that the ILO management questioned the
utility, in present circumstances, of a number of items under discussion within the UN system, and against which the demonstration was directed.

With specific reference to ILO staff, he recalled that they had a regular opportunity in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee to deliver a statement, the text of which was subsequently made available. He suggested, with the Staff Union’s support, that consideration be given to the possibility of a staff statement being circulated prior to the relevant sitting; the document’s salient points could then be presented orally in the Committee. In this way, staff members would be allowed to focus more attention upon matters of immediate relevance to the Governing Body.

The Staff Union was justly concerned about a number of issues: the General Assembly’s denial of well-founded salary increases plus pay freezes (with post adjustment being used as a means of reducing staff remuneration). Attention had also been drawn to job insecurity.

He returned to statements made by the United States Government in respect of good housekeeping to safeguard the future; in this context, the issue of staff travel expenditure (including daily subsistence allowances) had also been raised. He did not find it difficult to endorse such a sentiment, but he recalled that subsistence allowance scales were determined on a UN system-wide basis and could not be applied differently by individual organizations. Nevertheless, it was not for the staff to bear the burden ensuing from the Governing Body’s failure to meet its responsibilities.

Administrative processes could be rationalized in such a way as to make real economies which were not detrimental to staff members. The staff did not, however, feel that they were in a position to make their full contribution to this effort, the reason probably residing in the nature of the consultation machinery existing in the Office. He had previously raised this issue on behalf of the Workers’ group and had informed the Director-General of its concern. The situation was not helped by the absence of a collective bargaining process. Negotiating machinery could be established relatively rapidly, allowing for responsible discussion between management and staff. An opportunity for the parties to sit down together at the same table was essential; otherwise, staff morale could only deteriorate.

The Workers’ group thus requested the Director-General to discuss the prospect of effective consultation and negotiating machinery applicable to items for which the Office held discretionary powers (thus naturally excluding matters determined for the UN system as a whole). He was confident that, in this way, improvements could be achieved in an organization devoted to the principles of freedom of association and collective bargaining.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the Employers were not in a position to make a statement on the matters referred to by the Worker Vice-Chairman, although they might prompt a certain amount of reflection. His group had always paid close attention to personnel policy issues and believed that savings should not be the sole objective of that policy; he stated that the Employers were sympathetic with the staff in respect of the problems they faced.

The Chairman reported that, as was customary, he had received the Staff Union representatives following the demonstration to which reference had been made. He had observed that the decisions taken by the International Civil Service Commission were also closely linked to the anxiety currently experienced by staff, and that the demonstration might equally well have been held in New York.

The Director-General recalled his national experience of industrial relations in, inter alia, ministerial positions in a country renowned for its traditions of tripartite consultation and collective bargaining. A well-known distinction needed to be drawn between practices prevalent in private industry and those pertaining to the public service. The international civil service was different yet again, as the Director-General was powerless to influence the many regulations applicable to an organization’s staff. In this way, ambiguities arose in relations with the Staff Union. Representatives frequently invoked legislative structures, concepts and machinery designed for the private sector which did not readily apply to the international civil service where staff, in any event, had established rights of control over many issues and access to various decision-making bodies. Therefore, it did not seem possible to combine collective bargaining machinery with the
implementation of an established set of staff regulations and rights. He was, nevertheless, open-minded with regard to the formula to be envisaged, and would welcome the assistance of specialists from the Workers' group in endeavours to overcome these ambiguities.

Mr. Cavaglieli (Government, Italy) sought confirmation of the fact that, in the course of the report adoption process, delegations were entitled to submit written amendments to their own statements, without being obliged to announce the amendment by taking the floor. Such a procedure would make time savings.

The Chairman confirmed that this had already been done in connection with other reports and that, accordingly, corrigenda had been distributed.

Fifth item on the agenda

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE UNITED NATIONS IN 1995-96

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) welcomed the report and the useful information contained in it, even if it sometimes gave the impression that the financial crisis faced by the United Nations system had cast a shadow over the 50th anniversary celebrations. In any event, the section addressing the World Summit on Social Development had been particularly interesting.

With regard to migrant workers, he noted that this issue was now appearing more prominently on the agenda of various fora in the UN system, and he was pleased to note that the ILO also intended to be present in this debate: the discussion in the Committee on Employment and Social Policy bore witness to that endeavour, although no discussion had yet taken place on the International Conference on Population and Development held in Cairo, which addressed a related theme. His group was, however, concerned about the idea raised in the report of promoting the informal sector: the ILO's fundamental position had been that ways and means should be found of bringing that sector into the mainstream of the economy. Conversely, some parts of the UN system appeared to consider the informal sector as a potential solution to employment problems.

He agreed with the statement that there was a need to recast relations between the UN system and the Bretton Woods institutions; the Workers had frequently indicated that it was necessary to enhance the ILO's influence over the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank with a view to ensuring coherent policies and to achieving a better understanding of the social dimension.

He noted the desire for a review of the functioning and terms of reference of the various specialized agencies, but he was convinced that the ILO was different from other organizations in this regard. The ILO was generally more capable than others of taking its own decisions, of tackling its objectives and reviewing its own methods of work; this was largely due to the Governing Body's tripartite structure, which allowed the experience of industry to combine with that of governments.

In conclusion, he stated that his group welcomed the development of the UN Staff College in Turin, provided that ILO activities at the Turin Centre were in no way compromised.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) thanked the Office for the informative report. The Employers had no particular comment to make on it.

Mr. Otero (Government, United States) stated that his Government was pleased to see that the Office had once again taken the trouble to prepare a comprehensive survey of developments in the United Nations system. It was vital for the Governing Body to remain fully informed of such events; on this basis, it would be in a position to take informed decisions on the allocation of ILO resources.

Addressing the issue of UN finances and reform, he recalled that, for the first time in its history (indeed, in its 50th anniversary year), the UN had adopted a budget which constituted a nominal decrease in resources and required reform measures. Several such reform exercises were currently being conducted — the most comprehensive being that carried out by the High-level Working Group on the Strengthening of the UN System. His own Government had contributed a set of proposals for discussion by the Group; some of these concerned the specialized agencies in general and others addressed the ILO specifically. The majority of the proposals would be no
source of surprise to Governing Body members, as many of the ideas involved had been developed by it. They included the need for transparent budgets reflecting priorities that had been fully agreed upon, enhanced external supervision, as well as cost recovery. The strategies should be tailored specifically to the terms of reference of each individual agency. At the same time, it was clear that any discussion in the High-level Working Group was no substitute for the Governing Body’s consideration of those strategies.

Turning to the UN Staff College in Turin, he stated that his Government fully supported the project’s objectives and shared the hope that this would prove to be a successful contribution to UN reform: training had an important role to play in enhancing a coordinated response on the part of the system to rapidly emerging needs.

The United States Government also voiced its support for the role to be assumed by the ILO in follow-up action on various UN conferences and initiatives, in particular the World Summit on Social Development, the International Conference on Population and Development and Habitat II, to the extent that the work clearly fell within the ILO’s mandate and the priorities recommended by IMEC governments. The current cycle of meetings in the UN system was generating a large volume of activity; accordingly, the United States Government had made a recent call for a moratorium on large-scale UN conferences once the present series was completed as well as for focusing efforts on the commitments ensuing from conferences already held.

He noted that the special initiative in favour of Africa reflected the many development challenges on that continent, and his Government applauded the efforts to build on the priorities identified by African leaders. The recommendation that this initiative be largely funded from existing resources that had been redirected was commendable. The ILO’s leadership within the Social and Human Condition Working Group was welcomed, as one of the priority areas under examination was the role played by the informal sector in poverty alleviation through employment generation: that sector was gaining in importance as an engine of economic growth at a time when public funding was restricted. This initiative on Africa was an example of enhanced cooperation with the Bretton Woods institutions: the World Bank had shown special interest in the priority areas identified for UN agency coordinated programming, particularly health and education. In coordination between the various institutions, funding would continue to flow into Africa; this complementary multilateral action was vital at a time of scarce resources.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

Tenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECTORAL AND TECHNICAL MEETINGS AND RELATED ISSUES

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 8, 18, 24, 28, 35, 36, 37, 39 and 43 of the report.

The Governing Body took note of paragraphs 40-41 and 44-46 of the report.

The sitting closed at 12.45 p.m.
EIGHTH SITTING
Thursday, 28 March 1996, afternoon

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

Eighth item on the agenda
REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL ISSUES AND INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS

First report: Legal issues

Mr. llabaca (Government, Chile), as Chairman of the Committee, spoke of the excellent spirit of cooperation and understanding that had prevailed during its work. Its Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards had recommended the abrogation of a number of obsolete Conventions and identified a number of Conventions that should now be shelved, which would make it possible to streamline the Organization's standards, rendering them more readily comprehensible. These were the first steps in a new and historically important direction; they were a sign that it would be possible to renovate and adapt the International Labour Organization to the imperatives of the day. He therefore congratulated the Chairman of the Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards, Mr. Cartier, and the two Vice-Chairmen, Miss Hak and Mr. Parrot. They, together with the members of the Working Party, had demonstrated that, whenever there was good will, it was possible to respond effectively to such a challenge.

At the close of its meeting, the Committee had said farewell to Miss Hak, who was now taking highly merited retirement. For many years her rectitude had been admired, as had the determination with which she defended her convictions. Her valuable contribution had left an indelible mark upon the International Labour Organization and would continue to be cherished. He wished her every happiness and success for the future.

The Chairman associated himself with the tribute to Miss Hak. He had had many opportunities to observe her skill and competence in a whole range of fields. She would be remembered by all members of the Governing Body.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) joined previous speakers in paying tribute to Miss Hak. He noted from the Committee's report that some representatives had stated that they had not always been in full agreement with the positions she had taken on various subjects. It had, however, always been his experience that she was willing to listen to, and be convinced by, sound argument. When she agreed with the merits of a case, she was a reliable ally. This had often been witnessed on apartheid issues, and he recalled in particular the contribution that she had made in that field: she had been one of the most powerful and determined voices in the Organization on such matters, and the fact that she addressed them as an Employer representative had been of incalculable value at the time. On other occasions, she had naturally proved a tough adversary when her convictions prompted her to defend a different position. In any event, she was a champion of the ILO, and had been an irreplaceable asset to her group; she would be missed for her honesty and integrity.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) was grateful for the comments made by previous speakers. His group was extremely proud to have had Miss Hak in its ranks for many years. Few would have been as capable as she had been of devoting so much effort and showing such commitment to ILO activities. He therefore joined all other speakers in paying tribute to her.

The Employers fully supported the points for decision presented in the report now before the Governing Body.

Miss Hak (Employer, Netherlands) thanked speakers for their kind words. First, however, she extended her thanks for the assistance given to her over the years by the staff — secretariat,
interpreters and those responsible for servicing the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards and the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises.

She had found many good friends within the ILO, and was grateful for the time she had spent in it. It had so often been possible to reach a consensus together with those with whom she had worked: this was important in the ILO with its tripartite structure, where a consensus between three parties was a guarantee of success. The outlook for the Organization’s future was in some way clouded by the financial crisis and a certain lack of confidence, yet she was sure that the next Governing Body would be diligent in making improvements. Above all, the ILO should not neglect its fundamental mission — which it had had throughout its history — of promoting social justice and defending human rights. She therefore welcomed the fact that some consensus appeared to be taking shape regarding the need to give greater publicity to the Organization’s activities in the human rights field.

She praised the work of the Committee, thanking Mr. Ilabaca for his chairmanship and kind words, Mr. Parrot for his leadership of the Workers’ group, and Mr. Cartier for the way in which he had presided over the Working Party. In conclusion, she extended her best wishes to all members of the Governing Body.

_The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 10, 17, 29 and 33, and took note of paragraph 34 of the report._

_The Governing Body took note of the report, and adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 24 and 95 of the report._

### Third item on the agenda

**PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION ON THE PROGRAMME AND BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 1998-99 (concl.)**

**ILO publications policy**

_The Chairman_, speaking on behalf of the Officers of the Governing Body, proposed that discussion of the paper on ILO publications policy be postponed to the November session.

_Mr. Brett_ (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) supported the proposal.

_Mr. Otero_ (Government, United States) hoped that, in the meantime, it would still prove possible to make a number of the savings outlined in the paper submitted, even if the discussion on policy was deferred until November.

_The Director-General_ replied that, in any event, it was his responsibility to implement decisions taken by the Governing Body in November 1995; these involved, inter alia, a series of savings to be made in the former Editorial and Document Services Department. At the 267th Session (November 1996) there would be ample opportunity to modify various items so as to ensure that the different opinions expressed on policy matters were taken into account.

_Mr. Brett_ (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) observed that, for reasons which were understandable, the document had been distributed only recently; the discussion could thus be postponed. In any event, he noted the Director-General’s statement that savings were to be made.

_Mr. Oechslin_ (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) feared that a discussion on the item at this stage would not do justice to the substance of the paper submitted by the Office; the document addressed matters which went beyond mere savings (which were necessary and would, in any case, be implemented by the Director-General). He therefore looked forward to a well-prepared and thorough debate on this programme’s guidelines in November.

---

1 See also fourth and fifth sittings.
Mr. Otero (Government, United States) believed that, at a time of financial crisis, all opportunities to effect savings should be used. He therefore welcomed the Director-General’s comment that this would be done and that the policy would be reviewed in November with the possible objective of further savings.

The Governing Body postponed consideration of the Office paper to its 267th Session (November 1996).

Ninth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

Mr. Simanjuntak (Government, Indonesia), as acting Chairman of the Committee, introduced the report. The Committee had considered the country employment policy reviews and agreed on future action, requesting the Office to commence with a sample of countries and to report on progress to the Governing Body in November. Secondly, it had examined the issue of international migration and migrant workers; the debate had clearly shown that the phenomenon affected an ever-growing number of countries and raised concerns about better protection for migrant workers. The Committee also heard a report regarding ILO participation in the Habitat II Conference to be held in Istanbul in June 1996.

Mr. Katz (Employer, United States) pointed out that, as stated in paragraphs 24 and 51 of the report, certain issues had been left temporarily unresolved and still required agreement between the three parties.

The Governing Body took note of the report, and adopted the recommendations in paragraph 48 of the report.

Twelfth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed his group’s regret at the passing of three former members of the Governing Body. He wished to pay particular tribute to his countryman, Lord Collison, who had served the ILO for many years; after leaving the Governing Body, he had continued his activities in the furtherance of workers’ interests in the United Kingdom. The British Trades Union Congress had extended its condolences to Lord Collison’s family and it shared the Governing Body’s sorrow.

The Chairman associated himself with the sentiments expressed by the Workers’ group in respect of Lord Collison.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) paid tribute, on behalf of the Employers’ group, to Mr. Roger Décosterd; the Swiss authorities had also requested to be associated with this statement. Mr. Décosterd had played an eminent role in the Organization. He had been deeply attached to human values and had so often been a source of wise counsel not only for Employers but also for numerous other members of the Governing Body, as well as officials of the Office. Many would now wish to reflect upon the advice they had received from him in difficult situations in the past. He was a man of immense knowledge and intellectual curiosity, and became a friend to all those with whom he had occasion to work. When attending the International Labour Conference for the first time, he rapidly grasped the fact that, despite the formalistic trappings of the event, this was a formidable opportunity for cooperation with men and women of very diverse origins. Few members had commanded so much affection; he was an ardent defender of employers’ interests, and his compassion was extended to all he knew. It would not be possible to replace him.

The Chairman shared the sentiments voiced by the Employer Vice-Chairman.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman), associated the Workers’ group with the tribute paid to Mr. Décosterd.
Mr Mayaki (Worker, Niger) paid tribute to the memory of Mr. Raphaël Nangbog Barnabo, a great friend of the workers' cause and a personal friend to all members of the Governing Body. Mr. Barnabo had been a devoted trade unionist and had made many sacrifices in furtherance of workers' interests not only in his own country, Togo, but also internationally. He requested the Director-General to convey the Governing Body's condolences to Mr. Barnabo's family and to the National Confederation of Togo Workers.

The Director-General associated himself with the tribute paid to Mr. Roger Décosterd. Only a few days before he had died, Mr. Décosterd had addressed a letter to the Director-General with numerous valuable suggestions regarding the Organization and the Office, and a meeting had been planned. Regrettably, Mr. Décosterd's untimely death had prevented the meeting from ever taking place.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 6, 12 and 17 of the report, and took note of paragraphs 18-37 of the report.

First supplementary report:
Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations

The Governing Body took note of the report.

Second supplementary report:
Incomplete delegations at tripartite meetings

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) noted that the report highlighted the issue of tripartite representation at ILO meetings; although difficulties were experienced in almost all regions, there appeared to be a persistent problem in respect of delegations from African countries (some 16 nations had not been present at the most recent African Regional Conference). He was aware of the financial constraints faced by the governments of developing countries, but some consistently failed in their responsibility to ensure that tripartite delegations were sent to regional or even major international meetings. It was insufficient, in such circumstances, simply to invoke financial crises: the real cost of full representation was minimal in relation to those countries' difficulties, and the opportunities lost could not be overestimated. He trusted that African governments would heed this plea and ensure better representation on future occasions.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) noted that the principle of tripartite representation was not yet observed universally. The problem appeared to be most serious for worker representatives. In certain cases — which concerned all regions, but Africa in particular — the explanations were clearly not satisfactory.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

Third supplementary report:
Participation of non-metropolitan territories as observers in the 83rd Session (June 1996) of the International Labour Conference

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

Fourth supplementary report:
Activities of the International Occupational Safety and Health Information Centre (CIS)

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed his group's appreciation of, and support for, the activities conducted by the International Occupational Safety and Health Centre, in particular with regard to the practical assistance it provided to the social partners and the valuable work it performed in the developing world and countries in transition.
Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) fully shared the sentiment voiced by the Workers’ group. The International Occupational Safety and Health Centre worked closely with the end-users of its services, who were valuable contacts. His group therefore continued to give its full support to CIS activities.

*The Governing Body took note of the report.*

**Thirteenth item on the agenda**

**REPORTS OF THE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY**

**Fifth report:**

*Amendments to the Regulations of the International Institute for Labour Studies following the programme and budget adjustments approved by the Governing Body at its 264th Session (November 1995)*

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) stated that the amendments were the reflection in a legal text of the decisions already approved by the Governing Body; consequently, his group supported their adoption.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman) endorsed the comments made on behalf of the Employers’ group.

*The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 9 of the report.*

**First report:**

*Representation submitted by the Trade Union Confederation of Congo Workers (CSTC) under article 24 of the ILO Constitution, alleging non-observance by Congo of the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949 (No. 95)*

The Governing Body appointed a committee to examine the representation.

**Second report:**

*Representations made by the Latin American Central of Workers (CLAT) and the Single Confederation of Workers of Peru (CUT) under article 24 of the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by Peru of the Right of Association (Agriculture) Convention, 1921 (No. 11), the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) and the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122)*

The Governing Body appointed a committee to examine the representation.

**Third report:**

*Representation made by the Senegal Teachers’ Single and Democratic Trade Union under article 24 of the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by Senegal of the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)*

The Governing Body appointed a committee to examine the representation.
Fourth report:
Representation made by the Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions (TÜRK-IS) under article 24 of the ILO Constitution alleging non-observance by Turkey of the Termination of Employment Convention, 1982 (No. 158)

The Governing Body appointed a committee to examine the representation.

Fourteenth item on the agenda

COMPOSITION AND AGENDA OF STANDING BODIES AND MEETINGS

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 1 of the report.

Meeting of Experts on Workers' Privacy
(Geneva, 1-7 October 1996)

The Governing Body approved the nominations in paragraph 4 of the paper and the following government nominations:

Nominations made after consultations with governments
Mr. A. Battacharya (India), Director, Ministry of Labour; substitute: Mr. R. Shahare, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India, Geneva
Ms. U. Bhoola (South Africa), Cheadle Thompson & Haysom
Mr. E.G. Dutra (Uruguay), Director, Nacional de Empleo
Ms. K. Leigh (Australia), Senior Government Counsel, International Civil and Privacy Branch, Civil Law Division, Attorney-General's Department
Mr. O. Vidnes (Norway), Royal Ministry of Local Government and Labour
Mr. H.-P. Viethen (Germany), Regierungsdirektor, Federal Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs
Ms. S.J. De Vries (Netherlands), Directorate for Legislation, Administration and Legal Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (United States) [name to be supplied in June].

The Governing Body also approved the following nominations:

Tripartite Meeting on Improving the Conditions of Employment and Work of Agricultural Wage Workers in the Context of Economic Restructuring
(Geneva, 23-27 September 1996)

Nominations made after consultations with the Employers' group
Mr. L. Hermida Martínez (Argentina), Presidente, Comisión de Recursos Humanos, Unión Industrial Argentina (UIA)
Mr. R. Skeffington (Australia), Assistant Director, National Farmers Federation
Mr. M.J.M. Zubar (Bahrain), Managing Director, Gulf Fencing Est. WLL
Mr. M. Roberts (Canada), Director, Human Resources, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool
Ms. L. Horvatic (Croatia), Legal Adviser, Croatian Employers' Association
Mr. A. Christoudoulou (Cyprus), Director, Employers and Industrialists Federation of Cyprus
Mr. M. Tiitola (Finland), Managing Director, Federation of Agricultural Employers
Mr. A. Brum (France), Chef du Service des affaires sociales, Fédération nationale des syndicats d'exploitants agricoles (FNSEA)
Mr. H.-M. Freiherr von Schnurbein (Germany), Dipl.-Ing. Agr., Guts-Forstverwaltung Hemerten
Mr. H. Preti Jorquín (Guatemala), Presidente, Cámara del AGRO
Mr. G.N. Saxena (India), Chief Manager (Coop Service), Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Limited
Mr. Derom Bangun (Indonesia), Chairman, APINDO North Sumatra
Mr. K. Eliyahu (Israel), Manager, Labour Relations Division, Farmers’ Union of Israel
Mr. G.N. Konditi (Kenya), Deputy Executive Director, Federation of Kenya Employers
Mr. V. Lazda (Latvia), Deputy Director, Latvian Agriculture Cooperation Union
Mr. A. Nouali (Morocco), Président, Chambre de Commerce et d’Industrie de Taza au Maroc
Mr. D.O. Slama (Mauritania), Secrétaire général, Fédération de l’Agriculture et de l’Elevage
Mr. J.G. Garza Sada (Mexico), Asesor, Confederación Patronal de la República Mexicana
Mr. P.A. Gordón Sarasqueta (Panama), Presidente, Sociedad de Avicultores de Panamá
Mr. S. Witoslawski (Poland), Chairman, Managing Board, Federation of Agricultural Employers’ Union
Mr. J.C. Martins de Frias Gomes (Portugal), Director do Departamento Técnico, Confederação dos Agricultores do Portugal (CAP)
Mr. V. Naoumov (Russian Federation), First Deputy Chairman, Russian Agrarian Association
Mr. J. Horvath (Slovak Republic), Foreign Affairs Secretary, Federation of Employers’ Unions and Associations of the Slovak Republic
Mr. J.J. Alvarez Alcalde (Spain), Director del Departamento de Relaciones Laborales, Asociación Agraria Jóvenes Agricultores (ASAJA)
Mr. J.J. Visser (South Africa), Human Resources Manager, Western Cape Agricultural Development Trust
Mr. F.E.A. Wijesinghe (Sri Lanka), Industrial Relations Advisor (Plantations)
Ms. J. Garai (United Kingdom), National Farmers Union
Mr. A. García Arzola (Venezuela), Presidente, FEDECAMARAS Guárico
Mr. M. Mugala (Zambia), Human Resource Manager, Nanga Farms Limited
Mr. E.J. Rodger (Zimbabwe), Chief Executive, Agricultural Labour Bureau

Substitutes

Mr. A. Walters (Barbados), Personnel Manager, Barbados Agricultural Management Co.
Mr. L. Gonzaga Bertelli (Brazil), Director, Federação das Indústrias do Estado de São Paulo (FIESP)
Mr. J.C. Betancur (Colombia), Director de Relaciones Internacionales, Compañía Colombiana de Tabaco, S.A. COLTABACO
Mr. R. Gómez Orteéflana (Ecuador), Vicepresidente Jurídico, Cámara de Industrias de Guayaquil
Mr. H.H. Motawi (Egypt), Director-General, Federation of Egyptian Industries
Mr. Mohd Fakhrzi Bin A. Hamid (Malaysia), Manager, Revertex (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd
Mr. P. D’Arifat (Mauritius), Director, Mauritius Sugar Producers’ Association
Mr. I. Urbanowski (Poland), President, Gruntpol Company
Mr. G. Ogriskin (Russian Federation), Russian Agrarian Association
Mr. E. Skoglösa (Sweden), Agronomist, Swedish Forestry and Agricultural Employers
Mr. M.L. Johnson (United Republic of Tanzania), Chief Executive, Tanganyika Association of Agricultural Employers
Mr. J. Antoine (Trinidad and Tobago), Director
Mr. Ferhat Ilter (Turkey), Research Expert, Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations
Mr. R. Henson (Zimbabwe), Chairman, Agricultural Labour Bureau

Nominations made after consultations with the Workers' group

Ms. F.D. Aliaza Felix (Dominican Republic), UNAC
Ms. L. Arruda (Brazil), CONTAG
Mr. R.E. Astudillo (Chile), CNCC
Mr. H. Avivi (Israel), AWU
Mr. M. Bathily (Mali), SYNPRO
Mr. G. Bermúdez (Costa Rica), SITRAP
Ms. R. Bezovska (Macedonia), TUW-AIC
Mr. R.P. Boonerje (Bangladesh), BCSULH
Mr. I. Cambridge (Australia), AWU-FIME
Mr. R. Constantinescu (Romania), AGROSTAR
Mr. H. Correa (Colombia), SINTRAINAGRO
Mr. R. Dimitrav (Bulgaria), FL-Podkrepa
Ms. K. Ghamin (Morocco), UMT
Mr. Ch. Gomboşuren (Mongolia), AWU
Ms. D. Huerta (United States), UFW
Mr. M. Kammoura (Egypt), GTUWAI
Mr. S. Kanga (Ghana), GAWU
Mr. A. Kerbriand (France), FGTAATASA-CGT Force Ouvrière
Mr. F.D.L. Lacubtan (Philippines), ALU-TUCP
Mr. N. Lisethete (Haiti), FENATAPA.
Mr. D. Motha (South Africa), SAAPAWU
Mr. S. Okada (Japan), NFAFFCWU
Mr. A.W.D.D. Seneviratne (Sri Lanka), LJEWU
Ms. K. Sinha (India), HKMS
Ms. S. Songambele (United Republic of Tanzania), TPAWU
Ms. Y. Teferi (Ethiopia), NFFPFAITU
Ms. R. Valbe (Estonia), FAWU
Ms. M. Van Heen (Netherlands), Voedingsband-FNV
Mr. A.E. Villeda (Guatemala), SITRABI
Mr. H.-J. Wilms (Germany), IG-BAU

Substitutes

Mr. A. Carbone (Italy), FLAI-CGIL
Mr. P. Davidov (Russian Federation), Agricultural and Agro-Complex Workers' Union
Mr. L. Konan (Côte d'Ivoire), FNSIEAM
Mr. F. Minda (Ecuador), FETAAAA
Ms. P. Sundano (Zambia), NUPAW
Mr. O. Tariq (Pakistan), PAEU
Mr. M. Tulio Cartagena (Honduras), UNC
Tripartite Meeting on the Globalization of the Footwear, Textiles and Clothing Industries: Effects on Employment and Working Conditions
(Geneva, 28 October-1 November 1996)

Nominations made after consultations with the Employers' group

Mr. M. Michiels (Belgium), Directeur du département des affaires sociales, Fédération textile belge FEBELTEX

Mr. D. Lima Godoy (Brazil), Presidente, Federação das Indústrias do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul (FIERGS)

Mr. H. Hoyos (Colombia), Vicepresidente de Relaciones Humanas, Compañía Colombiana de Tejidos, S.A., COLTEJER

Ms. D. Kubícková (Czech Republic), Head, International Social Policy Affairs, Department of Social Policy and Collective Bargaining, Confederation of Industry of the Czech Republic

Mr. R. Kronfle (Ecuador), Ex-Presidente, Federación Nacional de Cámaras de Industrias del Ecuador

Mr. S.K. Ramadan (Egypt), General Manager, Egyptian Italian Company for the Production of Shoes and Leather Products

Mr. J.A. Addo (Ghana), Director, Freedom Textiles Industries

Mr. P.S. Cheema (India), Chairman and Managing Director, National Textile Corporation Limited

Mr. L. Pietripaoli (Italy), Director, Industrial Relations, Italian Federation of Associations of the Textile and Clothing Industries

Mr. M. Kanaya (Japan), Managing Director, Toyobo Co. Ltd.

Mr. Byong-moo Yang (Republic of Korea), Senior Research Fellow, Labour Economics Institute

Mr. Choy Ming Bil (Malaysia), Executive Director, Malaysian Textile Manufacturers Association

Mr. T. Lagesse (Mauritius), Chairman, Mauritius Export Processing Zone Association

Mr. W. Jibrin (Nigeria), Assistant to the General Manager, United Nigerian Textiles PLC

Mr. M. Aziz (Pakistan), Chief Executive, Delta Apparel (Pvt) Ltd.

Mr. D. Bagaloo (Trinidad and Tobago), Managing Director, Fanciwear Garments Limited

Mr. Lütfü Paker (Turkey), Proprietor, Yeni Tekstil San, A.S.

Mr. R. Hall (United States), Vice-President, International Trade Counsel, National Retail Federation

Substitutes

Mr. A.J.A. Awadi (Bahrain), Director, Abdulla M. Hassan Akhundawazi

Mr. N. Mikic (Croatia), Director and Co-Owner, Lumik plc Garment Industry

Mr. M. Pilikos (Cyprus), Head, Industrial Relations and Labour Legislation Department

Mr. R. León Paéz (Ecuador), Gerente General, Fábrica de Tejidos PINTEX, S.A.

Mr. F. Penard (France), Directeur des Affaires sociales, Union des Industries textiles

Mr. R. Mauer (Germany), Rechtsanwalt, Hauptgeschäftsführer, Bundesvereinigung der Arbeitgeber im Bundesverband Bekleidungsindustrie e.V.

Mr. M. Cuevas (Guatemala), Director, Corporación Avellaneda, S.A.

Mr. C.A. Maselli (Guatemala), Director, Cardiz, S.A.

Mr. S. Hardjomiguno (Indonesia), Vice-Chairman, APINDO Central Java

Mr. B. Sagiv (Israel), Director, Textile and Fashion Division, Manufacturers' Association of Israel

Mr. T. Mutiso (Kenya), Human Resources Manager, Bata Shoe Company (Kenya) Limited

Mr. E. Vanags (Latvia), Managing Director, Vidzemes Maiznieks SIA
Mr. A. Al Jaroudi (Morocco), Président, Chambre de Commerce et d’industrie de Nador
Mr. S.O. T’Feil (Mauritania), Directeur général, Société mauritienne des textiles (SOMATEXI)
Mr. J. Santos Aranda (Mexico), Director-General, Inducal, S.A. de C.V.
Mr. S.O. Dada (Nigeria), Honorary Secretary, Employers’ Association of Leather, Footwear and Rubber Industries of Nigeria
Mr. G. Ulvered (Norway), Adviser, Association of Norwegian Clothing, Shoes, Textile, Leather and Sporting Goods Industries
Mr. G. Andersen (Portugal), Portuguese Clothing Industries Association
Mr. A. Biryukov (Russian Federation), President, ROSLEGPROM
Mr. S. Sulo (Slovak Republic), Secretary-General, Association of the Leather and Shoe Industry
Mr. J. Baard (South Africa), Group Industrial Relations Executive, Seardal Investment Corporation Limited
Mr. E.F. Gamini Amerasinghe (Sri Lanka), Secretary-General, Employers’ Federation of Ceylon
Mr. A. Sandgren (Sweden), Managing Director, Swedish Textile and Clothing Industries Association
Mr. A.J. Shah (United Republic of Tanzania), Founder Chairman of the Textile Manufacturers’ Association of Tanzania
Mr. M. Maharaj (Trinidad and Tobago), Director, Fanciwear Garments Limited
Mr. A.J. Womersley (United Kingdom), Employment Affairs Manager, Confederation of British Wool and Textiles Ltd.
Mr. J. Quijano (Uruguay), Asesor de la Presidencia y del Consejo Directivo, Cámara de la Industria del Calzado
Mr. N. Taddeo (Venezuela), Especialista en Derecho Laboral, Fábrica de Calzados Gemelli
Mr. P.B. Mbulo (Zambia), Human Resources Manager, Zambian Bata Shoe Company

Fifteenth item on the agenda

APPOINTMENT OF GOVERNING BODY REPRESENTATIVES ON VARIOUS BODIES

In accordance with the new Standing Orders for sectoral meetings, the Governing Body appointed Mr. Gray (Worker member) to represent it at the Tripartite Meeting on Social and Labour Problems caused by Structural Adjustments in the Port Industry (Geneva, 20-24 May 1996).

The Governing Body appointed Dr. Lakshmidhar Mishra (Government, India) to represent it at the Tripartite Meeting on Improving the Conditions of Employment and Work of Agricultural Wage Workers in the Context of Economic Restructuring.

Other questions

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS FOR THE REMAINDER OF 1996 AND FOR 1997

The Governing Body took note of the document.

SYMPOSIA, SEMINARS AND SIMILAR MEETINGS

The Governing Body took note of the document.

VIII/10
REQUESTS FROM NON-GOVERNMENTAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WISHING TO BE REPRESENTED AT THE 83RD (1996) SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

The Governing Body took note of the document.

REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENT FOR THE APPLICATION OF THE PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURE (HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS AND PESTICIDES)

The Governing Body took note of the document.

Mr. Brett (Worker, United Kingdom; Worker Vice-Chairman), proposed on behalf of the Workers' group, with reference to the discussion on the report of the Committee on Freedom of Association, that the work of that Committee should be publicized on the WorldWideWeb. A corresponding proposal would be submitted to the Office for consideration.

The Director-General agreed that it would be useful to envisage appropriate methods for the publication of various forms of selected material.

The 265th Session of the Governing Body was declared closed at 4.10 p.m.
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WHO ATTENDED THE 265th SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY
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Mars 1996 / March 1996 / Marzo de 1996

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

VOSKUHL, Ursula, Mrs., Director General, European and International Social Policy Department, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs; Representative of the Government of Germany on the Governing Body.

substitute:
WILLERS, Dietrich, Mr., Head, ILO Affairs Division, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs; Substitute Representative of the Government of Germany on the Governing Body.

accompanied by:
RINGKAMP, Werner, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Germany in Geneva.
WETZ, Clemens, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Germany in Geneva.

Argentine/Argentina

ETALA, Carlos Alberto, Sr., Secretario de Estado, Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social; Representante del Gobierno de Argentina ante el Consejo de Administración.
SANCHEZ ARNAU, Juan Carlos, S.E., Sr., Embajador; Representante Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra.

suplente:
BENITEZ, Manuel, Sr., Ministro Plenipotenciario, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra.

acompañado de:
TOSONOTTI, María Cristina, Srta., Secretario de Embajada, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra.

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

SWAILS, Noel, Mr., Minister (Special Labour Adviser), Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva; Representative of the Government of Australia on the Governing Body.

substitute:

DEJONG, Bill, Mr., Assistant Secretary, International Branch, Department of Industrial Relations.

accompanied by:

WELLS, Ric, Mr., Minister, Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva.
MacDONALD, Angus, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva.
KNOTT, Chris, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva.

Brésil/Brazil/Brasil

LAFER, Celso, H.E., Mr., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Brazil in Geneva.
SILVA SOARES, Guido Fernando, Mr., Minister-Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Brazil in Geneva.

accompanied by:

GUAPINDAIA JOPPERT, Paulo, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Brazil in Geneva.
GOMES DOS SANTOS, Maria Helena, Ms., Head of the International Division of the Brazilian Ministry of Labour.

Chili/Chile

PEREZ VEGA, Guillermo, Sr., Subsecretario del Trabajo, Ministerio del Trabajo y Previsión Social; Representante del Gobierno de Chile ante el Consejo de Administración

suplente:

ILABACA, José Luis, Sr., Consejero, Misión Permanente de Chile en Ginebra; Representante Suplente del Gobierno de Chile ante el Consejo de Administración.

acompañado de:

RIVAS, Francisco, Sr., Agregado Laboral, Misión Permanente de Chile en Ginebra.

Chine/China

WU, Jianmin, H.E., Mr., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China in Geneva.

substitutes:

ZHANG, Wei, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the People’s Republic of China in Geneva.
LIN, MAIZHU, Mr., Deputy Director, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour.

accompanied by:

WANG, Jiyuan, Mr., Chief, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour.
ZHU, Zhengu, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China in Geneva.
CHEN, Yuping, Ms., Institute for International Labour Studies, Ministry of Labour.
Congo

TSOMAMBET, Anaclet, M., Ministre du Travail, de la Fonction publique et de la Sécurité sociale; représentant du gouvernement du Congo au Conseil d'administration.

suppléant:

LOUDI, Sylvain, M., Conseiller au Travail du Ministre du travail.

accompagné de:

M. NZABA, Anatole, M., Directeur général du Travail.
MAN-DOBE ATSOUAYE, M., Directeur de la Coopération.

Etats-Unis/United States/Estados Unidos

OTERO, Joaquin, Mr., Deputy Under-Secretary for International Affairs, Department of Labor; Representative of the Government of the United States on the Governing Body.

substitute:

SPRING, Charles H., Mr., Director, Office of International Organizations, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor; Substitute Representative of the Government of the United States on the Governing Body.

accompagné by:

ANDERSON, Betsy L., Ms., Director, Industrial and Communications Programs, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State.
DUNKAK, Barbara A., Mrs., Assistant Director, Office of International Organizations, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor.
SPIEGEL, Daniel L., H.E., Mr., Ambassaor, Permanent Representative of the United States in Geneva.
STIGLIANI, Nicholas, Mr., Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva.
WEINTRAUB, Leon, Mr., International Resource Management, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva.

France/Francia

CHOTARD, Yvon, M., Président de groupe au Conseil économique et social; Président du Conseil d'administration du BIT.

suppléant:

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

accompagné de:

CARTIER, Jean-Louis, M., Sous-Directeur, chef de la mission internationale, ministère du Travail et des Affaires sociales.
WELCOME, Dominique, M., Chargé de mission de la délégation à l'Emploi, ministère du Travail et des Affaires sociales.
FAUVEAU, Gérard M., Conseiller, mission permanente de la France à Genève.
MEUNIER, Guilemette, Mme, Secrétaire des affaires étrangères, direction des Nations Unies et des Organisations internationales, ministère des Affaires étrangères.
Ghana

BOATENG, D.S., Mr., Minister of Employment and Social Welfare.

substitute:

AGGREY-ORLEANS, A.Y., H.E., Mrs., Permanent Representative of Ghana in Geneva.

accompanied by:

GYEBI, Alex, Mr., Chief Labour Officer, Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare.
NEE-WHANG, E., Mrs., Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Ghana in Geneva.

Inde/India

MISHRA, Lakshmidhar, Mr., Labour Secretary, Ministry of Labour; Representative of the Government of India on the Governing Body.

accompanied by:

SINHA, Dilip, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva.
SIRAJUDDIN, P.M., Mr., Director, Ministry of Labour.
TIRUMURTI, T.S., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva.
SHAHARE, Rajeev, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva.

République islamique d'Iran/Islamic Republic of Iran
República Islámica del Irán

ALI-HOSSEINI, Taghi, Mr., Counsellor for Labour and Social Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

substitute:

FANNIZADEH, Kamran, Mr., Counsellor for Labour and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Geneva; Substitute Representative of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the Governing Body.

Italie/Italy/Italia

CAVAGLIERI, Alberto, S.E., M., Ambassadeur; représentant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration.

suppléant:

VALCAVI, Domenico, M., Directeur général, ministère du Travail; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration.

accompagné de:

SCHIAVONI, Gerolamo, M., Premier Conseiller, mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève.
CARLA, Daniela, Mme., Conseiller, Ministère du Travail.

Japon/Japan/Japón

ENDO, Minoru, H.E., Mr., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of Japan in Geneva; Representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body.
substitutes:

HIROMI, Kazuo, Mr., Assistant Minister of Labour, Ministry of Labour.
KOEZUKA, Takashi, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva.
TSUNEKAWA, Kenji, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva.
TSUNAKI, Masatoshi, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva.
HAYASHI, Jajime, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva.
accompanied by:

ISHIGAI, Tsuyoshi, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva.
TAKAHASHI, Hiroshi, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva.
KATAFUCHI, Hirofumi, Mr., Assistant Director, International Labour Affairs Division, Ministerial Secretariat, Ministry of Labour.

Kenya

MURAGE, Stanley K., Mr., Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Manpower Development; Representative of the Government of Kenya on the Governing Body.

substitute:

NGARE, Ephraim Waweru, Mr., Deputy Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour; Substitute Representative of the Government of Kenya on the Governing Body.

accompanied by:

TOLLE, Esther, M., H.E., Ms., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Kenya in Geneva.

Mexique/Mexico/México

DE ICAZA, Antonio, S.E., Sr., Embajador; Representante Permanente de México en Ginebra.
suplente:

JOUBLANC, Luciano, S.E., Sr., Embajador; Representante Permanente Alterno de México en Ginebra.
acompañado de:

DIAZ INFANTE MENDEZ, Sergio, Sr., Director para la Organización Internacional del Trabajo, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social.
ROMERO ESQUIVEL, Eusebio, Sr., Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente de México en Ginebra.

Nicaragua

MEJIA, Leister, S.E., Sr., Embajador; Representante Permanente de Nicaragua en Ginebra.
acompañado de:

ROSALES, Danilo, Sr., Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente de Nicaragua en Ginebra.
RUIZ, Fernando, Sr., Consejero técnico del Embajador, Misión Permanente de Nicaragua en Ginebra.
Niger/Níger

SEINI, ALI GADO, M., Ministre de la Fonction publique, du Travail et de l’Emploi.

accompagné de:

CHEGOU, Kochi, Maïna, M., Secrétaire général adjoint, ministère de la Fonction publique, du Travail et de l’Emploi.


Norvège/Norway/Noruega

VIDNES, Oyvind, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Norway in Geneva; Representative of the Government of Norway on the Governing Body.

substitute:

BRUAAS, Odd, Mr., Adviser, Ministry of Local Government and Labour; Substitute Representative of the Government of Norway on the Governing Body.

accompanied by:

HAUGE, Anders D., Mr., Adviser, Ministry of Local Government and Labour.

Philippines/Filipinas

TRAJANO, Cresenciano, Mr., Under-Secretary, Department of Labor and Employment.

substitutes:

CASTRO-MULLER DE, Bernarditas, Mrs., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Philippines in Geneva.

CALLANGAN, Monina, Ms., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Philippines in Geneva.

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

Qatar

AL-THANI, Fahad Awaida, H.E., Cheikh, Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Qatar in Geneva.

substitute:

ABOU SHARBAK, Ali Said, Mr., Director of Planning.

Roumanie/Romania/Rumania

POPESCU, Andrei, M., Directeur de la direction des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et de la Protection sociale; représentant du gouvernement de la Roumanie au Conseil d’administration.

suppléant:

MIRCEA, Tudor, M., Conseiller, mission permanente de Roumanie à Genève; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la Roumanie au Conseil d’administration.
Royaume-Uni/United Kingdom/Reino Unido

MORGAN, Shan, Ms., Principal, International Relations Branch, Department for Education and Employment; Representative of the Government of the United Kingdom on the Governing Body.

substitutes:

ANDREWS, Keith, Mr., Senior Executive Officer, Department for Education and Employment.
SIMMONS, Tim, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva.

accompanied by:

TUCKER, Clive, Mr., Under Secretary, International and Analytical Services
HARTWELL, Matilda, Ms., Labour Attaché, British Embassy in Paris.
BROWN, David, Mr., Department for Education and Employment.
QUIGLEY, Marian, Ms., Executive Officer, Department for Education and Employment.
WILLIAMS, Nigel, H.E., Mr., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom in Geneva.
CHAPLIN, Edward G.M., Mr., Deputy Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom in Geneva.
FRARY, Helen, Ms., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva.
PROCTOR, Matthew, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva.

Fédération de Russie/Russian Federation/Federación de Rusia

KOLOSOV, V.F., Mr., First Deputy Minister of Labour, Representative of the Government of the Russian Federation on the Governing Body.

substitutes:

EVLUKHIN, Y., Mr., Head, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour.
GUERBOV, V.M., Mr., Deputy Head, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour.

accompanied by:

STEFANKIN, V.V., Mr., Deputy Director, Department of Economic Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
SURVILLO, K.G., Ms., Second Secretary, Department of Economic Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
LYZHENKOV, A.L., Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation in Geneva.

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.

accompanied by:

PINTER, Ivan, Mr., International Economic Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
SKODA, Panel, Mr., Second 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.
accompagné de:

BACCAR, Kadhem, M., Conseiller des affaires étrangères, mission permanente de la Tunisie à Genève.

Venezuela

TARRE MURZI, Alfredo, S.E., Sr., Embajador; Representante Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra.

acompañado de:

SUAREZ, Naudy, Sr., Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra.
ARRAEZ HURTADO, Gisela, Sra., Consejero, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra.
FONSECA, Violeta, Sra., Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra.
AROCHA RIVAS, Yaneth, Sra., Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra.
TOURON LUGO, Iole, Sra., Agregado, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra.

Zimbabwe

SHAMUYARIRA, N.M., Mr., Minister for Labour, Public Service and Social Welfare.

substitute:

DZVITI, P.Z., Mr., Chief Public Relations Officer, Ministry for Labour, Public Service and Social Welfare.

accompagné by:

CHIFAMBA, T.T., Mr., Chargé d’Affaires a.i., Permanent Mission of Zimbabwe in Geneva.
ZAMCHIYA, F.M., Mrs., Senior Labour Relations Officer, Ministry of the Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare.
MUPEZENI, K., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Zimbabwe in Geneva.
CHIKOROWONDO, M., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Zimbabwe in Geneva.

MEMBRES EMPLOYEURS
EMPLOYER MEMBERS
MIEMBROS EMPLEADORES

AKA ANGHUI, J., M. (Côte d’Ivoire), Président honoraire, Conseil national du patronat ivoirien.
GAZARIN, Adel, Mr. (Egypt), President, Federation of Egyptian Industries.
HAK, Cornelie, Miss (Netherlands), Adviser, Federation of Netherlands Industries.
HOFF, Erik, Mr. (Norway), Director, International Social and Labour Market Affairs, Confederation of Norwegian Business and Industry.
KATZ, A., Mr. (United States), President, United States Council for International Business.
NASR, M., Mr. (Lebanon), Association of Lebanese Industrialists.
NEVES FILHO, J. Santos, Sr. (Brasil), Vicepresidente, Confederacao Nacional da Indústria (CNI).
NOAKES, B., Mr. (Australia), Deputy Chief Executive, Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
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.
REGIL de, Jorge A., Sr. (México), Confederación de Cámaras Industriales de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos.
SUZUKI, Toshio, Mr. (Japan), Senior Managing Director, Nikkeiren International Cooperation Center.
TABANI, A., Mr. (Pakistan), President, Employers’ Federation of Pakistan.
THÜSING, Rolf, Mr. (Germany), Member, Executive Board, Confederation of German Employers’ Associations.

* * *
BALBOUL, Fouad, M., suppléant personnel de M. Nasr.
BOUSSAT, Bernard, M., accompagnant M. Oechlin.
HESS, Christian, Mr., accompanying Mr. Thüsing.
KASAKAWA, Hikaru, Mr., Director, International Division, Japan Federation of Employers' Associations; personal substitute for Mr. Suzuki.
TUCKER, Amanda, Ms., accompanying Mr. Katz.

MEMBRES TRAVAILLEURS
WORKER MEMBERS
MIEMBROS TRABAJADORES

AGYEI, C.A., Mr. (Ghana), Secretary-General, Ghana Trades Union Congress.
BEN SEDDIK, Mahjoub, M. (Maroc), Secrétaire général, Union marocaine du Travail.
BRETT, William, Mr. (United Kingdom), General Secretary, Institution of Professional Managers and Specialists; Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body.
DOUCOURE, Issa, M. (Mali), Secrétaire général, Union nationale des travailleurs du Mali.
ENGELEN-KEFER, Ursula, Mrs. (Germany), Vice-President, German Confederation of Trade Unions (DGB).
FALBR, Richard, Mr. (Czech Republic), President, Czech-Moravian Chamber of Trade Unions.
GRAY, Charles, Mr. (United States), International Affairs Director, AFL-CIO.
ITOH, Sukesada, Mr. (Japan), Vice President, Japanese Trade Union Confederation (JITUC-RENGO).
MANSFIELD, William, Mr. (Australia), Assistant Secretary, Australian Council of Trade Unions.
NAIK, Haribhau, Mr. (India), Treasurer, Indian National Trade Union Congress.
PARROT, Jean-Claude, M. (Canada), Vice-Président exécutif, Congrès du travail du Canada.
RAMIREZ LEON, Frederico, Sr. (Venezuela), Presidente, Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela (CTV).
SANCHEZ MADARIAGA, Alfonso, Sr. (México), Secretario de Relaciones Internacionales, Confederación de Trabajadores de México.
TAPIOLA, Kari, Mr. (Finland), Director for International Affairs, Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions (SAK).

* * *

EDSTROEM, Ulf, Mr., International Secretary, accompanying Mr. Tapiola.
HAYASHIBARA, Michiko, Mrs., accompanying Mr. Itoh.
MALLON, Brian, Mr., accompanying M. Parrot.
STEYNE, Simon B., Mr., accompanying Mr. Brett.
ZELLOHEOFER, Jerald, Mr., accompanying Mr. Gray.

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

Canada/Canadá

GUERTIN, Louise, Ms., Directrice. Division de la coopération avec l'extérieur, Direction de la législation et recherche, Développement des ressources humaines.

substitute:

PERLIN, Jean, Mrs., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Canada in Geneva.
accompanied by:

McALISTER, Andrew, Mr., Minister, Permanent Mission of Canada in Geneva.
BEAUPRE-BERARD, Huguette, Mme, Agent des affaires internationales, Division de la coopération avec l’extérieur, Développement des ressources humaines.
BERNARD, Ann, Ms., Programme Officer, Economic and Social Development Division, Global Issues Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Cuba

CABALLERO-RODRÍGUEZ, Eumelio, S.E., Sr., Embajador, Representante Permanente de Cuba en Ginebra.

acompañado de:

HERNANDEZ OLIVA, Gretel, Sra., Especialista Principal, Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.
DELGADO GONZALEZ, Adrián, Sr., Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente de Cuba en Ginebra.

Egypte/Egypt/Egipto

ZAHRAN, Mounir, H.E., Mr., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Egypt in Geneva.

accompanied by:

SHAHIN, Magda, Mrs., Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of Egypt in Geneva.
BEBARS, Reda, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Egypt in Geneva.
AMIN, Eslahe, Mrs., Counsellor for Labour, Permanent Mission of Egypt in Geneva.
MOSTAFA, Hasan, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Egypt in Geneva.

Espagne/Spain/España

ALBALATE LAFITA, Joaquín, Sr., Consejero Laboral, Misión Permanente de España en Ginebra; Representante Adjunto del Gobierno de España ante el Consejo de Administración.

acompañado de:

DE SEGOVIA, Luis Fernando, Sr., Representante Permanente Alterno de España en Ginebra.

Gabon/Gabón


acompliqué de:

NZIENGUI, Moulomba, M., Directeur des relations internationales, Ministère du Travail, des Ressources humaines et de la Formation professionnelle.

Hongrie/Hungary/Hungría

HÉTHY, Lajos, Mr., State Secretary, Ministry of Labour; Representative of the Government of Hungary on the Governing Body.
substitute:

NAGY, Katalin, Ms., Deputy Head of Department, Ministry of Labour: Substitute Representative of the Government of Hungary on the Governing Body.

accompanied by:

KLEKNER, Péter, Mr., Deputy Head of Department, Ministry of Labour.
VARGA, Imre, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Hungary in Geneva.

Indonésie/Indonesia

LATIEF, Abdul, Mr., Minister of Manpower.

substitutes:

TARMIDZI, Agus, H.E., Mr., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of Indonesia in Geneva.
SYAHRUDDIN, Saodah B.A, Mrs., H.E., Ambassador, Deputy Representative of Indonesia in Geneva.

accompanied by:

SIMANJUNTAK, Payaman, Mr., Senior Adviser to the Minister of Manpower, Department of Manpower.
WIDODO, Makmur, Mr., Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva.
SUTANTO, Mr., Head, Bureau of Public Relations, Department of Manpower.
MOEHARIO, Dienne Hardianti, Ms., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva.
HANARTANI, Mira Maria, Ms., Head, Division of Minister Secretariat, Department of Manpower.
TAHAR, Reshanthy, Ms., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva.

Mali/Mali

DIARRA, Boubacar Gaoussou, M., Ministre de l’Emploi, de la Fonction publique et du Travail.

accompagné de:

DIAKITE, Mamadou, M., Conseiller technique du Ministre.

Maurice/Mauritius/Mauricio

CURE, P.E. Mr., Minister-Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative of Mauritius in Geneva.

accompanied by:

Mr. A.Y. LAM CHIOU YEE, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Mauritius in Geneva.
MUNISAMY, Renganaden, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of Mauritius in Geneva.

Nouvelle-Zélande/New Zealand/Nueva Zelandía

SILBERSTEIN, Joanne, Ms., Manager Policy, Industrial Relations Service, Department of Labour.

accompanied by:

ARMSTRONG, Wade, H.E., Mr., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of New Zealand in Geneva.
GOODMAN, Lisa, Ms., International Liaison Officer, Department of Labour.
WILSON, Elizabeth, Ms., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of New Zealand in Geneva.
Pakistan/Pakistan
AKRAM, Munir, H.E., Mr., Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Pakistan in Geneva.
SHERDIL, A.Z.K., Mr., Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Manpower and Overseas Pakistanis.

accompanied by:
KHAN, Khalique A., Mr., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Manpower and Overseas Pakistanis.
QAZI, Syrus, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan in Geneva.
JANJUA, Murad Ashraf, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan in Geneva.

Panama/Panamá
DUCREUX, Antonio A., Sr., Viceministro de Trabajo y Bienestar Social; Representante del Gobierno de Panamá ante el Consejo de Administración.

suplente:
MANZUR, Beatriz, Sra., Jefa del Departamento de Colaboración con la OIT, Asesoría de Asuntos internacionales del Ministerio de Trabajo y Bienestar Social; Representante Suplente del Gobierno de Panamá ante el Consejo de Administración.

Pays-Bas/Netherlands/Países Bajos
SCHRAMA, Henk, Mr., Director for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

substitute:
HAGEN, Cees, Mr., Social Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in Geneva.

accompanied by:
VAN BLANKENSTEIN, Jan, Mr., Directorate for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
VAN LEUR, Alette, Ms., Directorate for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
BUFFINGA, Roelof, Mr., Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Pologne/Poland/Polonia
HENCZEL, Remigiusz Achilles, Mr., Director, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy; Representative of the Government of Poland on the Governing Body.

substitute:
TYSZKO, Jacek, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Poland in Geneva;

accompanied by:
LEMIESZEWSKA, Renata, Ms., Expert, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

Portugal
RIBEIRO LOPES, Fernando, M., Directeur général des conditions du Travail, représentant adjoint du Gouvernement du Portugal au Conseil d’administration.
suppléant:
ALMEIDA, Luis Tomé, M., Conseiller (affaires du travail et de l’emploi), mission permanente du Portugal à Genève; représentant adjoint du Gouvernement du Portugal au Conseil d’administration.

accompagné de:
SOARES, Maria Cândida, Mme, Directeur général de l’emploi.

Soudan/Sudan/Sudán
HAIDOUB, Abdelrahman Y., Mr., First Under-Secretary, Ministry of Public Service, Administrative Reform and Labour.

accompagnied by:
ABO-UL-GADIR RABIE, Mr., Assistant-Director, International Relations, Ministry of Public Service, Administrative Reform and Labour.

Swaziland/Swazilandia
SHABANGU, Albert, Mr., Minister for Labour and Public Service.
CEKO, Sandile B., Mr., Principal Secretary, Ministry for Labour and Public Service; Representative of the Government of Swaziland on the Governing Body.

substitute:
BHEMBE, R.C.M., Mr., Commissioner of Labour; Substitute Representative of the Government of Swaziland on the Governing Body.

Uruguay
PINEYRUA, Ana Lía, Sra., Ministro de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.

acompañada de:
CALLORDA, Ariel, Sr., Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.
VANERIO, Gustavo, Sr., Consejero, Misión Permanente del Uruguay.

MEMBRES EMPLOYEURS ADJOINTS
EMPLOYER DEPUTY MEMBERS
MIEMBROS EMPLEADORES ADJUNTOS
ABOUGHE OBAME, J.M., M. (Gabon), représentant de la Confédération patronale gabonaise.
ANAND, I.P., Mr. (India), Adviser, The Thapar Group.
DIAZ GARAYCOA, F., Sr. (Ecuador), Asesor Jurídico, Federación Nacional de Cámaras de Industrias del Ecuador.
DURLING, Walter, Sr. (Panamá), Consultores y Asesores S.A.
FRANCE, Deborah, Miss (United Kingdom), Head, International Social Affairs Department, Confederation of British Industry (CBI).
IMOISILI, Imonitie C., Mr. (Nigeria), Director-General, Nigerian Employers' Consultative Association.
LACASA ASO, José María, Sr. (España), Director del Departamento de Relaciones Internacionales, Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales (CEOE).
MAKEKA, T., Mr. (Lesotho), Executive Director, Association of Lesotho Employers.
MOKHZANI, Abdul Rahim, Mr. (Malaysia), President, Malaysian Employers’ Federation (MEF).
MONTT BALMACEDA, Manuel, Sr. (Chile), Presidente Comisión de Asuntos Internacionales del Trabajo, Confederación de la Producción y del Comercio.
ould SIDI MOHAMED, Ali, M. (Mauritanie), Secrétaire général, Confédération générale des employeurs de Mauritanie.
Robinson, Barrington, Mr. (Jamaica), Executive Member, Jamaica Employers’ Federation.
SASSO-MAZZUFFERI, Lucia, Mme (Italie), Directeur des affaires internationales, Confederazione Generale dell’Industria Italiana (CONFINDUSTRIA).

MEMBRES TRAVAILLEURS ADJOINTS
WORKER DEPUTY MEMBERS
MIEMBROS TRABAJADORES ADJUNTOS

AHMED, K., Mr. (Pakistan), General Secretary, All-Pakistan Federation of Trade Unions.
BALDASSINI, Ramón, Sr. (Argentina), Secretario General, Federación de Obreros y Empleados.
BONMATI, Manuel, Sr. (España), Secretario Internacional, Unión General de Trabajadores.
BRIEŠCH, Roger, M. (France), Chargé de mission, Département international CFDT.
KARA, Y., Mr. (Israel), Member, Histadrut Executive Bureau.
MAYAKI, Ibrahim, M. (Niger), Secrétaire général, Union des syndicats des travailleurs du Niger.
MENDOZA, D.T., Mr. (Philippines), President, Trade Union Congress of the Philippines.
MBONINI, E., Mr. (Botswana), President, Botswana Federation of Trade Unions.
RAMPAK, Zainal, Mr. (Malaysia), President, Malaysian Trade Union Congress.
SANDOS, Jean-Richard, M. (République centrafricaine), Secrétaire général, Confédération nationale des travailleurs de Centrafrique.
SHMAKOV, Mikhail, Mr. (Russian Federation), President, Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia (FITUR).
SIBANDA, G., Mr. (Zimbabwe), President, Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions.
TROTMAN, Leroy, Mr. (Barbados), General Secretary, Barbados Workers’ Union.
WOJCIK, Tomasz, Mr. (Poland), Member of the Executive Bureau of Solidarnosc.

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

Afrique du Sud/South Africa/Sudáfrica
KETTLEDAS, L., Mr., Deputy Director General, Ministry of Labour.
JOHANNES, G., Mr., Director, International Relations.
VAN HEERDEN, A., Mr., Labour Consultant, Permanent Mission of South Africa in Geneva.

Autriche/Austria
MELAS, Heinz-Michael, Mr., Director, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
BUCHACHER, Ulrike, Ms., Secretary to the Minister.
FIGL, Regina, Ms., Attaché, Permanent Mission of Austria in Geneva.
Belgique/Belgium/Bélgica

WANDAMME, F.M., Directeur d'administration du service des relations internationales.
CLOESEN, Joseph, M., Conseiller adjoint, service des relations internationales, ministère de l'Emploi et du Travail.
WILLEMS, Lode, S.E., M., Ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la Belgique à Genève.
MUYLLE, Geert, M., Secrétaire, mission permanente de la Belgique à Genève.

Bulgarie/Bulgaria

ANDREEV, Konstantin, Mr., Minister-Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of Bulgaria in Geneva.

Colombie/Colombia

ARIAS, María Francisca, Sra., Ministra Consejera, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra.
ESPINOSA, Juan Carlos, Sr., Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra.
SAENZ, Carlos Roberto, Sr., Canciller, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra.

Corée/Korea/Corea

KIM, Yong-Dal, Mr., Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea in Geneva.

Danemark/Denmark/Dinamarca

ADLER, Lone, Ms., Special Adviser to the Minister of Labour on International Affairs.
HOUGAARD, Trine, Ms., Head of Section, Ministry of Labour.
POLD CHRISTENSEN, Marie-Louise, Ms., Head of Section, Ministry of Labour.

Finlande/Finland/Finlandia

SALMENPERA, Matti, Mr., Director, Ministry of Labour.
RAIVIO, Tuuli, Ms., Secretary for International Affairs, Ministry of Labour.
KORHONEN, Klaus, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Finland in Geneva.

Grèce/Greece/Grecia

COUNDOUREAS, Dionysios, M., Premier Conseiller, mission permanente de la Grèce à Genève.

Israël/Israel

LAMDAN, Yosef, H.E., Mr., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Israel in Geneva.
WALDEN, Raphael, Mr., Minister-Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Israel in Geneva.
PELEG, Eli, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Israel in Geneva.

Nigéria/Nigeria

ABUAH, Ejoh, H.E., Mr., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Nigeria in Geneva.
AHMAD, Abdullah S., Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of Nigeria in Geneva.
GWAM, C.U., Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Nigeria in Geneva.
OLADEJI, B.I.D., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Nigeria in Geneva.
Pérou/Perú/Perú

URRUTIA, José, S.E., Sr., Embajador, Representante Permanente del Perú en Ginebra.
TINCOPA, Romy, Srita., Segunda Secretaria, Misión Permanente del Perú en Ginebra.

Saint-Marin/San Marino

CECCHETTI, Domenico, M., Coordinateur du Département des secteurs productifs et du travail.

Slovaquie/Slovakia/Eslovaquia

KRASNOHORSKA, Mária, H.E., Mrs., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the Slovak Republic in Geneva.
SYKORA, Juraj, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Slovak Republic in Geneva.

Suède/Sweden/Suecia

JONZON, Björn, Mr., Assistant Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
JOREÉN, Stefan, Mr., Minister, Permanent Mission of Sweden in Geneva.
ANDERSON, Per, Mr., Head of Section, Ministry of Labour.

Suisse/Switzerland/Suiza

ELMIGER, Jean-Jacques, M., Chef du Service des affaires internationales, Office fédéral de l’industrie, des arts et métiers et du travail (OFIAMT).
MAYORAZ, Eric, M., Secrétaire d’ambassade, mission permanente de la Suisse à Genève.

Suriname

DAAL-VOGELLAND, M., Mrs.

République arabe syrienne/Syrian Arab Republic/República Arab Siria

NSEIR, Ghassan, M., Conseiller, mission permanente de la République arabe syrienne à Genève.
DAWALIBI, Hamzeh, M, Premier Secrétaire, mission permanente de la République arabe syrienne à Genève.

Turquie/Turkey/Turquía

DURUSOY, Aydin, Mr., Minister-Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative of Turkey in Geneva.
SEREF, Midhat, Mr., Counsellor for Labour and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission of Turkey in Geneva.

Ukraine/Ucrania

SLIPCHENKO, Olexander S., H.E., Mr., Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Ukraine in Geneva.
VYNOKOUROV, Andriy I., Mr., Chief of Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
REVA, Sergui V., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ukraine in Geneva.
Viet Nam

HOANG THI HOA BINH, Mrs., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Viet Nam in Geneva.

Saint-Siège/The Holy See/Santa Sede

BERTELLO, Giuseppe, S.E., Mgr, Nonce Apostolique, observateur permanent du Saint-Siège à Genève.
DE GREGORI, Massimo, M., membre.
COLANDREA, Anne-Marie, Mlle, membre.

IV. REPRESENTANTS D'ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES GOUVERNEMENTALES
IV. REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
IV. REPRESENTANTES DE ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES GUBERNAMENTALES

Nations Unies/United Nations/Naciones Unidas

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, E., Mr., Senior Adviser, 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 Officer, Inter-Organization Cooperation Section, Division of External Relations.

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

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

Organisation mondiale de la santé
World Health Organization
Organización Mundial de la Salud

LITTAUA, Ferdinand, Dr., Senior External Relations Officer, Division of Interagency Affairs.
MARTI, R.M., Mr., Adviser, Division of Budget and Finance.

Organisation Météorologique mondiale
World Meteorological Organization
Organización Meteorológica Mundial

SUTHERLAND, T.W., Mr., Office of the Special Assistant to the Secretary-General.
ASHROF, M., Ms., J Liaison Office in Geneva.

DELECHAT, Corinne, Ms., Administrator in the Division of Policy Interrelations, Trade Directorate. TORRES, Raymond, Mr., Principal Administrator in the Central Analysis Division.

TAIT, Alan A., Mr., Special Trade Representative and Director.

SINGH, Harsha, Mr., Counsellor, Trade and Environment Division. EGLIN, Richard, Mr., Director, Trade and Environment Division. D’ANDREA, Barbara, Ms., Economic Affairs Officer.

LOHRMANN, Reinhard, Mr., Chief, Division of Research and Forum Activities, Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation. OMELENIUK, I., Mrs., Chief, Division of Planning, Migration for Development and Technical Cooperation Programmes, Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

DEVONIC, Fay, Mme, Chef d’unité, DG Emploi, relations industrielles et affaires sociales. MILLERAUD, Didier, M., Administrateur, DG Emploi, relations industrielles et affaires sociales. DUFOUR, Christian, M., Attaché.
Ligue des États arabes
League of Arab States
Liga de Estados Arabes

SHUBAJLAT, Talal, M., Conseiller Chargé d'affaires a.i.
THARWAT ABAZA, Dessouky, M., Troisième Secrétaire.
EL HAJJE, Osman, M., membre de la mission.

Organisation arabe du travail
Arab Labour Organization
Organización Arabe del Trabajo

EL-TELawI, Adnan Khalil, M., Chef, délégation permanente à Genève.

Organisation de l'Unité africaine
Organization of African Unity
Organización de la Unidad Africana

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

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

Alliance coopérative internationale
International Co-operative Alliance
Alianza Cooperativa Internacional

THORDARSON, Bruce, Mr., Director-General.

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

HOSKINS, Dalmer, Mr., Secretary General.
BEDARD, Robert, Mr.

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

RYDER, G., Mr., Director, Geneva Office.
CUNNIAH, Dan, Mr., Assistant Director, Geneva Office.
FAUCHERE, Béatrice, Mme, représentante permanente.

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

KAPARTIS, Costas, Mr., Secretary-General.
PEÑALOSA, Antonio, Mr., Deputy Secretary-General.
ULBRICHT, Jutta, Miss, Executive Secretary.

SUNMONU, Hassan, Mr., Secretary-General.
ABUZEID, Mohamed Mabrouk, Mr., Permanent Representative in Geneva.

* * *

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:

Sr. M. EURNEKIAN (Argentina), miembro trabajador titular
Mr. J. MUGALLA (Kenya), regular worker member
Mr. J.C. HALLIWELL (Canada), employer deputy member
M. O. TOURE (Mali), membre employeur adjoint
Sr. O. MARTINES BARGAS (Brasil), miembro trabajador adjunto.