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The 286th Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva, from Tuesday, 25 March at 3 p.m. to Friday, 28 March 2003, under the chairmanship of Lord Brett (Worker, United Kingdom).

Monday, 24 March was devoted to a meeting of the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization, in which most of the Governing Body members participated.
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The sitting opened at 3 p.m., with Lord Brett in the Chair.

The Chairperson congratulated the Chairperson of the Workers’ group on his recent knighthood. This honour was a just recompense for a lifetime’s dedication to trade unionism.

First item on the agenda

APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

The Governing Body conducted a vote by secret ballot for the election of the Director-General, under the supervision of a tripartite team of returning officers composed as follows: Mr. F. Khan (Government representative, Pakistan); Mr. A. Tabani (Employer member, Pakistan); Mr. M. Blondel (Worker member, France). The only candidature that had been submitted was that of the present Director-General, Mr. Juan Somavia. The ballot paper contained two boxes, one of which indicated a vote in favour of the candidate, the other, an abstention. The result of the secret ballot was:

- 53 votes in favour;
- 3 abstentions.

The Governing Body re-elected Mr. Juan Somavia as Director-General of the International Labour Office, for a second mandate beginning on 4 March 2004 at zero hours.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed the increased dynamism and visibility the Organization had achieved under the stewardship of Mr. Somavia, not only among industrial associations, but in public opinion and in the international community. The Employers’ group remained firmly behind the Director-General in his consensus-building efforts.

The Worker spokesperson said his group fully backed the re-election of Mr. Somavia and trusted that he would continue to campaign to make the goal of decent work actively pursued in all countries. The great show of confidence that the vote for Mr. Somavia revealed was an endorsement by governments and the social partners of the path he had chosen for the Organization in its work to reduce human suffering, to promote fundamental principles and rights at work and further develop opportunities for social protection.

The Minister of Labour, Employment and Social Security of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the governments of Latin America and the Caribbean (GRULAC), said that the Director-General had succeeded in positioning the ILO centrally within the UN system. The concept of decent work in conditions of equity, freedom, safety and human dignity had become a starting point for labour relations. GRULAC firmly supported the promotion of the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and applauded the InFocus programmes, which had enabled the ILO to achieve a greater, more dynamic presence in the regions. Particular initiatives had been taken to solve problems in highly vulnerable sectors of society, such as children. IPEC, the member States, social partners
and civil society were all united in this ongoing struggle. Dignity for women workers had been another keynote of the ILO's action over the last few years, with work towards the elimination of gender discrimination and the inclusion of the input and experience of women in the solving of social questions. The promotion of social dialogue had also been constantly upheld by the ILO, as a means of ensuring the development and protection of democracy. The inclusion of a social dimension in world trade was one more theme which had been followed closely by the Director-General during his first term of office, and which should contribute to the development of investment policies to stimulate productive growth and the creation of decent work. Finally, the speaker pointed to the efforts that had been made by countries in the Latin American region to eliminate export subsidies and reduce barriers to trade, in so far as these hampered social progress and the economic development of developing countries.

The Government Vice-Chairperson congratulated the Director-General on behalf of the governments of Asia and the Pacific. Mr. Somavia's first mandate had served to establish the institutional groundwork for the Decent Work Agenda. The next five years would be an era for putting the Agenda into practice and making its goals a reality. One major challenge was that of making globalization work for all and, under the present Director-General, the ILO was fast emerging as a key organization for fulfilling this task.

A Government representative from Canada, speaking for the governments of industrialized market economy countries (IMEC), recalled the changes to the ILO that had been introduced by the Director-General during his first mandate. The Decent Work Agenda, the four strategic objectives and the establishment of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization had all strengthened the Organization and raised its profile. Goals for the future included continued improvements to standards-related activities, the implementation of the Global Employment Agenda, following up on the work of the World Commission and improved delivery of technical cooperation, by strengthening capacity at regional and country levels. To achieve these aims, the management and internal functioning of the Office should be reviewed, through consultations with governments and the social partners.

A Government representative from Romania, speaking on behalf of Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia and Slovenia, said that the range of issues which the ILO was called on to address reflected the increased dynamism it had achieved under the present Director-General. Greater attention should be paid to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe during Mr. Somavia's next mandate.

A Government representative of China pointed to the achievements of Mr. Somavia's first mandate, but recalled that there remained much to be done if the Organization was to advance towards its goal of social justice and, through it, world peace.

A Government representative of France said that the ILO should be a cornerstone of the multilateral system. It should continue to play a leading role in the globalization debate, bridging the divide between economic concerns and the requirements of social justice, and working towards the emergence of international governance of the phenomenon. Attention should also be paid to the internal functioning of the Organization, where progress had been made in many domains, despite the regrettable constraints of a zero-growth budget. This had necessitated a risky dependence on extra-budgetary resources and required careful examination. There was much current discussion on policy integration and on the integrated approach, but this vision was insufficiently applied to the tools of the Organization. For example, the Turin Centre should work towards the aims and objectives of the ILO, rather than acting as a policy-making body. Finally, there was a need to maintain a balanced usage of the official languages of the Organization. Language was a
reflection of cultural diversity and the challenges posed by social issues could not be faced without taking such diversity into account.

The Minister of Labour of South Africa saluted the Director-General’s transparent, democratic and consensual style of leadership and acknowledged the achievements of the ILO in the developing world in general and Africa in particular. The ILO’s contribution to the struggle against HIV/AIDS was a milestone of the Director-General’s previous mandate. The challenge of ensuring that employment was central to economic development, and a policy objective rather than just a result, remained paramount. In this context, the ILO should continue to forge links with other multilateral organizations, raising awareness of the dangers of unilateral decisions.

A Government representative of the Russian Federation said that the Director-General’s reorganization of the ILO had increased its capacity to react quickly to changes in the world, enabling it to play a more effective and prominent role. The Decent Work Agenda, to which Mr. Somavia had largely contributed, had been established as a basis for development strategies and as a political platform throughout the world. The speaker was also pleased to announce that the Russian Federation, in submitting the instrument of ratification of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), to the Director-General, had now ratified all eight of the fundamental Conventions.

A Government representative of India wished to join his voice to the congratulations proffered by the governments of the Asia-Pacific region. Under Mr. Somavia, the ILO and its Decent Work Agenda would have significant impact on employment generation in developing countries and on working conditions generally.

A Government representative of Nigeria praised the Director-General for the “signposts” that he had erected in his first term of office and hoped that his second mandate would enable him to tackle the many problems faced by Africa more comprehensively. Among these, HIV/AIDS should be more closely examined and possibly upgraded to the status of an InFocus programme.

The Minister of Employment, Labour and Social Security of Cameroon noted that his country had been a member of the ILO since its independence in 1960 and that ILO collaboration had increased significantly under Mr. Somavia’s leadership. The Government of Cameroon was in broad agreement with the ILO regarding the struggle against HIV/AIDS and promotion of employment as set out in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2004-05. It also agreed with the linkage between social dialogue and peace: combat must not be allowed to replace debate.

A Government representative of Sudan said that his country had a special relationship with the ILO and had greatly benefited from technical assistance and cooperation. Training received at the Turin Centre had also been very positive.

The Minister of Labour and Social Security of Uruguay endorsed the GRULAC statement and praised the Director-General for his professionalism, enthusiasm and the transparency of his management. Uruguay was in the throes of a harsh economic crisis. The ILO should respond by strengthening the position of labour ministers, who were the allies of the Organization. This would help them to work more closely with the ministries of finance. The dichotomy which still existed in some countries between the economic and financial authorities and the labour ministries was an impediment to job creation, and the ILO should take steps, through its field activities, to break down this separation.

A Government representative of Kenya noted the advances made under Mr. Somavia’s leadership in the promotion of the Decent Work Agenda, strategic budgeting, combating poverty, promoting gender issues, as well as the establishment of the
World Commission. His second mandate should provide opportunities to consolidate the gains made and promote work in other vital fields, such as the Jobs for Africa programme, multinationals, globalization, IPEC and HIV/AIDS.

A Government representative of Pakistan highlighted the Decent Work Agenda and the Global Employment Agenda as key initiatives launched by the Director-General. These provided a framework within which the Organization could move towards the achievement of its four strategic objectives.

The Minister of Labour and Vocational Training of Malawi joined the other African governments in congratulating Mr. Somavia on his re-election. She called on him to give greater support to women, in government and in the ILO as well.

The Minister of Labour and Employment of Gabon in his congratulations expressed the wish that the efforts made in Gabon and Africa by the ILO under the leadership of Mr. Somavia during his first mandate, should be redoubled.

The Minister of Labour and Social Affairs of Ethiopia highlighted the difficulties of advancing the ILO's values as essential elements of universal and lasting peace in a globalized world. The restructuring of ILO action within a framework of four strategic objectives was a commendable attempt to stay in step with such a rapidly changing world. The speaker was pleased to announce that Ethiopia had initiated the process of ratification of Convention No. 182 and would shortly be able to communicate its ratification to the Director-General.

A Government representative of Bangladesh, the Secretary of State for Labour of the Dominican Republic, the Minister of Labour and Social Security of El Salvador, a Government representative of Indonesia, a Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a Government representative of Jordan and a Government representative of Saudi Arabia all congratulated the Director-General on his re-election, on the initiatives that he had taken during his first mandate, which they trusted would be developed still further in the second mandate. They stated their full support for Mr. Somavia and their confidence in his management of the Organization.

The Director-General thanked the participants for the extent and generosity of the support they had expressed for him. The vote, although nominally for the Director-General, was in fact a vote in favour of all that had been accomplished collectively. In this way, it reflected on all the ILO staff, both at home and in the field. Those in the field were exposed to extreme situations: the office in Abidjan had had to close and, now, with current events in Iraq, it might also be necessary to consider the safety of the Regional Office in Lebanon.

Mr. Somavia expressed his belief in the values of the ILO as set out in the Constitution, the Declaration of Philadelphia and in the Conventions and Recommendations and other instruments produced by the Organization. Such values were essential if the weakest were to be protected and allowed to work in dignity and security. Social justice, based on the four objectives of protection, dialogue, enterprise and work, was a means of creating peace and eradicating poverty. As a native of a developing country, the Director-General wished to convey to those member States of Africa, Asia, the Arab region and Latin America that he considered it his responsibility to bring to the negotiating table the sensitivities of the developing countries.

Tripartism was a crucial source of creativity and stability for society. This was clear from the history of the ILO and, today, remained more important than ever. Without strong social actors, tripartism could not flourish and for this reason it was essential to strengthen labour ministries and other ministries that acted in tandem with them. Dialogue was the
only way in which disagreements could be reasonably solved. The many countries in Latin America that had laboured under dictatorships were only too well aware of what absence of dialogue meant. Dialogue was the fundamental element in the ILO's institutional identity. As such, the Director-General pledged himself to doing all he could to promote respect and broad agreement among the ILO constituents. To this end, the Office would continue to conduct consultations and provide the technical means of reaching consensus.

In a world in such a turmoil of change, the voice of tripartism represented an extraordinary opportunity. Many governments had spoken in support of the need to promote decent and dignified work and to reconcile this with the march of globalization. This might be achieved through a new social contract, based on ILO values. The ILO was in a unique position, from its history, its structure, and the fact that it covered a major portion of society, to seek a solution to this issue. Indeed, if the ILO could not find a solution, it was difficult to see what other organization could do so. While the ILO lacked the power of institutions such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, it nevertheless had a profound legitimacy derived from its constituents, who were the genuine economic and social actors. The ILO should therefore start such an initiative and make it a major theme of future discussions — globalization, ILO values and a new social contract. For this it was essential that other partners, the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Development Programme, the Bretton Woods institutions and the World Trade Organization, should work together in a functioning multilateral structure.

The Director-General invited the participants to engage in extensive consultations, to see how this initiative might be moved forward. Some indications had already been given on directions in which to work and it was now time to look at ways in which objectives might be linked to decent work and globalization, taking full account of the interests of all — Governments, Employers and Workers.

*The sitting adjourned at 5.25 p.m. and resumed at 5.35 p.m.*

**Nineteenth item on the agenda**

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

**THIRD SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT: APPOINTMENTS OF AN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND ACTING TREASURER AND FINANCIAL COMPTROLLER, OF AN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AND OF A REGIONAL DIRECTOR**

*Mr. Manoj Juneja, Mr. Don Skerret and Mr. Taleb Rifai read out and signed the declaration of loyalty provided in article 1.4(b) of the Staff Regulations.*

**Second item on the agenda**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 285TH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY**

*The Governing Body approved the minutes of its 285th Session.*

---

1 See also second, seventh and eighth sittings.
Third item on the agenda

AGENDA OF THE 2005 SESSIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

(a) Date, place and agenda of the 93rd Session (June 2005) of the International Labour Conference

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

The Chairperson reminded the Governing Body that at the 91st Session (June 2003) of the Conference there was to be a general discussion on standards-related activities in the area of occupational safety and health, based for the first time on an integrated approach. It might therefore be wiser to take decisions on the 2005 agenda in the light of that discussion, which could yield important subjects to be followed up at the 93rd Session of the ILC, rather than concluding and filling up the agenda at the present meeting. This would imply delaying the choice of items for the 2005 agenda until the 288th Session of the Governing Body, in November 2003.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated that his group had intended to support two subjects which they considered very important: youth employment and technical cooperation. However, the group was prepared to go along with the Chair’s proposal, provided it did not imply automatic inclusion of a follow-up in 2005 to the first integrated discussion topic.

The Worker spokesperson also agreed with the Chairperson’s proposal to delay the finalization of the 2005 agenda until November 2003.

A Government representative of India stated that his Government had consistently spoken in favour of consolidating and modifying existing instruments that were out of date, rather than drawing up new standards. The 2005 agenda already contained a standard-setting item for a Convention and Recommendation in the fishing sector. Moreover, the Maritime Session of the Conference, also programmed for 2005, would produce another standard, in the form of a consolidation of all ILO maritime instruments. The ILO should not feel under any compulsion invariably to include two standard-setting items on the Conference agenda, unless there was full justification to do so. Therefore, the decision to finalize the 2005 agenda should be taken at the 288th Session of the Governing Body in November.

A Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran agreed that there might be a need in 2005 to follow up the first integrated approach topic, after its discussion at the 91st Session in June 2003, and that the agenda for 2005 should not be fixed until after that experience. All seven of the Office proposals for the 2005 agenda were important; however, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the items on the promotion of youth employment and on decent jobs and productivity. On the question of child labour and the protection of children and young persons, it was important that the struggle against child labour should not be limited to its worst forms, but should cover the effective abolition of all its forms.

Viability in small and medium-sized enterprises often depended on productivity. Fair access to global markets and a just share of the rewards of globalization were critical to raising productivity. Moreover, productivity should not be considered in purely economic terms: decent work, good quality jobs and job satisfaction were also important elements that could increase output.
Youth employment was not a new issue for the ILO. But, it was getting worse and should become an integral part of the Global Employment Agenda. As far as gender disparities were concerned, these remained prevalent in the private sector but were less common in the public sector.

The Governing Body decided to delay until its 288th Session (November 2003) the fixing of the agenda for the 93rd Session (June 2005) of the International Labour Conference.

(b) Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference (2004) and the date, place and agenda of the 94th (Maritime) Session (2005) of the International Labour Conference

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 6 of the report.

The sitting closed at 6.05 p.m.
SECOND SITTING

Wednesday, 26 March 2003, morning

The sitting opened at 10.50 a.m., with Lord Brett in the Chair.

Nineteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL (cont.)

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

The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his group's concern that the Committee of Experts appeared occasionally to issue judgements in certain areas outside its technical mandate. Paragraph 511 of the report stated that the Committee considered the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949 (No. 95), should be included among the fundamental Conventions. This was an opinion which could only be issued by the policy-making organs of the ILO; the technical bodies were simply called on to interpret standards or situations. While these points would be raised at the Conference in June when the report was discussed fully, they should be borne in mind during the current review of the supervisory mechanisms.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

Fourth item on the agenda

REVIEW OF ANNUAL REPORTS UNDER THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE ILO
DECLARATION ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES AND RIGHTS AT WORK

The Governing Body decided, in accordance with article 9bis of its Standing Orders, to meet as a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of examining the review of annual reports under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

The minutes of the Committee of the Whole are appended to these minutes.

The sitting closed at 10.55 a.m.

1 See also first, seventh and eighth sittings.

2 See also third sitting.
THIRD SITTING

Wednesday, 26 March 2003, morning

The sitting opened at 12.05 p.m., with Lord Brett in the Chair.

Fourth item on the agenda

REVIEW OF ANNUAL REPORTS UNDER THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE ILO DECLARATION ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES AND RIGHTS AT WORK (concl.) ¹

The Chairperson gave an oral summary of the discussions of the Committee of the Whole. All three groups were concerned at the low response rate and considered that there was a need to give a greater impulse to the Declaration process. The Expert-Advisers mentioned that they foresaw significant positive developments provided the necessary funding for the programme was forthcoming. It was clear to anyone who had attended the discussion in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee that there were not adequate resources in the regular budget to fund all the programmes wanted. The ILO was therefore falling back increasingly on extra-budgetary funds. There had been clear agreement that the 41 countries that had not responded should be encouraged to do so on future occasions, but also that the Director-General should make personal contact with the ten countries that had failed to reply to any of the four rounds of questionnaires. Employers and Workers had both vouched to ensure that there would be better responses from their organizations in future reports. It had appeared from the overall discussion, that there was broad consensus on the point for decision.

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

Fifth item on the agenda

REPORT AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIFTEENTH AMERICAN REGIONAL MEETING

The Employer Vice-Chairperson drew the Governing-Body's attention to the interesting debate contained in Appendix I to the report: “Crisis and globalization: Possible answers”. Appendix III bore witness to the clear agreement between Employers and Workers, that to face up to the situation in the region – involving unemployment, crisis, recession and instability – social dialogue and tripartism should be encouraged, to promote integration among the countries of the continent. Appendix IV contained another joint Worker and Employer statement, which concerned the situation facing their organizations, FEDECAMARAS and the CTV, in Venezuela. It was important that authentic employers' and workers' representatives should be able to perform their roles properly in their own country, and that full respect for the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), was maintained.

The Employers had been represented in large numbers at the Regional Meeting, coming not just from South and North America, but also from the Caribbean. Greater participation by the Caribbean region was important and the regional advisers and officers

¹ See also second sitting.
should work to promote it. The fact that Sir Leroy Trotman had been Worker Vice-Chairperson of the Meeting was itself an indication of greater participation by the Caribbean region. The report reflected the excellence of the Meeting; for the Employers, paragraphs 18-24, 32-34 and 94-95 of Appendix I, were particularly interesting.

The Worker spokesperson agreed that the Meeting had resulted in a greater sense of regional integration and inclusion of the Caribbean, and that this should be developed further. The joint declaration made by the Workers and Employers in Appendix III was an indication of the efforts the two groups were prepared to make to promote integration. It concerned the lack of respect for fundamental principles and rights at work, the corruption in government, the lack of an adequate education and training system and, for workers, inadequate social protection systems and programmes. The declaration in Appendix IV was an expression of concern at the escalating violence in Venezuela, involving the deaths of peaceful demonstrators. Further action was needed to guarantee freedom of association for workers and trade unions unshackled from government interference.

The Meeting had advanced the cause of social dialogue and tripartism, in a region where a number of governments were trying to deny workers, and also employers, their rights. In reviewing the Meeting, the group considered that the link between debt repayment problems and increasing levels of poverty in many of the countries should be highlighted. As a general comment, the time allowed for the Meeting could have been used more efficiently, as could the staff available to it. Delivery of speech after speech from the podium did not contribute to interactivity.

A Government representative of Canada said that the Regional Meeting had given the Canadian Minister of Labour a chance to provide an update on implementation of the action plan adopted by the Twelfth Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labour, and she looked forward to further cooperation with the ILO on this plan. The Office should conduct consultations on the format of future regional meetings, which might profit from more interactive discussions focused on specific themes.

A Government representative of the United States endorsed this latter statement.

A Government representative of Argentina, speaking firstly for GRULAC, particularly appreciated the special sitting dedicated to an examination of a form of globalization with a human face, capable of generating decent work. The conclusions of the Meeting, contained in Appendix V, reflected the major concerns of the countries in the region, many of which were in economic crisis. The work of the World Commission had done much to highlight the problems of countries in the region.

Speaking for the Government of Argentina, she referred to Appendix II, which dealt with the impact of globalization and international trade on employment and decent work. The President of Peru, Dr. Toledo, had contributed considerably to this document, and the Governing Body should take account of the requests it contained.

A Government representative of Barbados said the Meeting had allowed her country to voice the particular issues that concerned the Caribbean and had strengthened the links between the Caribbean and the other countries present.

A Government representative of Venezuela said the Meeting had raised the fundamental question of the elimination of poverty and of child labour in all its forms, not just the worst forms. The most serious problem was that of integration, which should not just be approached solely through government action, but also through the peoples of Latin America. The tripartite experience provided by the Meeting was one way in which this could be brought about.
With reference to Appendix IV, Venezuela was now returning to a state of normality. Thanks to the oil and metal workers, and generally to the communities neighbouring oil refineries, Venezuela had fully recovered its oil production and distribution capacity. A Venezuelan Government delegation had been unable to participate at the Regional Meeting, due to a lockout organized by the employers, which prevented the workers of the country from exercising their right to work.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson raised a point of order as to whether the intervention by the Government representative of Venezuela was pertinent either to the 15th American Regional Meeting or to Appendix IV to the report. The question could be more suitably addressed when discussing the report of the Committee on Freedom of Association.

The Government representative of Venezuela said that besides being Minister for Labour, she was also active in the dialogue process which was taking place in the country and which had achieved remarkable results. The Venezuelan Government approved overall the text of Appendix IV, but had supplied information on the question to the Meeting within the time limits, and as this did not appear in the document, requested that it might be circulated as a document as soon as possible.

The representative of the Director-General said that an official Venezuelan delegation had attended the American Regional Meeting and the report, as presented, was the official output of the Meeting. It was therefore not clear whether other documents could now be added. The Meeting had been well attended by Governments, Employers and Workers. As the Employers’ and Workers’ group had said, the Office should make a major effort to ensure greater participation by the Caribbean countries. A high level of discussion had resulted in the adoption of 26 important conclusions which would be included in regional work programmes. The suggestions, from the Governments of Canada and the United States as well as from the groups, that the format of the Meeting might be improved would be considered. The experience of the special sitting on crisis and globalization might provide lessons in this respect. Special thanks were due to the Government of Peru and to President Alejandro Toledo, who had greatly facilitated the organization of the Meeting.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson understood from the representative of the Director-General that the document presented to the Governing Body, with its Appendices, was the only official document from the Meeting. No document that had not been officially approved should be incorporated into the report at this stage.

A Government representative of France suggested that the document should have made a clear distinction between the conclusions of the Meeting, and various positions adopted by participants, reflected in the Appendices. The Government of Venezuela had been called into question in Appendix IV. It was natural that it should wish to reply.

A Government representative of Brazil wished to know what had become of the document sent to the Meeting by the Government of Venezuela. Had it not been received, or had the Office not wished to include it?

The representative of the Director-General reiterated that the document presented to the Governing Body was the official output of the Meeting.

A Government representative of France said that before adopting the point for decision, it was necessary to know what was being voted. Paragraph 97 suggested that it should be the report itself, up to paragraph 98, and Appendix V, which contained the conclusions of the Meeting.
The Chairperson said he believed it was the document as a whole that was to be adopted.

A Government representative of Brazil asked whether the point for decision, which referred simply to the transmittal of the text of the conclusions of the Meeting, meant that only Appendix V was to be transmitted, and none of the rest of the document.

A Government representative of France supported this understanding of the text.

The Governing Body adopted the point for decision in paragraph 98 of the document.

A Government representative of Venezuela asked for clarification as to what was being voted. If Appendix IV was going to be distributed with the conclusions, then she requested that the document duly submitted to the Regional Meeting by her Government should also be published.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the representative of the Director-General had stated clearly that the document before the Governing Body was the official report of the Meeting. The Employers’ group would oppose the inclusion of any document which did not reflect the objective considerations of the Meeting. The Government of Venezuela had the right to make known her Government’s views on the matters concerned at the appropriate point in the discussions, but they could not be included in the document in question.

The Chairperson asked the Office to clarify the matter at the afternoon sitting.

The sitting closed at 12.50 p.m.
FOURTH SITTING

Wednesday, 26 March 2003, afternoon

The sitting opened at 3.40 p.m., with Lord Brett in the Chair.

Fifth item on the agenda

REPORT AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIFTEENTH AMERICAN REGIONAL MEETING (concl.)

The Chairperson said that the statement made by the Government of Venezuela was summarized in paragraph 62 of the report of the Fifteenth American Regional Meeting. In paragraphs 95 and 96, representatives of the Employers' and Workers' groups were reported as reading out declarations, the texts of which were included as Appendices III and IV. The practice for the circulation of reports was that the Office, with an appropriate covering note including the indications contained in the point for decision, sent out the entire report with its appendices to the governments of member States, to international governmental and non-governmental organizations.

A Government representative of Venezuela asked whether the statement made by her Government and duly submitted in writing to the Meeting would be included with the circulated report.

The Chairperson said that in accordance with practice, the only statements that would be circulated would be those authorized in the document, which had been approved by the Meeting itself.

Seventh item on the agenda

SPECIAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION PROGRAMME FOR COLOMBIA

The representative of the Director-General said that though the number of assassinations of trade union leaders and activists had dropped between November 2002 and February 2003, substantive changes in the climate of violence were not perceptible. The main aims of the programme were to preserve the right to life and physical integrity of those involved in trade union activities, to promote freedom of association and the right to organize by bringing law and practice into conformity with ILO principles, and to strengthen social dialogue mechanisms. These activities were principally funded from the 2000-01 budget surplus, with funds from the Regional Office, the MDT and technical cooperation projects. The report outlined various plans allowing the temporary removal from the country of trade unionists considered at risk, with their families. The choice of persons to benefit from these plans was made in consultation with the trade unions. Negotiations to establish a similar mechanism continued with the help of the United Kingdom TUC. Various seminars and workshops had taken place in the field of freedom of association. In addition to those mentioned in the report, two had been held for the three Colombian trade union centrals, on 5 and 19 March; the first had covered ILO supervisory

1 See also third sitting.
machinery, and the second was on the impact of the labour reforms on living and working conditions. Two more were planned for April and May aimed at employers and trade unionists, on essential services and conflict resolution. The forum, which was to be held in March on the promotion of respect for fundamental human rights at work, had been delayed until May by the Government.

In response to the recommendations of the last session of the Governing Body, the Government was supporting the activities of the Special Committee for the Handling of Conflicts. At its last meeting, the Committee had agreed to request the help of the ILO MDT for the Andean countries to provide information on the various methods of conflict resolution. This training would be given in April. The project, financed by the United States Department of Labor, was organizing capacity-building seminars for trade unionists in the months of April and May, and an agreement had been reached with the trade unions on training for trade unionists and trainers in fundamental principles and rights at work, which would be backed up by radio promotion by the United Nations radio in Colombia. Under the same project, five studies on collective bargaining and good working practices had been carried out, with a view to encouraging solid labour strategies in selected areas of the economy and businesses. Regarding child labour, besides the details given in the report, a system to provide information on and monitor child labour was completed on 17 March.

The special programme had achieved much in a very short space of time. This was due to the energy and dedication of the Director-General and CABINET, of the Office and its various services, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP, IPEC, to name only some. The momentum could only be sustained with the full support and agreement of the Colombian Government and social partners.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the situation in Colombia, though remaining very serious, allowed cautious optimism. The ILO had set itself a goal, based on the special technical cooperation programme. The first was to re-establish the conditions for social dialogue in a country rocked by conflict and violence; the second was to eradicate the worst social injustices, such as child labour; the third was to enable the social partners to play their role in an orderly society. The ILO could not solve all problems in Colombia, but it could build a spirit of cooperation and create a space for tripartite dialogue. Technical cooperation and the promotion of social dialogue could go some way to generating the conditions necessary for respect for the institutions, for fundamental principles and rights at work, and for the dignity and integrity of human life.

The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the situation in Colombia was still critical. The report referred to a failure by the Colombian Government to establish the conditions necessary for respect of the provision of 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 Labour Relations (Public Service) Convention, 1978 (No. 151), and the Collective Bargaining Convention, 1981 (No. 154). Given that these texts were the cornerstones of social dialogue, and only if they were fully respected could such dialogue be held profitably in the country, and given moreover that the Government had announced that Convention No. 151 could not be upheld because of cost implications, how was the Special programme to achieve its aims? Only through the instigation of a climate of transparency, in which government, employers and workers were able to see that those responsible for killings and other crimes against trade unionists were being brought to justice, could genuine progress be made. The report stated that 114 trade unionists had been killed in 2002; the Workers' group had a far higher figure of 184 assassinations. However, even if only one person had been killed, it would still not diminish the seriousness of the act.
A Government representative of Italy spoke on behalf of the European Union, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, and Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey, and Switzerland and Norway. The European Union monitored the situation in Colombia closely, and supported the implementation of the Special programme and the efforts of the Colombian people, civil society and the Government to bring about justice, social peace and national reconciliation. It strongly condemned the continuous murders and kidnappings of trade unionists and others. The Colombian Government had increased funding for the protection of vulnerable groups of the population, and should continue to take effective measures to safeguard trade union members’ right to life and physical integrity and to abolish impunity. The EU noted the reactivation of the Inter-Institutional Commission for the Promotion and Protection of Workers’ Human Rights. This body should be provided with the necessary funds to function properly. It also noted the reactivation of the Special Committee for the Handling of Conflicts referred to the ILO, and initiatives taken for the promotion of Conventions Nos. 87, 98, and 151. In the absence of any fundamental change in the general climate of violence, social dialogue was of critical importance. The Government should take steps to cooperate with the social partners to bring an end to the problems besetting the country.

A Government representative of Spain endorsed the statement made by the previous speaker on behalf of the EU and other countries. Paragraph 27 of the report referred to a selection process to find a suitable professional person to coordinate the Special technical programme. He supported the creation of this post, but asked for information concerning the selection criteria for the incumbent, whether the Governing Body would be informed of the appointment when it took place, and how much would be the cost of the new post.

A Government representative of the United States noted the positive elements contained in the report. The ILO should continue to focus its resources on the Special programme and the US urged the Director-General to seek additional donor funding for it, and allocate funds from the 2000-01 surplus to support it. The programme coordinator should be appointed as soon as possible.

A Government representative of Argentina spoke for GRULAC. The situation remained alarming, though the reduction in the number of killings and the Government’s decisions to reactivate the Inter-Institutional Commission and the Special Committee were positive. Progress had also been made in the activities to promote respect of fundamental principles and rights at work. The ILO should continue to carry out activities established with the Government to implement the three basic components of the Special programme, the ILO’s principal tool to help overcome the problem of violence and impunity in the country.

A Government representative of Canada reiterated his Government’s strong support for the Special programme, and welcomed the reactivation of the Inter-Institutional Commission by the Government, which should allocate the Commission sufficient long-term funding to operate effectively. Measures should be taken to bring domestic legislation into line with ILO standards, especially regarding freedom of association and collective bargaining. Canada supported the training programme on international labour standards aimed at judges and magistrates. Impunity was still at the heart of the problem, and it was correct that part of the ILO budget surplus should be used under Project Colombia to locate trade unionists at risk and remove them temporarily from the country. The Government should cooperate fully with the ILO in promoting social dialogue and the ILO Declaration, and should give its utmost support to the Special programme.

A Government representative of Brazil said that the drop in the number of killings, the effective financing of the protection programme for trade unionists, the training programme for judges and the reactivation of the Inter-Institutional Commission and the
Special Committee were all encouraging. In the face of a situation which nevertheless remained critical, the ILO should continue to strengthen the Special programme.

A Government representative of China noted the positive aspects reported in the document both in respect of ILO activities and regarding action taken by the Colombian Government. The ILO should continue its efforts to apply the Special programme, particularly with regard to the protection of trade unionists.

A Government representative of Mexico said the report was a reliable account of progress made in confronting the problems in Colombia: the number of killings had fallen, and persons responsible for acts of violence against workers and trade unionists were being brought to justice. The Special programme was starting to bear fruit and should be maintained and strengthened. As the Government of Brazil had also said, the Special programme was the best contribution the ILO could make, and the funds supplied by various governments to carry out the protection programme for trade unionists were welcome. The programme coordinator should be appointed as soon as possible.

A Government representative of Indonesia supported the Special programme and appreciated the efforts made by the Government of Colombia to engage the social partners in a solution to the problems, and also to cooperate fully with the ILO in implementing the programme. All parties should continue to collaborate to consolidate the progress made so far.

A Government representative of India expressed his Government's full support for the Special programme.

A Government representative of El Salvador, speaking with intimate knowledge of a country that had gone through 12 years of civil conflict, felt that the Colombian Government was making its best possible efforts to attempt to guarantee the right to life and physical integrity of its workers and trade unionists. All wished to see Colombia living in complete peace, but the situation was extremely complex and transcended simple labour issues. The Special programme could contribute to the social peace that Colombia needed. The ILO should continue its efforts in this domain, with the welcome backing of resources from a number of donor countries.

A Worker member from France protested at the number of governments who had expressed satisfaction that fewer trade unionists were being assassinated than previously. This was scarcely cause for satisfaction. Freedom of association was the freedom to carry trade union colours openly, as a militant unionist, without risking the slightest retribution, naturally including assassination. Moreover, the practice of placing trade unionists in exile, for their own protection, should under no circumstances become a means of getting rid of troublesome characters. If freedom of association did not imply the right to express certain beliefs openly in public, then it had itself died and was to be mourned.

The Vice-President of Colombia recalled that at the previous Governing Body session he had confirmed his Government's determination to improve the conditions under which trade unionism was carried out in Colombia. Since last November, the Inter-Institutional Commission for the Protection and Promotion of Workers' Human Rights had completed a working plan, which covered 95 per cent of the activities, goals and indicators set out for Working Party No. 1, dealing with justice and protection of workers' human rights. Work was now going ahead on the activities of Working Party No. 2, on the promotion and protection of freedom of association and of the right to organize, collective bargaining and to strike. Specific agreements had been made to implement the recommendations of the Ministry of the Interior's protection programme and initiate 60 security schemes before 30 June 2003, and a plan promoting trade unionism, including regional meetings to diminish tension and the concurrent risks incurred by workers in the regions who exercised
their trade union rights. The persons operating this programme would receive training from
the ILO Regional Office on international labour standards and workers’ fundamental
rights. The Government was determined that this plan should achieve its aims, and all the
relevant departments of the administration were collaborating to this end, together with
international human rights organizations present in Colombia.

This determination to promote freedom of association and social dialogue was also
apparent in the reactivation by the Government of the Special Committee for the Handling
of Conflicts referred to the ILO, which had now met five times. Work was progressing on
a tripartite basis, and in May, a workshop on conflict management would be organized
with experts from the Colombian Chamber of Commerce and representatives of the ILO
from the Regional Office in Lima.

However, the Government’s most important commitment was to prevent the
assassinations of trade unionists. There had been nine killings in the first three months of
2003, a reduction of 83 per cent compared with the 53 killings of the first three months of
2002. While agreeing with the intervention of the previous speaker, this still represented
progress. The Inter-Institutional Commission had been given the task of establishing a
database on investigations and the general situation of human rights in the trade union
movement. Workers’ organizations should supply all necessary information to the
Government to enable it to carry through this task.

Despite a difficult economic situation, a budget of 29,000 million Colombian pesetas
(US$11 million) had been granted to the Ministry of the Interior’s protection programme.
Over 52 per cent of this was set aside for the protection of trade unionists. This budget had
been increased by 13 per cent at a time when most other budgets were being cut. Last year,
the programme implemented 4,494 security measures, and this year hoped to implement
9,000, with 3,000 destined to protect trade unionists. The protection programme was being
improved on the basis of an external evaluation carried out with the participation of
workers and the ILO; it would be neither closed down, nor reduced.

The Government had engaged in exploratory peace talks with the armed groups, but
had made it clear that the suspension of all action against civilians was a prerequisite to
any negotiations. The often- evoked problem of impunity must not be considered to result
from a lack of political will on the part of the State. It was due to the high incidence of
crime and other grave problems with which Colombian justice had to deal. More than
25,000 homicides took place annually — a quantity which would disrupt the function of any
legal system. Because of the situation of armed conflict in the country, it was not always
possible for the competent authorities to accede to crime sites before such proofs and
indications as might have existed were altered or disappeared. Sometimes military force
was required to open a passage for investigative officers, and this might take days of
intense combat. Moreover, in Colombia, criminal investigations, and especially in respect
of homicides, were based on statements by witnesses. Once again, the situation
in Colombia was not such as to encourage witnesses to come forward and testify freely.

Despite these difficulties, the Government wished to take concrete steps to improve
the situation of impunity. An agreement had been signed with the Netherlands
Government, whereby US$2 million would be allocated to establish a committee to
advance justice for human rights cases. Among the 100 principal cases before this
committee, a quarter concerned the assassination of trade unionists. Other steps had also
been taken: on 17 and 19 March, with the support of the Turin Training Centre and the
Lima Regional Office, two training sessions for judges had been given; two more
workshops were planned for the judiciary, to help judges confront the problem of
impunity. The best approach was to continue to develop the Special programme, support
tripartite initiatives taken in Colombia, redouble efforts promoting workers’ rights and
prioritize training and investigative procedures.
Dialogue and cooperation between the Government and the ILO were increasing. New and promising lines of action had been identified with the new MDT director. After tripartite consultations, the Government requested the Director-General to nominate a special representative to coordinate action to promote freedom of association, and the Director-General had submitted for consideration the name of a person to act as coordinator for the Special programme, but without the status of a special representative. In the meanwhile, the COL/95/003 project was being reactivated and linked closely to the Special programme.

The Government had engaged reductions in public spending, including on diplomatic representation, on the presidency of the Republic, Congress expenses, official travel and advertising costs, and the freezing of the salaries of senior state officials. Reductions were also being undertaken in the Administration: the workforce was to be cut by 30,000 workers, but 75 per cent of these would correspond to retirements over the next three years, with the subsequent suppression of posts. Of the 10,000 civil servants that would have to be laid off, all would be retrained and compensated with an amount equal to one year’s salary. Special care had been taken of those in vulnerable groups: handicapped workers, women heads of families, and those approaching retirement. In taking this necessary action, the Government had not lost sight of its social responsibilities.

The delegation of Colombia requested that this subject might be included on the agenda of the Governing Body once a year. This would allow the groups to obtain a clearer perspective of progress in the country. Information would be supplied regularly, in coordination with the Special programme, to enable the Governing Body to follow the situation.

A Worker member from Colombia said that despite all the ILO’s efforts, the Special programme was not being applied forcefully enough. The Government of Colombia must not introduce statistics showing a reduction or an increase in violence as though the phenomenon was a macroeconomic factor of the country. One single murder was too many, because the problem was a human problem, and not reducible to numbers. Collective bargaining in Colombia was not developing, it was in frank regression, both in the public and private sectors. On the signing of a recent collective agreement by trade union colleagues at USO, the Government militarized the site and refused entry to the plants by trade union leaders. The labour reforms carried out by the Government had had the effect of seriously impoverishing the workers; they imposed limits to the amount of admissible salary increases, thereby controlling collective bargaining. It was the duty of the State to protect trade union leaders. However, they did not wish to leave the country, but to stay and continue the struggle and bring an end to the current violence.

The Office should supply more information on the proposed coordinator for the Special programme. As a partner of the programme, the workers of Colombia should be informed of the choice and be able to give an opinion on the selection criteria applied. Was the post to be funded from the resources of the Special programme, or paid directly by the ILO? The programme should not simply concentrate on training for workers and trade union leaders, but should raise the awareness of employers and the Government of the need for tolerance of the trade union movement. Social dialogue must be restored, and impunity and violations of trade union rights eliminated.

A Worker member from Colombia confirmed that 184, rather than 114, Colombian trade unionists had been assassinated in 2002. Moreover, there had been 13 killings this year, and not nine. A reduction in the number of murders could not be considered a qualitative improvement or an indication of progress by the Government. Another element of which the Governing Body should be aware was the forced displacement of trade union leaders, from their own regions into other parts of the country. These persons were obliged to leave their jobs simply for exercising their right to take part in trade union activities.
The Ministry of Labour and Social Security had been merged with the Ministry of Health, to become the Ministry of Social Protection. Effectively, this meant that there was now neither a Ministry of Labour, nor of Health. The Government appeared to be developing a policy of non-involvement in worker-employer conflicts, other than to declare such conflicts illegal. Strike-breakers seemed to have official backing. At a strike organized recently in the central market in Bogotá, when strike-breakers arrived, the police, who should have protected the striking workers, disappeared. Unions were being forced out of existence as unionists were dismissed or pressurized into leaving the union. The ratification of international labour standards and their assimilation into national law did not ensure their implementation. The latest labour reforms were a violation of ILO Conventions. It was essential that the Special technical cooperation programme should not turn into a protection programme, and even become a smoke screen behind which unions were dismantled through the removal of their leading members. The programme must be strengthened if progress towards freedom of association was to be achieved.

The representative of the Director-General replied to a query from the Worker spokesperson by saying that the figure of 114 assassinations in 2002 had been supplied by the Attorney-General of Colombia, while that of 184 deaths was supplied by the trade unions. In response to a question from the Government representative of Spain, the selection criteria for the Special programme coordinator were experience in management, especially of technical cooperation programmes, in labour relations between employers and workers, labour experience in the area, and availability. There were also language and nationality requirements. At the moment informal consultations were taking place. This was not usual ILO practice for appointments of this sort. However, in this instance, there were considerable political sensitivities. Three trade unions had been consulted so far. The Governing Body would be kept informed of all developments and of the salary that was to be paid. Funds were scarce, but for a person in a position of this responsibility, a minimum of around US$45,000 per annum, including health insurance and pension, would be required, together with travel allowances.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the presence of the Vice-President of Colombia at the Governing Body was a sign of the importance of the issue. Some of the subjects that had been discussed would have been more appropriate to other forums, but as had been stated, numbers and statistics relating to the assassinations were beside the point. The Employers' group supported the right to life, and for this reason was in full solidarity with the Workers. Impunity must cease in Colombia, and to this end all institutional paths and procedures must be pursued. It was disconcerting to note that although the Ministry of Labour's Conflict Resolution Committee had been convened three times, it had fallen short of a quorum on each occasion because of the absence of the trade union sector. This suggested that despite all the efforts being made, there was still a lack of disposition to engage in social dialogue. It could not exist unless the social actors shouldered their responsibilities to engage in it. There was still a need for the ILO to provide training in this field.

There appeared to be a framework for agreement between the Regional Office, the Government and the social partners for the choice of a coordinator for the Special programme. Clearly, the person chosen must have the qualities necessary for facilitating contact between government, employers and workers. The frequency of discussions in the Governing Body on the situation in Colombia depended on circumstances, but the Employers' group felt that the flow of information should be kept open and was ready to discuss the question whenever necessary. The Governing Body should be informed of the development of the programme, its short-, medium- and long-term objectives, and the results obtained should be regularly evaluated.

The Worker spokesperson said, regarding the disparity in the number of killings of trade unionists in 2002, that both figures should have been included in the report. It was for
the Governing Body to decide on how frequently it wished to discuss particular problems and request information on the situation in Colombia. The Vice-President of Colombia had mentioned that Working Party No. 1 had completed 95 per cent of its tasks, but had not given an indication of the state of advancement of Working Party No. 2, dealing with freedom of association. Did this mean that the first Working Party had to finish its work, before the second could begin?

*The Chairperson* noted, without casting doubt on one or the other, that the opinion of the Vice-President of Colombia and of the Colombian worker members on the situation in their country showed a clear divergence. This made it very difficult for the Governing Body to judge whether progress had been made or not. The next report might allow greater understanding. Whether there had been 114 or 184 killings, there was firm consensus that the impunity must stop, and the perpetrators of crimes brought to justice, and in this connection, no one had said that the Special programme was not helpful. Much depended on resources available, and here donor countries should be generous, if progress was to be seen. It could not be left to the Government of Colombia, to trade unions or employers’ organizations alone.

*The Governing Body took note of the report.*

**Eighth item on the agenda**

**ENHANCED PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION FOR THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES**

*The Worker spokesperson* recalled that the Workers’ group had proposed that there should be a Palestinian Fund for Employment and Social Protection (the Fund), so the progress made in its establishment was encouraging. The creation of a platform for social dialogue between Palestinians and Israelis should be considered an important element, contributing to peace and stability. The Office should provide more information on the Community Infrastructure Development Programme (CIDP), the Enterprise Development Programme (EDP) and the Human Resources Development Programme (HRDP). The report did not make it clear whether these programmes would contribute to capacity building for trade unions. Paragraph 4 of the report stated: “Civil society will be thoroughly engaged in the Fund’s operations (...).” Details of which civil society organizations were in question should be given. The Office should also keep the Governing Body informed on the date and venue of the projected donors’ meeting to support the Fund, and a progress report should be submitted to the November session.

*The Employer Vice-Chairperson* said that the Office should concentrate in the fields already outlined, but that ACT/EMP should be more closely involved, especially in the support of employers’ organizations. Well-trained social partners were fundamental to the construction of social dialogue. The Beirut Office would need to deal not only with the themes under examination, but also with all the issues that would arise post-war. The economic efforts mentioned in the document would be insufficient to develop the proposed programme further. The group supported the report, but believed that greater efforts needed to be made to build peace, establish true social dialogue and create a suitable climate for the implantation of enterprises and employment generation. The ILO should encourage donors, and participate with its own funds and with available human resources.

*A Government representative of Italy,* spoke on behalf of the European Union, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, and the associated countries of Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey, as well as Switzerland. The European Union continued to monitor the progress in the implementation of the enhanced programme of technical cooperation, which was the ILO’s main tool for
action in the area, given the extreme circumstances. The EU was in favour of the programme as outlined in the report and was ready to contribute fully to peace building and to the reconstruction of Palestinian employment and social protection. The movement of people should be facilitated by the lifting of closures and curfews. The Middle East peace process would be invigorated by the immediate publication and implementation of the road map endorsed in Washington on 20 December 2002.

A Government representative of Jordan said the Office should now concentrate more on the implementation of projects, rather than on fact-finding missions and visits. The Government of Jordan appealed to donor countries to give generously to the Fund, and hoped that the ILO would make rapid progress in its development. The US$1.4 million allocated by the Office to the Fund were of course welcome, but in view of the deteriorating situation, were insufficient. More funds needed to be made available to the Beirut Office, which was responsible for implementing the project.

A Government representative of the United States noted the progress made by the ILO in the implementation of the programme. The initiative should continue to have high priority in the use of budget surplus funds. The United States Government looked forward to examining the completed feasibility study on the Fund at the projected donors’ meeting. The ILO’s efforts to support Palestinian employers’ and workers’ organizations, the Ministry of Labour and to promote social dialogue were welcome. The ILO, with its tripartite structure and expertise, had a small but important part to play in alleviating the crisis in the territories.

A Government representative of the Republic of Korea, speaking for the Asia and Pacific group, welcomed the progress made in establishing the Fund and called on donor countries to support it. The Fund should continue to be supervised by the ILO, and administered in a transparent and accountable manner. The other activities described in the report were also valuable, and the ILO should extract the maximum of benefit for workers from the programme by thorough coordination with other agencies. In November the delegation had made comments regarding conflict resolution, and the building of dialogue between Palestinians and Israelis. Further information on this question, and whether it was already addressed under the social and civil dialogue project at the Turin Centre, would be welcome. The ILO should explore all ways of implementing the programme and should keep the Governing Body fully informed on the subject.

A Government representative of Saudi Arabia appreciated the efforts made to provide expertise and funds to boost social dialogue in the area. The areas isolated as requiring future follow-up were well chosen. The ILO should retain full supervision of the Fund, as the only organization competent to decide which projects should be implemented. The Governing Body should be kept well informed of all developments, to ensure that implementation of the projects moved ahead.

An Employer member from Saudi Arabia said that the progress was welcome, if limited. The international community should work to bring peace to the region. The Fund was a good initiative; in addition to the US$1.4 million allocated by the ILO, Saudi Arabia had donated US$500,000 for training purposes, and appealed to all donor countries to give generously as well.

The International Organisation of Employers was also playing an important role by trying to provide funds to employers’ organizations in the region. Any technical cooperation should be practical and promote productivity and improve the production process and thus help workers to find decent jobs. The Beirut Office should be entrusted with the task of implementing the major part of the programme and should be reinforced to allow it to do so.
The representative of the Director-General announced three developments that had occurred since the report was issued. The Arab Labour Conference, at its meeting in February, had decided to form a tripartite group, composed of the Minister of Labour of Oman; Mr. Dahlan, Governing Body member and representative of the Council of the Saudi Chamber of Commerce and Industry; and Mr. Gérard, the Secretary-General of the Trade Union Federation of Tunisia, to assist the Office in organizing the work of the donors’ meeting. A letter had been received from the Minister of Labour in Palestine, enclosing the draft decree submitted to Mr. Arafat by the new Prime Minister of Palestine, legally establishing the Fund. Finally, the representative of the Director-General had made a visit to Saudi Arabia, with the Chairperson of the Governing Body, and that country had pledged further support, from the highest level, for the programme.

The role of employers’ and workers’ representatives in the occupied territories had been fully enforced at every step of the programme. One of the main aims of the Fund was indeed to build the capacity of employers and workers and enable them to increase their influence in the territories and build their capacity for social dialogue. Regarding the question from the Worker spokesperson on the meaning of “civil society” in the context of the programme, the reality in the territories was such that non-governmental organizations played an important role, for example in distribution, since moving about the region was difficult. Once the decree establishing the Fund was issued, steps would be taken with the tripartite committee mentioned above, to contact other representatives of the international community. The ILO and UNCTAD would be represented at an UNRWA meeting on 8 April, and a steering committee would be formed from the group to monitor the establishment of the Fund. Regarding the question of focusing on project implementation, rather than on studies, no missions had been sent from Geneva, or even from Beirut, into the occupied territories. The work had been carried out by the Palestinian authorities and employers and workers. The Beirut Office would have the major responsibility for carrying out the programme.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

Ninth item on the agenda

Consideration of the Director-General’s report on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories at the 91st (2003) session of the International Labour Conference

The Chairperson said that there had been eight special sittings to discuss this issue over the past 13 years. Long-standing members of the Governing Body would be acquainted with the arguments of those countries that believed that the question should not be discussed at a single sitting, and would recall that in the past, after much debate, consensus had been reached to hold a sitting. In this instance, the Chairperson had spoken with many of the members of the Governing Body, and particularly with Government representatives, and believed that there was consensus that a special sitting should be held. He proposed to the Governing Body that the point for decision in paragraph 7 of the document should be adopted.

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

The sitting closed at 6.30 p.m.
FIFTH SITTING

Thursday, 27 March 2003, morning

The sitting opened at 11.25 a.m., with Lord Brett in the Chair.

Sixth item on the agenda

DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF THE OBSERVANCE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF MYANMAR OF THE FORCED LABOUR CONVENTION, 1930 (NO. 29)

The Ambassador of Myanmar recalled that the Myanmar Government had been cooperating fully with the United Nations, the Commission on Human Rights and the ILO. Cooperation with the ILO had been significant, and substantial progress had been made. Myanmar and the ILO had signed, in March 2002, the Understanding on the appointment of the ILO Liaison Officer, Ms. Hong-Trang Perret-Nguyen was in place and able to exercise her functions fully and effectively. She had been travelling freely in Myanmar. The Minister for Labour himself had frequently assisted her in overcoming any practical difficulties and in facilitating her travels. Following a series of consultations with the ILO Liaison Officer, the Ministry of Labour had drawn up a Plan of Action, covering a wide range of concrete measures binding the Myanmar Government to the elimination of forced labour.

Progress had been made in the dissemination of information: Order No. 199 and Supplementing Order No. 199, prohibiting the use of forced labour, had been translated into the Mon, Kayin, Shan, Kachin and Kayah languages and distributed to the regions concerned, to raise public awareness. Copies of these translations had been transmitted to the ILO. Order No. 199 and Supplementing Order No. 199 were promulgated in 1999 and 2000 respectively, and were issued, with specific instructions, to all ministries, including the Ministry of Defence, and all departments. They were published in the Government's Official Gazettes, posted on the notice boards of the Office of Peace and Development Councils, and were widely disseminated in the weekly Myanmar Times.

The Government had selected Myat Township in southern Myanmar as a pilot project area in consultation with the ILO Liaison Officer. A Plan of Action would be implemented there and extended to other parts of the country. The Myanmar authorities had also assigned three observation teams to visit various parts of the country for inspections and investigations into instances of alleged use of forced labour, and to raise public awareness. Another concrete measure would be the expansion of the army mule company to the battalion level to provide necessary transport as an alternative to porters.

The Plan of Action had a separate section, which outlined the role of the facilitator in reviewing cases relating to the alleged use of forced labour, and Mr. Léon de Riedmatten, who had served as interim Liaison Officer from May to October 2002, had been proposed for the post. Informal discussions and consultations with the ILO regarding the Plan had begun in December 2002.

The Government of Myanmar was concerned by the term “mediator”, and preferred the term “facilitator”. The ILO had indicated that there could be flexibility in this and that the functions of the facilitator were more important than the name. Another concern related to elements in certain groups, not based within Myanmar territory, which opposed the
Government. If these elements were to be given full access to the facilitator it would be in contravention of Myanmar law.

*The Employer Vice-Chairperson* recognized the good will that the Government of Myanmar, and the Ambassador, had shown in providing information, but said the reported progress did not cover the expectations of the group. The point had still to be reached where forced labour no longer existed in Myanmar and where any attempt to perpetuate or to bring back forced labour could be punished through appropriate legal mechanisms.

Verification could be advanced through pilot projects, which would enable the facilitator to check from place to place whether or not there was forced labour. Progress had certainly been made, but more was needed to conclude the work. The Employers’ group wanted to arrive at a point where there could be talks with Myanmar as with the authorities of any other government on issues other than forced labour. Then they could be helped to solve other problems which their society faced. Specific steps should be included in the Plan of Action to achieve the objectives set by the Liaison Officer and to establish the post of a facilitator empowered to carry out verification in the field. If infringements or violations occurred and forced labour continued or returned, then victims should have access to the legal system with punishment for the perpetrators.

*The Worker spokesperson* agreed that the work done so far by the Government of Myanmar fell far short of expectations, although the Government’s attitude had apparently changed. According to the Liaison Officer’s assessment, the situation remained serious in areas where there was a heavy army presence. This had been little altered by the dissemination of government-issued orders prohibiting forced labour. The army, or at least that part which was stationed in the field, lacked alternative measures to the forcible recruitment of porters. Contrary to the information in the Liaison Officer’s report that the army no longer issued written orders to obtain forced labour, the Workers’ group had received, in the last few days, copies of written orders addressed by military units to village heads in various locations of Karin State, the English translation of which amounted to about 23 pages. The oldest of these orders dated back to 27 June 2002 and the most recent one, signed by a commander of the Kia Army Camp, belonging to the 61st Infantry Battalion, was dated 9 March 2003. These were identical to the thousands of forced labour orders examined over the years, firstly by the ILO Committee of Inquiry and subsequently by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, and found by those bodies to constitute clear evidence of forced labour.

In addition, the Workers were in possession of dozens of recent reports of forced labour in Karin State and Mon State, such as a detailed account of forced labour on a road construction project. In this case, an army major identified as Mint Ring Ayung, ordered forced labourers to hide in the forest while the road project was being inspected by General Teniyo, in charge of the armies of the Eastern Command.

Among the many disturbing facts reported by the Liaison Officer were numerous incidences of the Government attempting to hinder her free movement and access. In the preparation of a Plan of Action, the Government continued to refuse to accept the appointment of a mediator who would be entrusted with identifying violations of Convention No. 29, or any other mechanism that would result in having offenders prosecuted and sanctioned. The latest version of the Government’s Plan of Action as presented still fell far short of the Liaison Officer’s suggestions, particularly regarding the appointment of the mediator; the absence of a comprehensive review of the current use, and possible alternatives to, forced labour; the Plan’s failure to address adequately or credibly the issue of forced labour imposed by the army; and the absence of any commitment by the Government to issue strict instructions enforcing the prohibition of forced labour in the pilot region. Moreover, the Government’s investigation into six serious allegations of forced labour had resulted in a complete denial of forced labour in
any of the cases. This seriously called the Government’s stated desire to eliminate forced labour into question.

The Workers’ group felt that there were only two positive recent elements: the Government’s acceptance of the opening of an ILO Liaison Office, and the fact that the authorities no longer denied that forced labour existed in the country, even though they denied all concrete cases presented to them.

The Liaison Officer’s report was objective and professional. The Workers’ group was more than ever committed to doing all it could to advance the full implementation of the resolution adopted by the Conference in June 2000. The Director-General should send a second letter to all ILO member States, and to all other parties mentioned in the resolution, to have them report on the action they had taken to give effect to the resolution and should inform the Governing Body on this matter in June. The Director-General should use the full capacity of the Department of Communication to give the highest level of publicity to this additional action.

A Government representative of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the ASEAN member States, welcomed the commitment of the Government of Myanmar to observing ILO Convention No. 29, and its sincere determination to eradicate forced labour. He hoped that the cooperation between the Government of Myanmar and the ILO would continue until this issue was fully resolved.

A Government representative of New Zealand, speaking also on behalf of the Government of Australia, urged the Government of Myanmar to make strenuous and effective efforts to fulfil its obligations under Convention No. 29. This commitment should include an agreed Plan of Action, covering amongst other things, an independent facilitator to receive complaints of forced labour. The dialogue was not delivering enough tangible results. There were no signs of a plan of work being put into effect, as the Governments of New Zealand and Australia had urged in November 2002. It was disappointing that such modest expectations had not been met. Appropriate technical assistance, within the terms of the resolutions passed by the International Labour Conference in 1999 and 2000, should continue to be supplied.

A Government representative of Canada regretted that the Liaison Officer’s report showed very little real progress since the Commission of Inquiry. The Plan of Action must take into account the recommendations of the High-Level Team led by Sir Ninian Stephen in September 2001. It should be comprehensive and address in earnest key aspects of the problem, such as investigation and prosecution mechanisms, alternatives to forced labour, wide dissemination of the orders in all ethnic languages, and serious implementation of these measures. It was regrettable that the senior military representative, now included on the Implementation Committee, was from military intelligence and would thus have limited authority to represent the regular army. This raised serious doubts about any intention to establish a credible complaint mechanism.

An independent mechanism, ombudsman or facilitator, must also be part of the Plan of Action. It was unacceptable that the Liaison Officer had still not received written reports on any investigation. Given the lack of meaningful progress, the Government of Canada continued to support the imposition of the measures under article 33 of the ILO Constitution.

A Government representative of Italy, speaking on behalf of the European Union, the acceding countries — Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, and the associated countries — Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey, as well as Switzerland, expressed grave concern that very few steps had been taken by Myanmar since the Commission of Inquiry. The few initiatives
regarding dialogue, as well as the dissemination of information on forced labour, had not had any impact. Moreover, serious difficulties had impeded the establishment of a reformed system of investigation into allegations, particularly those concerning the army. The report reflected a general lessening of the Myanmar authorities' interest in pursuing change in Myanmar: the stalling of the political reform process with Aung San Suu Kyi and the continued absence of credible policies to tackle the worsening economic situation bore witness to this. National reconciliation in Myanmar was essential if the use of forced labour was to be ended. The structure and the size of the Myanmar armed forces and their use for internal security reasons contributed significantly to the overall incidences of forced labour and the reported acts of associated violence. It was also clear that it was the armed forces who were most resistant to cooperation with the ILO.

Regarding the Plan of Action, there appeared to be a policy of unnecessary delay and an attempt to minimize the scope of the Plan, indicating the lack of high-level political will to progress. Advances were made grudgingly, and often only shortly before Governing Body meetings or the Conference. It was particularly worrying that the authorities had failed, firstly, to set up a reformed system of inspection and verification of allegations, including an independent mediator, to identify violations and have offenders prosecuted and sanctioned; secondly, to use the military chain of command to end the army’s use of forced labour; thirdly, to establish a working group to identify and recommend comprehensive alternatives to the current use of forced labour; and fourthly, to implement a prohibition pilot area project, with a clear view of bringing about countrywide enforcement as quickly as possible. Concrete action in this sense should be taken before the forthcoming June 2003 session of the International Labour Conference.

Given the lack of progress to date, it would be inappropriate for any consideration to be given to removing the measures imposed under article 33.

A Government representative of Norway noted that the state of affairs remained serious in Myanmar, in particular, close to the Thai border, where uncertainty reigned and the military presence was heavy. Conditions were also believed to be grave in Northern Rakhine State. The manner in which forced labour was being put into practice was changing. It appeared that the dissemination of the orders to prohibit forced labour had not significantly affected the practice. Failure to provide alternatives to the use of forced labour could be one of the primary reasons underlying the difficulty in enforcing orders.

The Myanmar Government should clarify the authority of the military representative on the Implementation Committee, investigate the allegations before the Committee and provide written reports of investigations as called for by the Liaison Officer in her report. The Liaison Officer should assist in this urgent matter.

The current draft of the Government’s Plan of Action contained a number of positive elements, but provided mainly for an intensification of the current public information and observation measures which, thus far, had not led to any significant results. The Norwegian Government therefore urged the authorities to take immediate steps to finalize the development of a Plan of Action, which should include the following four elements: firstly and most crucially, an outline for a reformed system of inspection and verification of allegations, with an independent mediator; secondly, identification and recommendation of alternatives to the current use of forced labour, the immediate implementation of two alternatives — local road construction with greater utilization of machinery instead of manual labour and the use of animals to replace porters; thirdly, identification of a pilot area in which the Government could demonstrate its ability to reduce the extent of forced labour in Myanmar; and lastly, a public information campaign. The Plan should be submitted well before the June Conference, to allow time for proper consideration.
A Government representative of Pakistan noted with satisfaction that the negotiations on the finalization of the proposed Plan of Action were under way.

A Government representative of the United States noted that the Government of Myanmar had only taken small steps to implement the recommendations made by the Committee of Inquiry five years previously, in 1998, and was still a long way from demonstrating a genuine commitment to eradicating forced labour. Numerous reports from non-governmental organizations confirmed this. In five years there had not been a single prosecution. The case of the murdered Shan State villagers had still not been adequately investigated. It would therefore be premature to consider any review of the measures the ILO had taken to try to ensure Myanmar's compliance with its obligations under Convention No. 29.

A Government representative of India took note with satisfaction of the appointment of the Liaison Officer. The Government of India had continuously supported the adoption of a promotional approach by the ILO and had opposed any punitive action. The pilot project was perhaps an example of such cooperation and technical assistance. It was encouraging that attempts to hold dialogue and extend mutual cooperation had started bearing fruit.

A Government representative of Lithuania endorsed the European Union statement and encouraged the Government of Myanmar to improve the development of the Plan of Action, taking into account the suggestions of the High-Level Team.

A Government representative of Japan stressed that the very purpose of the Plan of Action was to encourage the authorities in their efforts to ensure the prompt and the effective elimination of forced labour. The ILO and the Government of Myanmar should work together to agree on the remaining issues in the Plan of Action as early as possible, without losing the momentum and mutual confidence created over the past year. The Japanese Government's position had always been to resolve this question through dialogue and cooperation.

A Government representative of China said that the Liaison Officer had made considerable advances since her last report in November 2002. The Government of China hoped that the Plan of Action could be implemented and that the Government of Myanmar would intensify its cooperation and dialogue with the ILO to continue to make progress.

A Government representative of the Republic of Korea appreciated the work of the Liaison Officer and welcomed the commitment of the Government of Myanmar in drawing up the Plan of Action.

A Government representative of Bangladesh also welcomed the Plan of Action, which would enable Myanmar to move gradually forward to complete adherence to Convention No. 29. The initiatives of the Government of Myanmar should be complemented by the international community.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson remarked that the Government of Myanmar must continue along the line that it had already started but needed to go deeper into matters, together with the Liaison Officer, in order to find effective solutions to the problems.

The Chairperson summarized the discussions and proposed a conclusion. Simply to note the report would not satisfy the views expressed. The most recent text of the Plan of Action did not meet the minimum requirements to be meaningful and credible. The two main elements missing were the attribution to the facilitator of a system of confidential examination of complaints, and a systematic examination of concrete alternatives to forced labour. The Government of Myanmar proposed that the present dialogue should continue.
While positive, a strict time limit should be observed, otherwise the lack of progress could damage the credibility of the ILO. A meaningful Plan of Action should be adopted before the Conference in June, and this should include the appointment of a mediator/facilitator with the necessary authority, as well as concrete measures prohibiting forced labour, as applied in the pilot area.

It was so decided.

The sitting closed at 1 p.m.
SIXTH SITTING

Thursday, 27 March 2003, afternoon

The sitting opened at 3.40 p.m., with Lord BRETT in the Chair.

The Chairperson read a statement on behalf of the Officers of the Governing Body and of the Director-General regarding the situation in Iraq, as follows:

War has broken out in Iraq despite the dedicated efforts to reach decisions to solve the problem through peaceful means.

History has taught us that wars have far-reaching ramifications that affect people’s lives, going beyond those directly involved in the conflict. The loss of lives on all sides will represent a tragedy for families everywhere and disruption of economic activities in the region will jeopardize the sources of income for millions of workers.

In this situation, the founding principles of the ILO, based on social justice and protection of workers, respond to the needs of people who will be affected by the war.

Looking at the immediate and daunting task of post-war reconstruction, the ILO stands firm in playing its role in assisting the efforts to create jobs and guarantee the livelihoods of the maximum number of people.

In response, the ILO is taking a number of emergency measures as part of a UN-wide initiative on Iraq designed to address immediate needs, through an action plan to protect displaced workers, assess the needs of the job market after the conflict, and launch a number of reconstruction projects designed to create jobs and ensure adequate social protection for vulnerable groups.

The ILO is ready to participate with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in the proposed programme for rebuilding Iraq.

In the longer term, the ILO will want to play a major role in the international community’s efforts for reconstruction, focusing on a strategic response to the employment consequences of the conflict as well as in contributing to the creation of a positive environment for investment, growth and democracy, in which labour rights are fully recognized and respected.

Eleventh item on the agenda

330TH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION
(PARTS I AND II)

The Reporter of the Committee noted that the report contained 99 pending cases. A record-breaking 41 cases had been examined, resulting in a particularly long report. Appeals had been made to the Governments of the Bahamas, Case No. 2127, Madagascar, Case No. 2132, Pakistan, Case No. 2169 and the Russian Federation, Cases Nos. 2185 and 2199, to transmit their observations as a matter of urgency. Serious and urgent cases included those regarding Colombia, No. 1787; China, No. 2189; Belarus, No. 2090; and Guatemala, No. 2203. The situation in Venezuela, with numerous complaints of repeated violations of freedom of association for both workers’ and employers’ organizations, was extremely serious and urgent.

In certain of the 41 cases examined by the Committee, its recommendations had been implemented: Argentina, Cases Nos. 2131 and 2157; Spain, Case No. 2123; and Mauritius,
Case No. 2106. However, others were still very serious. These included seven from Canada. Two concerned the Province of Ontario, where important categories of workers continued to be excluded from full organizational and collective bargaining rights. The Committee had strongly urged the Government to amend its legislation to align it with the principles of freedom of association.

In Cuba, Case No. 1961, the Government still refused to recognize or register the Single Council of Cuban Workers (CUTC). The Committee had requested the Government to take the necessary steps to bring national law and practice into line with Convention No. 87. The Government had failed to reply to allegations of harassment of trade unionists, threats of arrest, confiscation of documents, police intimidation etc., and the Committee had deplored these acts. At the Committee’s request, its Chairperson had met with Government representatives of Cuba to discuss this case.

The situation in Venezuela was very serious. The Committee had already issued recommendations on three cases at the last meeting and there were now four new cases in which there was grave violation of trade union rights. In particular, the Committee continued to note the excessive powers of intervention granted to the National Electoral Council and urged the Government to amend article 293 of the Constitution and the Organic Act on Electoral Authority. It also urged the Government to ensure that the authorities refrained from intimidating statements to the Venezuelan Workers’ Confederation and asked it to recognize its Executive Committee. It deplored the fact that the Government had not replied to the serious allegations of anti-union violence and urged it to investigate these.

Case No. 2090, concerning Belarus, remained extremely alarming. The Government had not replied adequately to previous complaints of interference in trade union elections, problems regarding social dialogue and international help to trade unions in Belarus. The Committee had decided to examine this case at its next session, and requested the Government to supply observations on recent allegations made by the complainants, including a new complaint concerning continuing harassment, anti-union discrimination, and interference in the internal affairs of trade unions. The Chairperson had met the Deputy Minister of Labour regarding this case.

In Case No. 2189, China, in which there were allegations of threats, intimidation, intervention by security forces, beatings, detentions, arrests and other mistreatment meted out to trade unionists, the Committee had requested the Government to provide information on the charges brought against the leaders of the independent workers’ organizations at one of the factories concerned and to arrange the immediate release of those still detained, with charges against them quashed. The Committee hoped that the Government would respond positively to its suggestion of a direct contacts mission to promote full implementation of freedom of association.

Case No. 1787, concerning Colombia, was amongst the most grave of the cases before the Committee. From the information provided by the Government, it appeared that not one of the 81 complaints of murder or violence alleged from November 2002, and 265 complaints of a similar nature from March 2002, had led to a conviction. Moreover, there had been complaints of 11 murders, two abductions, one attempted murder and 15 death threats since the Committee had last examined the case in November 2002. The delay in the administration of justice and the suspension of proceedings resulted from deeply rooted impunity. The Government should therefore take measures to ensure that investigations into all the alleged acts of violence were carried out and the guilty parties sanctioned, and the Committee had asked it for further and more detailed information. The Committee had also referred to its November 2002 recommendation on the question of the fact-finding and conciliation commission.
Case No. 1888, concerned serious allegations, including murder, arrest and detention in Ethiopia, and dated back to 1996. The Committee noted that although the defendants had been released from prison, Dr. Taye Woldesmiate had been sentenced and had served five years in prison for having exercised legitimate trade union activities. It had also noted that the Government did not intend to hold an independent inquiry into the killing of Assefa Maru, and again requested it to do so.

Regarding Guatemala, Case No. 2203, concerned allegations of assaults, death threats and intimidation of union members in various companies and public institutions, with the raiding and sacking of trade union headquarters. The Committee urged the Government to order a rapid investigation into these allegations and to refer the incidents to the special attorney for offences against union members. The Committee also requested the Government to revise the process of protecting union rights, noting that judicial orders for reinstatement of dismissed union members were often ignored. The Government might consider requesting ILO technical assistance to improve implementation of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98.

An Employer member from Australia supported the report, with some reservations. He highlighted the serious and urgent cases concerning Belarus, China, Colombia, Guatemala and Venezuela. Case No. 2189, on China, mainly concerned large workforce reductions in a number of state-owned enterprises. Workers’ demonstrations had been suppressed by the authorities, and some workers had been detained and charged with serious offences. The Committee had made appropriate recommendations and requested the Government to examine the possibility of a direct contacts mission to promote freedom of association. Regarding Case No. 1787, Colombia, the reduction in the number of allegations was significant, and the Government had responded extensively to the Committee’s recommendations. The Committee had simply recalled its recommendation at its previous session to refer these matters to a fact-finding and conciliation commission.

The cases concerning Canada/British Columbia, Case No. 2166 and following, were of particular concern because they raised again the issues of essential services and of government intervention in intractable disputes. The Employers disagreed with some of the Committee’s conclusions concerning the process by which the dispute had been brought to an end. In some circumstances conciliation and arbitration should be imposed, even where it was not freely chosen by the parties. The Committee took a different approach with respect to the education sector, despite the existence of a ten-month dispute and the loss of 4 million working hours in ten years. In the Employers’ view, the effects of such disputation on the education and welfare of children could not be tolerated.

In November 2002, the Employers had made their position clear concerning a dispute in the aviation sector in the Philippines. The approach adopted by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations to essential services was inflexible and too narrow. The Employers had pointed out that it ignored the likely effects of a dispute on the welfare of the community. In certain disputes, when collective bargaining had failed, and no end was visible, government intervention to bring the dispute to a close was justified. The Committee had concluded that minimum services could be established in the education sector, in full consultation with social partners, in strikes of long duration. This approach should be extended to any strike in this sector, and should be implemented by an impartial and independent body, such as the Labour Relations Board. At the very least, minimum services should be provided during all strikes in the education sector and the extent of those minimum services should be determined by the needs of students.

Concerning Case No. 2178, Denmark, and Case No. 2171, Sweden, the Governments had, respectively, sought to limit the scope of collective bargaining to allow more flexible use of part-time work, and introduced legislation establishing the right of a worker to
remain in work until the age of 67, irrespective of the provisions of collective agreements. The Committee’s recommendations in both instances were qualified by the words “in the particular circumstances of this case”. The Employers interpreted this as meaning that the cases had special features and did not constitute a precedent.

Case No. 2170 concerned a six-week strike in the fishing sector in Iceland, ended by the Government imposing an arbitration process. The Committee decided that, although the sector was not an essential service in the narrow sense, government intervention was justified. Nevertheless, in the absence of “an acute national crisis”, the arbitration process imposed should have been voluntary. The Employers believed, firstly, the criterion of acute national crisis, although imprecise and dependent on particular circumstances, was satisfied in this case. Secondly, in such circumstances recourse to arbitration might or might not be voluntary. The circumstances in which disputes could be ended by government intervention and the processes applicable in those circumstances required re-examination.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson, in view of the great seriousness of the situation in Venezuela, spoke on behalf of the group and of the International Organisation of Employers. He noted that for some three years there had been continuous harassment by the Government of Venezuela of the most representative employers’ and workers’ organizations. This had been systematically denounced, both by the Employers and Workers.

In one particular case, Mr. Carlos Fernandez, President of FEDECAMARAS, had been arrested and detained for 30 days and, though subsequently released, the charges against him were upheld. Mr. Fernandez had been protesting legitimately at the introduction by the Government of anti-entrepreneurial policy and the drafting of legislation in violation of the rights of employers and of property. This had been introduced with no consultation with employers and workers. Illegal occupation of productive land had been encouraged and discriminatory policies introduced on exchange controls affecting all FEDECAMARAS members. Employers and workers had sought a joint response to this violation of their rights; such violations contravened the basic principles defined in Convention No. 87, and the civil liberties set out in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Employers’ group thus trusted that the Government of Venezuela would immediately establish a constructive dialogue with FEDECAMARAS and the CTV, the most representative employers’ and workers’ organizations, rather than with bodies artificially created by the Government; in this way a joint solution might be found. In view of the severity and seriousness of the events, the Employer representatives at the June 2003 session of the International Labour Conference would be obliged to make a complaint under article 26 of the Constitution, requesting the urgent establishment of a commission of inquiry in Venezuela. However, he hoped that dialogue would win through. He urged the Director-General to take all necessary steps, not only to ensure that this end could be achieved, but also to prepare a commission of inquiry so it was immediately available, if needed.

The Worker spokesperson wholeheartedly supported the views expressed by the Employers’ group. The Workers were equally concerned about the harassment of trade union leaders, some of whom had had to flee for their lives. Further action should be taken at the Conference, and the Director-General should write to the Government of Venezuela to encourage dialogue. The strength of sentiment expressed by the Employers’ group should not be restricted to Venezuela, but should be extended to Colombia as well.

A Worker member from Sweden endorsed the Reporter’s statement and asked the Governing Body to adopt the conclusions and recommendations, without reservation.
The Committee had dealt with seven cases concerning Colombia. The worst case, No. 1787, had been considered on 12 previous occasions. The Committee had again deplored the fact that the Government had not implemented its previous recommendations regarding impunity. It had urged the Government to pursue the dismantling of paramilitary and other violent revolutionary groups, and had again requested the provision of protection for trade unionists whose lives were in danger. The Government had not provided information requested on the especially high incidence of violence against trade unionists in certain regions and industrial sectors. All seven cases demonstrated the frequency of violations of freedom of association, and the Workers' group would make a formal technical proposal for the establishment of a fact-finding and conciliation commission.

In November 2002, the Workers' group had expressed great concern over the situation in Belarus, Case No. 2090. They had called on the Government, currently a Governing Body member, to halt its violations of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98 forthwith. Despite assurance given by the Government, the situation had not improved. The Committee would examine the case again at its next session, and the Workers' group would take additional measures against the Government if it had failed to act by that time.

The cases relating to Venezuela, Guatemala and China were very grave. In Guatemala, the Committee had requested the Government to eliminate the use of excessive violence by the forces of law against demonstrations. Specifically, the Government was requested to drop all charges relating to terrorism, sabotage and subversion, which carried heavy penalties, made following a dispute at the Ferrous Alloy Factory. The Trade Union Act should be amended to allow workers to organize freely in independent trade unions of their own choosing.

In Case No. 2186, China/Hong Kong, the Committee expected the Government to take measures to stop all acts by Cathay Pacific of anti-union discrimination and intimidation against members of the Hong Kong Aircrew Officers' Association and encourage collective bargaining to settle matters of dispute between them.

In British Columbia, the Government was asked to repeal provisions of Bill No. 18, under which education was an essential sector, thereby granting the workers concerned the right to strike. The same request was made by the Committee in relation to the health and services sector. It asked the Government to stop imposing settlements, and to respect the autonomy of bargaining partners.

Case No. 2182, concerning Ontario, showed that the Government had introduced legislation aimed at trade union de-certification. It had also introduced legislative protection of employers against any complaints by the trade unions for unfair labour practices. The Government therefore had no intention of advising non-unionized workers how to organize. This was a blatant violation of Convention No. 87, ratified by Canada. Section 63.1 of the Labour Relations Act should be repealed. Cases Nos. 1900, 1943, 1951 and 1975 showed a similar disrespect for workers' rights. The Workers' group wished to be informed of what the Government intended to do in order to have Convention No. 87 respected in all provinces of Canada.

In Case No. 1888 concerning Ethiopia, the Committee regretted that there was no new information on the killing of Mr. Assefa Maru. The legislation should be amended to allow teachers to organize freely and bargain collectively, possibly with the help of ILO technical assistance.

In Case No. 2229, Pakistan, the Committee had stressed the need for full consultations with the social partners concerning any changes in legislation affecting trade union rights. The Government should amend the legislation to allow workers in a number of establishments not providing truly essential services the right to establish and join trade
unions of their own choosing. Amendment of the legislation had also been requested to allow trade unions to form and join federations freely. Legislative protection against anti-union discrimination should be provided at any time, not only during industrial disputes.

The Committee had dealt with three complaints in regard to the Nordic countries. In Case No. 2178, Denmark, and Case No. 2171, Sweden, the Governments had introduced legislation prohibiting collective agreements prevailing over individual agreements on, respectively, part-time work, and an individual preference on retirement age. These were matters traditionally regulated by the social partners themselves, who had unanimously rejected this legislative interference.

In Case No. 2170, Iceland, in which the Government had intervened to end a dispute in the fishing sector, the Committee had not, as the Employers maintained, recognized the intervention by the Government as justified, but stated it was not in a position to determine whether the strike actually caused an acute national economic crisis. A work stoppage in the fishing industry did not endanger the life, personal safety or health of the whole or part of the population: moreover, this was the third intervention by the Government in the collective bargaining process concerning fishermen in seven years.

In Case No. 2200, Turkey, concerning trade union rights in the public sector, the Committee had requested the Government to amend Act No. 4688 to bring it into conformity with Conventions Nos. 87, 98 and 151, to provide effective protection of public servants from acts of anti-union discrimination, and institute independent investigations concerning a number of alleged actions taken against trade union members performing legitimate trade union activities.

In Case No. 1826 concerning the Philippines, the question of certification of the trade union at Cebu Mitsumi Incorporated in the Danao export processing zone had still not been resolved, although a request had been lodged by the trade union in February 1994, and despite repeated requests by the Committee. Case No. 2179, Guatemala, with alleged threats and physical assaults against trade unionists at certain enterprises in the Villanueva free zone was also alarming. The governments concerned should take the necessary action.

A Government representative of Cuba said, in respect of Case No. 1961, that copious information supplied by the Government had not been included in the report. This showed that the trade union in question had no bona fide status; the persons mentioned as being in detention were all at liberty, although none were workers, or were involved in the world of work, and some had retired. None had ever been elected as a trade union official, but they had falsely assumed trade union titles, and had received funding from terrorist organizations based in the United States. They aimed to sabotage certain economic sectors by creating an artificial climate of violations of trade union rights.

The Committee on Freedom of Association had reminded the Government of the principles of freedom of association, although the investigations had revealed that the trade union organization mentioned in the report did not exist. It was only possible to obtain information that had been distributed under its name. In Cuba, 98 per cent of workers were affiliated to independent unions, which took part fully, through elected representatives, in all labour decisions, free from government interference. The report inadequately reflected the information supplied by the Government.

A Government representative of Venezuela said that if the report were viewed against that of November, it would reveal the progress made by Venezuela. The withdrawal of the complaint by the Latin American Central of Workers (CLAT), noted in the Committee's 299th Report, should have marked the closing of Case No. 1986. The variety of cases referring to Venezuela showed that there were many trade unions, although the majority of those mentioned were not members of the Venezuelan Workers' Confederation (CTV) as
alleged. These cases had been presented by certain organizations linked to non-governmental organizations whose interests were not those of the majority, and which did not contribute to the development of Latin American countries. These representations gave the erroneous idea that there was a single union in Venezuela.

The Government had improved its collaboration with the Committee, and had provided adequate information on each case. Reform had been initiated both by the Ministry of Labour and by the National Assembly, and all cases were dealt with in a balanced manner to ensure respect for the democratic process and for the rule of law.

A Government representative of the Bahamas announced that a response to the urgent appeal for information on Case No. 2127, Bahamas, had been dispatched two months ago. A copy of that response was being sent to the Office of the Director-General for the attention of the Committee.

A Government representative of China said, regarding Case No. 2189, that the Government had conducted a fact-finding investigation with all parties concerned, and had submitted a reply in written form to the Office. The incidents related in this case were still under investigation. China would continue to provide further information from the ongoing investigation to the Office.

A Government representative of Pakistan stated, in respect of Case No. 2229, that the Government was consulting all stakeholders, especially the leadership of employees' federations, regarding the new legislative measures. A tripartite process of talks was under way and should soon achieve consensus. Once completed, the Government would make, and submit to Parliament, the required changes in the labour laws.

A Worker member from Japan said the Committee had postponed examination of Case No. 2177 and Case No. 1991 to May. Recommendations had already been adopted in November 2002, but the Government showed no sign of acting. RENGO, the Japan Trade Union Confederation, had more recommendations to make, but the delay in the Government's reply meant that this had gone no further. Case No. 2177 had been a thorn in the side of the Japanese labour movement for the past 50 years. Case No. 1991 concerned the dismissal of workers at the former national Japanese railway; 16 years had elapsed, and life for those dismissed had been very difficult. He hoped for recommendations in May 2003 that would lead to a total settlement of these two disputes.

The Governing Body adopted paragraphs 1 to 180.

A Government representative of Belarus said the Government was studying Case No. 2090. It supported dialogue with the Committee and had submitted information as requested. During the present session, consultations between representatives of the Government, the Chairperson of the Committee, and Mr. Tapiola had been held. Additional material on the legitimacy of the Federation of Trade Unions had been submitted for consideration. In Belarus, in practice, the principles of social partnership and tripartism were being implemented. The social partners were cooperating at various levels, where tripartite consultative bodies existed. Within the National Council for Labour and Social Issues, regular general agreements were concluded between the Government, the republican trade union associations and entrepreneurs. Legislation on social and labour issues was being drafted in collaboration with the trade unions. In August 2002, the National Council adopted a decision to form a tripartite group of experts for the implementation of international labour standards, now known as the Committee on ILO Activities.

Trade unions had always played an important social role in Belarus, but in recent years their authority had declined. An excessive commitment by trade union leadership in
the election of the President of Belarus in 2001 had not been well accepted by members. Trust between the social partners had gradually eroded, and there was a danger that the whole system would no longer function. In this situation the members of the Federation of Belarus Unions felt that they needed a new leader. The Government understood that only social dialogue could lead to mutual comprehension between the three parties, but was obliged to work within the framework of legislation and could not intervene in the internal affairs of trade unions.

The coordinator of the Worker members of the Committee hoped the Belarus statement could be taken as an assurance that the situation would change, and that the Government would be prepared to fulfil all recommendations in previous cases.


A Government representative of India reported that he had discussed Case No. 2158 with the Principal Labour Secretary of West Bengal and had given him the whole set of documents in February during the Conference organized by the Council of Indian Employers. The report had been submitted to the ILO, but had not been mentioned. He would submit it to the Office for consideration.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 834, 854, 894, 908, 917, 958, 977, 988, 1009, 1053, 1076 and 1105 of the report.

A Government representative of Venezuela noted that the organization in question in Case No. 1986 was independent and not affiliated to any confederation.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 1111 and 1130 of the report.

A Government representative of Venezuela, speaking on Case No. 1147, noted that the union in question was again an independent body. The Government had estimated that 50,000 dismissals had resulted from an employers' lockout mounted to overthrow the democratically elected executive. It had subsequently drafted a Bill accelerating the administrative process of protection for workers affected by anti-trade union discrimination. The case had generated wide debate in the country on the protection of workers, associated with the Committee's recommendations.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson rejected any allegation questioning the democratic nature of the employers' and workers' movements of Venezuela, respect for principles and rights contained in Convention No. 87 and any other allegation that affected their dignity. The previous speaker had spoken of "overthrowing the Government" and of "promoting fascism". Such ideas were utterly foreign to either the Employers or Workers represented on the Governing Body.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 1147 and 1163 of the report.

The Worker spokesperson noted that, at the November session, the Committee had recommended considering the possibility of transmitting matters relating to Colombia to the fact-finding and conciliation commission. The Vice-President of Colombia had asked for more time for his Government to combat the state of impunity and the level of violence against trade union leaders. The Workers' group therefore requested that, since there had been little or no progress, this action should be carried through.
The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the Employers had always supported the need for active cooperation between the ILO and Colombia, and there was now a Government ready to cooperate. Measures taken should centre on more technical cooperation. Rather than take the path of the fact-finding and conciliation commission, the Governing Body should send a high-level mission to Colombia as part of the technical cooperation programme, to make contact with the competent legal bodies, including the legally constituted ombudsperson, which already existed in Colombia. Technical cooperation would help to diminish tensions and promote social dialogue.

A Government representative of Colombia said that his Government needed time to see how a fact-finding mission could be organized on a tripartite basis, to ensure the presence of a government representative.

A Government representative of the United States said that the best way to support the ILO’s efforts in Colombia was to devote all the resources at the Organization’s disposal to strengthening the special technical cooperation programme. This programme was beginning to produce results and could be expected to do much more. It was not the time to initiate a new and costly supervisory procedure. The question should be reviewed again in June.

A Government representative of South Africa supported transmitting matters to a fact-finding and conciliation commission, as had been agreed in November.

A Government representative of Ecuador felt that it was important to strengthen international cooperation with Colombia and reiterated support for the special technical cooperation programme as the main instrument through which the ILO could operate.

A Government representative of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean group of governments, said that the special technical cooperation programme was the best instrument available to seek solutions to the problems. Establishing an additional mechanism would undermine procedures already in place.

The Chairperson explained the difference between a fact-finding and conciliation commission and a high-level team. The fact-finding and conciliation commission would be made up of independent experts; it would suspend the Committee on Freedom of Association’s consideration of current cases and have a more ad hoc nature. The high-level team would be tripartite, and constituted of Governing Body members, party to the discussions to the Committee’s report, to the considerations and views of the workers, employers and the Government of Colombia.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the high-level commission would be an additional element of the special technical cooperation programme, rather than an institutional path that was part of the supervisory machinery of the house.

Government representatives of the Dominican Republic, Uruguay and El Salvador further endorsed the position of the Latin American and Caribbean governments.

A Government representative of Mexico felt that establishing a new procedure would undermine the cooperation programme, which was beginning to bear results. The programme should be reinforced.

A Government representative of Barbados was concerned by the divergence between the Government’s and the Workers’ reports, but felt that the special programme was working although it must be allowed adequate time and institutional support to attain its objectives. The Government of Colombia should be given time to study the proposal to establish a tripartite fact-finding mission.
A Government representative of Nigeria supported the November recommendation to set up a fact-finding and conciliation commission.

A Government representative of Brazil said an additional fact-finding mission would not help the situation in Colombia, but that efforts should focus on technical cooperation. A choice had been made to seek a solution with the social partners, and this should be allowed time to deliver results.

The Chairperson suggested that the two Vice-Chairpersons and the Vice-President of Colombia or his representative should discuss the various proposals together, to reach a decision which could be presented to the Governing Body at its next sitting.

It was so decided.

The sitting closed at 6.35 p.m.
SEVENTH SITTING (PRIVATE)

Friday, 28 March 2003, morning

The sitting opened at 10.40 a.m., with Lord Brett in the Chair.

Nineteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

Fourth Supplementary Report:
Representation alleging non-observance by Guatemala of the Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 144), presented under article 24 of the Constitution of the ILO by the Trade Union and Popular Action Unit (UASP) and the Trade Union of Workers of Guatemala (UNISITRAGUA)

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 43 of the Report and declared closed the procedure initiated as a result of the submission of the representation.

Twentieth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY

First report:
Representation alleging non-observance by Mexico of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the Authentic Workers' Front (FAT) and the Union of Metal, Steel, Iron and Allied Workers (STIMAHC)

The Governing Body decided the representation was receivable and deferred the establishment of a committee for its examination until a later date.

Second report:
Representation alleging non-observance by China of the Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97), made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP)

The Governing Body decided the representation was receivable and deferred the establishment of a committee for its examination until a later date.

The sitting closed at 10.55 a.m.

1 See also first, second and eighth sittings.
EIGHTH SITTING

Friday, 28 March 2003, morning

_The sitting opened at 11.00 a.m., with Lord Brett in the Chair._

**Eleventh item on the agenda**

330TH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION (concl.)

_The Worker spokesperson_ asked that note should be taken of the group’s firm belief in the need for definite action in Colombia, but did not insist on a vote to decide whether all questions concerning the situation should be referred to a Commission of Inquiry. However, should the situation deteriorate before the next Governing Body, the group reserved the right to take comparable action to that proposed regarding Venezuela.

_The Employer Vice-Chairperson_ urged that the ILO make technical assistance its principle tool to resolve the situation.

_A Government representative of the United States_ said, regarding Case No. 1961 (Cuba), that the Cuban Government that very week had arrested more than 70 human rights defenders, including the General Secretary of the Single Council of Cuban Workers, a union the Government representative said only existed as a front, receiving funding from terrorist organizations in the United States. This was not true: it was an independent organization with over 3,500 registered members in 14 provinces, and affiliated to the World Confederation of Labour. Its General Secretary had been arrested for challenging the trade union monopoly upheld by Cuban law. The Committee of Experts had for many years urged the Cuban Government to repeal the legal provisions establishing this monopoly, but the Government had ignored these requests.

_The report as a whole was adopted._

**Tenth item on the agenda**

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

_The Employer Vice-Chairperson_ said that interaction between the ILO and the multilateral system should be subject to greater debate within the Governing Body. An agenda should be established for the next six months to fix orientations.

_The Worker spokesperson_ noted that out of 48 United Nations programmes, only two made specific reference to the ILO. The Organization should have far more impact in its interaction with other UN agencies. Regarding the World Summit on the Information Society, the Workers had pushed for an ILO meeting on the future and quality of work in the information society and the Employers and Governments had agreed. The conclusions of the meeting should constitute the ILO platform for the World Summit on the Information Society.

---

1 See also sixth sitting.
A Government representative of India pledged India's support for the objectives set out in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The Representative of the Director-General noted that interest in the multilateral framework had developed greatly recently. There had been closer follow-up to the activities of the United Nations in areas which affected the work of the ILO. The Office was producing a report, to be submitted to the Committee on Employment and Social Policy, reflecting the role of tripartism in the major conferences over the past few years. The Office had difficulty in ensuring full visibility and a high profile for the ILO in respect of the MDGs. Efforts were outlined in the document, but it remained difficult to ensure that international labour standards and the Decent Work Agenda received the attention they deserved. The tripartite representatives of the ILO should be involved to increase the impact of ILO views against those of other purely governmental, multilateral organizations.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 51 of the report.

Nineteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL (concl.)

The Chairperson paid tribute to the memory of Mr. Arthur João Donato, former Employer member of the Governing Body and well-known figure on the Employer benches since 1996. Mr. Donato had been Vice-President of the Conference in 2001. That he had continued to work into his 80th year bore testimony to his commitment to the causes he espoused.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson said Mr. Donato had been an extremely important member of the Governing Body. He had been Vice-President of the International Organisation of Employers for the Latin American region and Employers’ Vice-President of the Conference in 2001, when he brought his career in the ILO to a close. His balanced approach to problems and desire always to advance through seeking agreement were an inspiration to Governing Body members.

The Worker spokesperson said his group also grieved at the loss of one of the leaders in the business community of Brazil and of Latin America.

A Government representative of Brazil, on behalf of the Government of Brazil, extended his condolences.

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

The Employer Vice-Chairperson, referring to Part IV of the Report — Publications and documents — suggested that publications should also be issued in CD-ROM format.

The Governing Body took note of the Report as a whole.

See also first, second and seventh sittings.
First Supplementary Report:

The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted with concern that the Committee of Experts occasionally went beyond its mandate. The suggestion in the report that Convention No. 95 should become a fundamental Convention was a case in point. It was not up to the Committee of Experts to decide on matters proper to the Conference or to the Governing Body.

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

Second Supplementary Report:
Legal protection of a new ILO logo

The document was withdrawn.

Seventeenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL COOPERATION

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

Eighteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION

The Chairperson of the Working Party informed the Governing Body that the Officers of the Working Party had agreed that the next discussion on governance, in November 2003, would combine options (iii) and (iv) of the proposals in section VI of the Office paper. The Office would prepare a paper entitled “Policies and social partnerships for good governance”, incorporating a review of the literature on the determinants of good governance and of experiences where social partnership had contributed to improved governance. The paper would aim to draw out policy guidelines from the material reviewed. It was also agreed that the information note on corporate social responsibility would be updated by the Office and reintroduced for the November 2003 meeting. The understanding reached was that while members could comment on the information note, the Working Party would not enter into substantive discussion on the issue of corporate social responsibility.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the report. However, the group had hoped that the report of the World Commission would be available in November, but it was now announced for March 2004. The Governing Body should be kept constantly informed of the work being carried out in the Commission. The report had a great deal to contribute to the work of the Governing Body, and if it reached other forums first, the Governing Body would be left behind by public debate by the time it discussed it.

The Worker spokesperson said the Workers’ group in the Working Party had asked a number of very specific questions, and that the Office would draw up answers to as many

3 GB.286/WP/SDG/3.
of these as possible for the next Governing Body session. The report of the World Commission should be reviewed by the Governing Body at its forthcoming November 2003 session.

A Government representative of Brazil said that GRULAC had clearly expressed preference for options (i) and (ii) for further discussion. He asked whether GRULAC had been represented in the Officers’ meeting that had decided on options (iii) and (iv).

The Chairperson of the Working Party confirmed that GRULAC was represented at the Officers’ meeting.

The Chairperson said it might not be practically possible to have the report of the World Commission available by November 2003. However, the point that it should be presented to the Governing Body with a minimum of delay after publication had been well noted by the Office.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

Fourteenth item on the agenda
REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 33, 34, 35 and 36 of the report.

Fifteenth item on the agenda
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 27, 56, 96, 114 and 140 of the report.

Sixteenth item on the agenda
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECTORAL AND TECHNICAL MEETINGS AND RELATED ISSUES

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 32, 40, 45, 51, 57 and 63 of the report.

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

First report: Legal issues

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 9, 16, 30 and 43 of the report.
Second report: International labour standards and human rights

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 16, 22 and 30 and noted the report.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that his group fully supported all initiatives taken by the ILO to promote its principles and values. However, in the case of cooperation with the Asian Development Bank, funding from the Bank had been made dependent on application by the funded enterprises of international labour standards. Neither the Bank nor the enterprises it funded were agencies for enforcing standards: that was the job of governments. Moreover, the group felt that it had been insufficiently consulted on the matter before the Understanding with the Bank was signed, and requested the Office to make certain that consultations between the Office and development banks be carried out in full coordination with the secretariats of both groups.

A Worker member from Sweden said that the Workers believed that other organizations and enterprises did have a duty to promote the ILO Declaration, standards and values.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson, did not agree with the Workers: further debate could take place in the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards. However, the group’s main problem in this instance had been the lack of communication.

Twelfth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE PROGRAMME, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

First report: Financial questions

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 88, 94, 96, 97, 98, 121 and 139 of the report.

Second report: Personnel questions

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 41, 51 and 54 of the report.

Third report: Programme and Budget proposals for 2004-05

A Government representative of Brazil said that consultations for the approval of the budget should be started far earlier. Discussion should in future begin in November prior to the March budget debate.

A Worker member from France said his group had proposed that the Office should prepare a more ambitious, real growth budget. Preliminary consultations might well be useful in this, and the Workers would support them.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson thought that it was always positive to have as much time as possible for discussion, and consequently prior consultations could prove useful.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 155 of the report.
Fourth report: Report of the Government members of the Committee on allocations matters

A Government representative of Brazil reiterated that prior, and earlier, consultation would be useful in respect of this item.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 26 of the report.

Twenty-first item on the agenda

COMPOSITION AND AGENDA OF STANDING BODIES AND MEETINGS

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 13, 15, 20, 23, 25 and 28 of the report.

The sitting closed at 12.20 p.m.
Appendix I

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Wednesday, 26 March 2003, morning

The sitting opened at 10.55 a.m., with Lord Brett in the Chair.

Fourth item on the agenda

REVIEW OF ANNUAL REPORTS UNDER THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE DECLARATION ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES AND RIGHTS AT WORK

The Worker spokesperson agreed with the Expert-Advisers that the Declaration provided social ground rules to guide action within the context of globalization, and also that the principles and rights it contained were applicable to all countries, irrespective of their level of development. This time round, the level of reporting had been distressingly low, with 41 governments failing to fulfill their obligations. Ten governments had never responded to the Office questionnaires: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Fiji, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia and Uzbekistan. While some of these had clear reasons for such failure, others did not. The Director-General should contact the countries that had not responded and explain their responsibilities to them. There had been a low response also this year from national and international trade unions. This dip could be partly explained by frustration at repeated violations of the provisions of the fundamental Conventions, lack of progress in many countries, and failure by governments to implement ratified texts. In previous reporting rounds, comments from these unions had prompted governments to react. The Office should reinforce its promotional work with employers’ and workers’ organizations to encourage their participation in the Declaration process.

The steps listed as taken by various countries in the ratification of fundamental Conventions were welcome, and other countries that had indicated willingness to ratify these instruments should provide information on the action they intended to take. However, requests for technical cooperation or for continuing dialogue with the Office did not constitute significant progress. Much remained to be done before achieving universal ratification of the eight Conventions, and the Office should continue working with countries that requested assistance. Member States should bear in mind that under article 2 of the Declaration, all States, even those that had not ratified the fundamental Conventions, should respect and promote their provisions.

The report showed that there were persistent problems in many countries in each of the four categories: in freedom of association, there were forced dissolutions of trade unions and limitations on the right to strike and collective bargaining; with regard to forced labour, there were continued reports of compulsory work and difficulties in changing current legislation; in child labour, debt bondage, forced recruitment for the military, prostitution and hazardous work were still problems; in discrimination, there were problems in legislation, equal remuneration, access to, and discriminatory treatment at, work. The Workers’ group supported technical cooperation to solve these problems, but with better preparation and selection of chief technical advisers and of projects, and with closer involvement of the Bureau for Workers’ Activities (ACTRAV). The social partners should be better integrated in the projects at national level, and the competencies of the InFocus Declaration programme should be clearly defined against those of other units involved in technical cooperation projects. The Expert-Advisers had recommended that
countries should be approached to offer their national studies on obstacles hindering the full respect of fundamental rights and principles. Governments that had not taken up this possibility should be encouraged to do so.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the Declaration was a fundamental point of departure for all dialogue for the ILO, and a new dynamism should be given to promoting it. Efforts should be made to redress the reply deficit, which concerned not only governments, but also employers’ and workers’ organizations. Obstacles to reporting should be identified; efforts had been made to simplify the reporting procedure for governments, and this could be pursued. The document referred to an absence of factual information which would allow an accurate assessment of progress. He inquired what action the Office envisaged to remedy this situation, and to encourage the ten States, that had never replied to questionnaires, to do so. In the field of freedom of association, 38 countries had not ratified the relevant instruments, and the ratification rate was falling. The ILO should continue its efforts to promote these ratifications. More disturbing still was the fact that the legislation in a number of countries still required that trade unions be authorized, rather than registered. This encouraged state interventionism and should be stopped. The fact that reports had been submitted by Myanmar was an important result and showed that the work in the Governing Body had borne fruit. Regarding the section of the report headed “Outreach and research”, Arabic-speaking members of the Governing Body had mentioned that a very useful seminar, not listed in the report, had taken place in Cairo. More activities were not needed – rather a greater participation by ACTRAV, ACT/EMP, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the International Organisation of Employers (IOE).

An Employer member from India welcomed the constructive approach taken in the report, which differed from the condemnatory style of the three previous numbers. He questioned the assertion, in paragraph 49 of the review, that the Government of the State of Western Bengal had repressed trade unions to create a favourable environment for investment. These allegations should have been investigated at national level on a tripartite basis, and the conference held on the Declaration in Calcutta in February 2003, sponsored by the ILO and the IOE, would have provided an opportunity to do this. The national affiliate of the IOE, the Council of Indian Employers, had been energetic in its promotion of the elements and programmes under the Declaration, as the ILO and indeed the Chairperson of the Governing Body, who was present at the Calcutta conference, were well aware.

The informal economy was the mainstay of India, and certainly required action to bring it into the structured zone. Any campaigns to this end could not be carried out in luxury venues with foreign language media and literature. Such campaigns had to be at regional level, in small towns and rural areas, in local languages and dialects. The promotional follow-up should not close its eyes to realities and difficulties on the ground.

A Government representative of India said that India had already implemented the principles in the Declaration through national laws and development programmes. Four of the eight fundamental Conventions had been ratified to date. However, regarding technical cooperation on sensitive issues, priorities should be based on the demands of the constituents and not on those of the donors. Donor priorities should not contravene national governments’ views of the way to approach problems. The ILO should, in the near future, organize a similar two-day meeting to that held with the Council of Indian Employers in Calcutta, with the central trade union organizations of India, also in Calcutta, so that the misconceptions raised in paragraph 49 of the document could be laid to rest.

A Government representative of Turkey stated that the Office should campaign for a greater level of response not only from governments, but also from the social partners and non-governmental organizations.
A Government representative of the Republic of Korea, on behalf of the Asia-Pacific group, said that, while firmly supporting the aims of the Declaration, the group strongly believed that its follow-up should be promotional, and not provide a means of targeting the shortcomings of member States. It should be neither case-specific nor punitive, and should not be a substitute for the existing supervisory systems, or duplicate the existing reporting methods. The Expert-Advisers appeared once again to have exceeded their mandate.

The declining response rate from countries and employers’ and workers’ organizations was worrying, and the Office should assist countries, especially those that had never replied to the questionnaire, by identifying the challenges and difficulties they faced in fulfilling their obligations.

Regarding the cooperation mentioned in paragraph 28 of the paper, between the Asian Development Bank and the ILO, this should be promotional, and not involve financial lending. Any such collaboration between the Organization and financial institutions and regional bodies should be subject to the prior agreement of the Governing Body.

The group supported the points for decision in paragraph 5(a), (c) and (e). In respect of subparagraph 5(b), the group wished to know whether the regular budget had the means to supply the “sufficient resources” mentioned. For subparagraph 5(d)(ii), the recommendation to strengthen regional and subregional workshops in countries not having ratified all core Conventions was welcome, providing that the proposed action took place bilaterally, at the request of the specific country involved.

A Government representative of Argentina, speaking for GRULAC, said that the social actors should be made aware of the fundamental rights upheld by the Declaration, which marked a step forward in the acquisition of human rights by the world’s workers and encouraged ratification of the fundamental Conventions. The work carried out by the Office should continue, and sufficient human and financial resources should be made available to advance this work. These resources should be sought through international solidarity in the face of the economic and social difficulties experienced by developing countries in general and the GRULAC countries specifically.

A Government representative of Sudan noted that his Government had complied with the reporting requirements of the Declaration, and informed the Governing Body that Sudan had also ratified the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), and the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), bringing Sudan’s ratification tally of the fundamental Conventions to seven out of eight. The country would require considerable ILO technical assistance to help it meet its obligations under these Conventions.

A Government representative of Kenya observed that the Declaration process stressed that the ILO should help member States to ratify and implement the fundamental Conventions. Kenya had ratified all of these instruments, with the exception of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and had recently set up a task force with ILO technical assistance, to review national labour law and align it with the provisions of this text. The review should be completed by the end of 2003, and was covering areas which included discrimination against women, religious minorities, disabled workers, child labour, migrant workers and refugees.

Regarding the mention of Kenya in paragraph 44 of the report, the Kenyan Civil Servant Union was now free to operate and was recruiting members. Kenya had profited from ILO assistance in key areas such as the capacity building of employers’ and workers’ organizations, training in labour inspection, labour administration and the strengthening of tripartism and social dialogue. Training had also been delivered in various specific
technical fields. There was a need to initiate policies and programmes to carry through the fundamental rights and principles, and Kenya strongly supported the call to allocate sufficient resources to continue implementation of the Declaration, and appealed urgently to donor countries to supply substantial and sustainable extra-budgetary support for ILO technical cooperation, to allow the ILO to expand its activities, especially in countries not having ratified all the fundamental Conventions.

A Government representative of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the governments of the Gulf States, was satisfied that the report gave a positive picture of action that had been undertaken in the Gulf States to promote fundamental rights and principles at work. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was seeking to expand its cooperation with the ILO. The country had ratified Convention No. 182 in 2001. Both the Director-General and Lord Brett had visited Saudi Arabia and discussed contacts with the ILO. A technical cooperation mission to the country had also taken place, focusing on employment, occupational safety and health and job security. An expert group from the ILO had reviewed the Saudi Labour Code, while a second group had worked on developing a charter which would enable decisions of the Council of Ministers to be implemented in enterprises with the involvement of employers’ and workers’ organizations. An information seminar had also been organized on the ILO, its Conventions and Recommendations and on fundamental principles and rights at work. In line with these principles, a recent decision had been taken by the Government prohibiting all persons under the age of 18 from participating in camel racing, thus upholding the Saudi commitment to eliminate child labour. The ILO should take steps to ensure that the Declaration programme was allocated sufficient funds to allow it to maintain the necessary level of technical cooperation.

A Worker member from Sweden pointed out that the Expert-Advisers said in paragraph 2 of the report that “A promotional follow-up does not mean a follow-up that closes its eyes to difficulties”. It was occasionally necessary to highlight shortcomings. In November, the Governing Body would have to discuss what type of assistance and promotional activities should be instigated. This would be impossible if a strictly non-case-specific approach were adopted, where countries were not mentioned and situations could not be identified.

The representative of the Director-General said that where cooperation had been introduced, it would be followed up with a series of activities. The Governing Body would be kept informed of progress achieved and would be able to review it. So far, progress had been encouraging, and the additional suggestions made at the present meeting would be studied carefully for possible action.

Regarding the question by the spokesperson for the Asia-Pacific group concerning the budgetary matters included under subparagraph 5(b), the Office would see what it could do within the framework of regular budget resources, coupled with the appeal to donors, under subparagraph 5(c), for extra-budgetary resources. Action would be taken in cooperation with the whole house, not just one sector. IPEC was engaged in activities, as was the InFocus Programme on Social Dialogue and, of course, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV, to ensure the constituents’ involvement.

Concerning subparagraph 5(d)(ii), and the question of whether decisions to convene regional or subregional workshops should be taken directly or on a bilateral basis, at the request of the concerned country, the representative of the Director-General agreed that the approach should be balanced and pragmatic.

The sitting closed at 12.05 p.m.
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acompañado(s) de:

Mr. S. NMENGESHA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. W. TADESSE, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. E. GOTTA SEIFU, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ghana

Ms. C. BANNERMAN, Minister of Manpower Development and Employment.

substitute(s):

Mr. F. POKU, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

acompañado(s) de:

Ms. V. TETTEGAH, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

République islamique d’Iran Islamic Republic of Iran República Islámica del Irán

Mr. P. SA’ADATI, Director-General, International Relations Bureau, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

substitute(s):

Mr. KHAJEH NOURI, Deputy Minister for Labour Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

acompañado(s) de:

Mr. S. HEFDATAN, Labour Counsellor, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. M. A’BED, Senior Expert for Regional Activities, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. H. MAHAMMADZADEH, Labour Inspectorate Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Jordanie Jordan Jordania

Mr. S.A. MADI, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

acompañado(s) de:

Mr. W. OBEIDAT, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. S. DAJANI, Adviser, ILO issues.
Kenya

Mr. P. ODOYO, Assistant Minister, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.

substitute(s):

Ms. A. MOHAMED, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Mr. E. NGARE, Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. J. YIDAH, Assistant Labour Commissioner (ILO duties), Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.

Maroc  Morocco  Marruecos

M. O. HILALE, Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent, Mission permanente, Genève.

accompagné(s) de:

M. H. CHATER, Chef de la Division de la Réglementation et des Organismes internationaux.
Mme S. FAHIM, Chef de service au Ministère de l'Emploi.
Mme S. BOUASSA, Conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.

Niger  Niger  Niger

M. I. SAMAILA, Secrétaire général, Ministère de la Fonction publique et du Travail.

suppléant(s):

M. B. MAMADOU, Directeur général, Administration du Travail et de la Formation professionnelle, Ministère de la Fonction publique et du Travail.

Luxembourg  Luxembourg  Luxemburgo

M. J. ZAHLEN, Premier Conseiller de Gouvernement, Ministère du Travail et de l'Emploi.

suppléant(s):

Mme N. WELTER, Attachée de Gouvernement, Ministère du Travail et de l'Emploi.
M. G. TUNSCHE, Inspecteur principal, Ministère du Travail et de l'Emploi.

accompagné(s) de:

M. A. BERNS, Ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. M. GODEFROID, Premier Secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève.

Nouvelle-Zélande  New Zealand  Nueva Zelandia

Ms. R. STEFFENS, Manager, International Services, Department of Labour.

substitute(s):

Ms. D. TSE, Manager, New Zealand Immigration Service, Department of Labour.

accompagné by:

Mr. T. CAUGHLEY, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Malawi

Ms. A. SUMANI, Minister of Labour and Vocational Training.

substitute(s):

Mr. M. MONONGA, Principal Secretary for Labour and Vocational Training, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

accompanied by:

Mr. Z. KAMBUTO, Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.
Mr. A. AL-ABDUWANI, Adviser to the Minister for Manpower Planning, Ministry of Manpower.

Mr. K. LIM, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. S. ONG, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. A. GOSNAR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Mr. D. LEPATAN, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. Y. PORSCHWITZ, Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. S. RAMEL, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Mr. D. LEPATAN, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. Y. PORSCHWITZ, Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. V. MENON, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Mr. S. MANIAR, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. S. RAMEL, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Mr. D. LEPATAN, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. Y. PORSCHWITZ, Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. GOSNAR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. K. RIHAR BAJUK, Adviser, International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. GOSNAR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. K. RIHAR BAJUK, Adviser, International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. GOSNAR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. K. RIHAR BAJUK, Adviser, International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. GOSNAR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. K. RIHAR BAJUK, Adviser, International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. GOSNAR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. K. RIHAR BAJUK, Adviser, International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. GOSNAR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. K. RIHAR BAJUK, Adviser, International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. T. CESEN, Adviser, Employment Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.
Sr. L. FRANCESCHI, Diputado de la Asamblea Nacional.
Sr. H. LARREAL, Diputado de la Asamblea Nacional.
Sr. R. HANDS, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Viet Nam

Mr. NGO QUANG XUAN, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Mr. TRUONG TRIEU DUONG, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. VU HUY TAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Membres employeurs titulaires  Regular Employer members
Miembros empleadores titulares

M. B. BOISSON (France), Conseiller social, Mouvement des Entreprises de France (MEDEF).

Mr. A. DAHLAN (Saudi Arabia), Representative, Council of Saudi Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Sr. J. DE REGIL (México), Vicepresidente, Comisión de Trabajo, Confederación de Cámaras Industriales de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos.

Sr. D. FUNES DE RIOJA (Argentina), Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración de la OIT, Presidente del Departamento de Política Social, Unión Industrial Argentina (UIA).

Mr. E. HOFF (Norway), Director, International Employer Relations, Confederation of Norwegian Business and Industry.

Ms. R. HORNUNG-DRAUS (Germany), Director, European Affairs and International Social Policy, Confederation of German Employers’ Associations (BDA).

Mr. A. JEETUN (Mauritius), Director, Mauritius Employers’ Federation.

Mr. M. LAMBERT (United Kingdom), Human Resources Consultant.

M. A. M’KAISSI (Tunisie), Conseiller Directeur central, Union tunisienne de l’Industrie, du Commerce et de l’Artisanat (UTICA).

Mr. T. NILES (United States), President, United States Council for International Business.

Mr. B. NOAKES (Australia), Advisor, International Affairs, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Mr. T. SUZUKI (Japan), Managing Director, NIKKEIREN International Cooperation Center.

Mr. A. TABANI (Pakistan), President, Employers’ Federation of Pakistan.

M. Y. WADE (Sénégal), Président, Conseil national du Patronat du Sénégal.

Mr. A. AL TELAWI, accompanying Mr. Dahlan.
Mr. B. HEINZEMANN, accompanying Ms. Hornung-Draus.
Membres employeurs adjoints  Deputy Employer members
Miembros empleadores adjuntos

Mr. I. ANAND (India), Chairman, Shivathene Corporate Centre.

M. M. BARDE (Suisse), Secrétaire général, Fédération des syndicats patronaux.

Mr. J.W. BOTHA (South Africa), Business South Africa.

Mr. N. CHO (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, Korea Employers’ Federation.

Sr. B. DE ARBELOA (Venezuela), Promotores y Consultores Asociados.

Sr. F. DÍAZ GARAYCOA (Ecuador), Asesor Jurídico, Federación Nacional de Cámaras de Industrias del Ecuador.

Mr. O. EREMEEV (Russian Federation), Director-General, Coordinating Council of Employers’ Unions of Russia (CCEUR).

M. L. GLÉLÉ (Bénin), Président, Conseil national du Patronat du Bénin.

Mr. W.A. HILTON-CLARKE (Trinidad and Tobago), Vice-Chairman, Employers Consultative Association of Trinidad and Tobago.

Ms. L. HORVATIC (Croatia), Head of International Relations, Croatian Employers’ Association.

Ms. R. KARIKARI ANANG (Ghana), Executive Director, Ghana Employers’ Association.

Sr. J. LACASA ASO (España), Director, Departamento de Relaciones Internacionales, Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales (CEOE).

Mr. J. LAWSON (Canada), President, Canada Employers’ Council.

Mr. D. LIMA GODOY (Brazil), Vicepresident, Confederación Nacional de la Industria (CNI).

Mr. K. MATTAR (United Arab Emirates), Board Director, Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry.

M. E. MEGATELI (Algérie), Secrétaire général, Conféderation Générale des Opérateurs Economiques Algériens.

Mr. V.T. NATHAN (Malaysia), Vice President, Malaysian Employers’ Federation (MEF).

M. F. SANZOUANGO (Cameroun), Secrétaire général, Groupement interpatronal du Cameroun (GICAM).

Mme L. SASSO MAZZUFFERI (Italie), Conseiller spécial des Affaires internationales, Confédération générale des employeurs d’Italie, CONFINDEUSTRIA.
Membres travailleurs titulaires  Regular Worker members
Miembros trabajadores titulares

LORD BRETT (United Kingdom), Chairperson of the Governing Body of the ILO.

Ms. S. BURROW (Australia), President, Australian Council of Trade Unions.

Ms. B. BYERS (Canada), Executive Vice-President, Canadian Labour Congress.

Mr. U. EDSTRÖM (Sweden), Head of International Department, Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO-S).

Ms. U. ENGELEN-KEFER (Germany), Vice-President, German Confederation of Trade Unions (DGB).

Mr. S. ITO (Japan), Adviser, Japanese Trade Union Confederation – JTUC RENGO.

M. B. MAHAN GAHÉ (Côte d’Ivoire), Secrétaire général permanent, Confédération DIGNITE.

Mr. A. OSHIOMHOLE (Nigeria), President, Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC).

Mr. Z. RAMPAK (Malaysia), Secretary-General, Transport Workers’ Union.

M. A. SIDI SAÏD (Algérie), Secrétaire général, Union générale des Travailleurs algériens.

Mr. E. SIDOROV (Russian Federation), International Secretary, Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia (FNPR).

Mr. L. TROTMAN (Barbados), General Secretary, Barbados Workers’ Union.

Mr. J. VACCARI NETO (Brazil), Secretary-General, Central Unica dos Trabalhadores (CUT).

Mr. J. ZELLHOEFER (United States), European Representative, AFL-CIO European Office.

Ms. M. HAYASHIBARA, accompanying Mr. Ito.
Membres travailleurs adjoints  
Deputy Worker members
Miembros trabajadores adjuntos

Mr. N. ADYANTHAYA (India), Secretary, Indian National Trade Union Congress.

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

Sra. H. ANDERSON NEVÁREZ (México), Secretaria de Acción Femina del Comité, Confederación de Trabajadores de México.

M. G. ATTIGBE (Bénin), Secrétaire général, Centrale des Syndicats Autonomes du Bénin.

Mr. L. BASNET (Nepal), President, Nepal Trade Union Congress.

M. M. BLONDEL (France), Secrétaire général, Confédération Générale du Travail - Force Ouvrière (CGT-FO).

Mme C. BRIGHI (Italie), Assistant Director International, C.I.S.L.

Mr. B. CANAK (Serbia and Montenegro), President, United Branch Trade Unions, UGS - Nezavisnost.

Sr. R. DAER (Argentina), Secretario General, Confederación General del Trabajo.

Mme M. DE VITS (Belgique), Secrétaire générale, Fédération générale du Travail de Belgique.

Mme R. DIALLO (Guinée), Secrétaire générale, Confédération nationale des Travailleurs de Guinée (CNTG).

M. G. GHOSN (Liban), Président, Confédération générale des Travailleurs du Liban (CGTL).

M. S. KATALAY MULELI (Rép. Dém. du Congo), Président, Union nationale des Travailleurs du Congo (UNTC).

Mr. N. KHAN (Bangladesh), General Secretary, Bangladesh Jatiyatabadi Sramik Dal (BJSD).

Ms. C. PANDENI (Namibia), Treasurer, National Union of Namibian Workers (NUNW).

Mr. E. PATEL (South Africa), National Labour Convenor, COSATU.

Sr. J. URBIETA (Venezuela), Director General, Instituto de Altos Estudios Sindicales de la Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela.

Mr. T. WOJCICK (Poland), National Commission Member, Solidarnosc.

Mr. X. XU (China), Vice Chairman, All-China Federation of Trade Unions.

Mr. L. WANG, accompanying Mr. Xu.

Ms. L. XU, accompanying Mr. Xu.
Représentants d'autres États Membres de l'Organisation assistant à la session
Representatives of other member States of the Organization present at the session
Representantes de otros Estados Miembros de la Organización presentes en la reunión

**Australie**

| Mr. M. SMITH, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva. |
| Ms. A. GREY, Acting Assistant Secretary, Safety, Compensation and International Branch, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations. |
| Mr. L. BRODRICK, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva. |

**Astriche**

| Mr. P. STORER, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva. |

**Chili**

| Sr. J. VEGA, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra. |
| Sr. P. PRADEL, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra. |
| Sr. M. BARRERA, Agregado Laboral, Misión Permanente, Ginebra. |

**Colombie**

| Sr. F. SANTOS CALDERÓN, Vicepresidente de la República de Colombia. |
| Sr. D. PALACIO BETANCOURT, Ministro de la Protección Social. |

**Cuba**

| Sr. J. MORA GODOY, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra. |
| Sr. A. MENÉNDEZ, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra. |
| Sra. G. HERNÁNDEZ, Especialista del Ministerio del Trabajo y Seguridad Social |

**Danemark**

<p>| Ms. L. WANG KRISTENSEN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egypte</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Egipto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. N. GABR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. ROUSHDY, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Madagascar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. A. RAMBELOSON, Ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme Y. PASEA, Conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panama</th>
<th>Panamá</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sra. I. ROSAS PEREZ, Viceministra de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. A. BÉLIZ G., Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. X. ORTIZ, Asistente del Despacho de la Viceministra de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. N. DE MADURO, Asesora de Asuntos Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hongrie</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Hungría</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. P. KLEKNER, Head of Department, Ministry of Employment Policy and Labour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. L. FÁRI, Deputy Head of Department, Ministry of Employment Policy and Labour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. P. SZIRMAI, Co-President, National Association of Entrepreneurs and Employers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K. GYÖRGY, Member of the Executive Board of the National Confederation of Hungarian Metal Workers’ Unions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Z. HÓDI, Vice-president of the Federation of Hungarian Metal Workers’ Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. K. CSIMA SZALÓKINÉ, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pays-Bas</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Países Bajos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. L. BEETS, Director for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. E. WUBS, Directorate for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. A. KOOPMAN, Directorate for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. VAN RENSELAAR, United Nations Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. M. NOTEBOOM, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Israël</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Israel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Y. LEVY, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. WAXMAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pérou</th>
<th>Peru</th>
<th>Perú</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr. J. VOTO-BERNALES, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sra. J. SALINAS, Ministro, Representante Permanente Alterno, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Srita. E. BERAUN, Segunda Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

**Pologne  Poland  Polonia**

Mr. K. JAKUBOWSKI, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. S. PRZYGODZKI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. R. HENCZEL, Director, Legal and Treaty Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Ms. R. LEMIESZEWSKA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Suède  Sweden  Suecia**

Mr. B. JONZON, Director, Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.
Ms. K. WIKLUND, Counsellor, Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.
Ms. A. MIDDELMAN, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.

**Portugal**


**Slovaquie  Slovakia  Eslovaquia**

Mr. M. MÁJEK, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Suède  Sweden  Suecia**

Mr. B. JONZON, Director, Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.
Ms. K. WIKLUND, Counsellor, Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.
Ms. A. MIDDELMAN, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.

**Saint-Marin  San Marino  San Marino**

Mme H. ZEILER, Conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. R. INNOCENTINI, Stagiaire, Mission permanente, Genève.

**Suisse  Switzerland  Suiza**

Mme R. ADAM, Département des Affaires étrangères (DFAE).
M. R. VONOVIER, Mission permanente, Genève.

**Republique tchèque  Czech Republic  República Checa**

Mr. I. PINTÉR, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. P. POKORNY, Department for European Integration and International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

**Saint-Siège  The Holy See  Santa Sede**

Dr. P. GUTIÉRREZ, Conseiller technique, Mission permanente, Genève.
Thaïlande  Thailand  Tailandia

Ms. L. LAOHAPHAN, Ambassador,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. K. CHANDRAPRABHA, Minister,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. P. AMORNCHEWIN, Minister Counsellor
(Labour Affairs), Permanent Mission,
Geneva.
Mr. N. BALANKURA, First Secretary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Tunisie  Tunisia  Túnez

M. H. MANSOUR, Ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mlle S. AMMAR, Conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
Représentants d'organisations internationales gouvernementales  
Representatives of international governmental organizations  
Representantes de organizaciones internacionales gubernamentales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nations Unies</th>
<th>United Nations</th>
<th>Naciones Unidas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. SMITH-SERRANO, External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs Officer, Office of the Director-General.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Ms. M. HOUTART, Senior Technical Officer, Reintegration and Local Settlement Section. |
| Mr. M. LOFTUS, Senior Inter-Organisation Officer, Secretariat and Inter-Organisation Service. |

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

| Mr. E. BONEV, Senior Adviser. |
| Ms. V. QUOIDBACH, Programme Officer. |

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

| Mr. T. MASUKU, Director, FAO Liaison Office, Geneva. |
| Mr. P. KONANDREAS, Senior Liaison Officer, FAO Liaison Office, Geneva. |
| Mr. P. CALVI-PARISETTI, Consultant, FAO Liaison Office, Geneva. |

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

| Ms. C. GOLDEN, Programme Specialist, Division of Social Science Research and Policy. |

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

| Ms. N. YOUNES, Executive Director, External Relations and Governing Bodies. |
| Dr. B. KEAN, Director, Department of Governance. |
GB.286/PV

Dr. A. CASSELS, Director, Strategy Unit, Office of the Director-General.
Ms. C. ROSE-ODUYEMI, External Relations Officer, Department of Governance.

---

Banque Mondiale
World Bank
Banco Mundial

Mr. F. ZARCONE, Economist, Acting for the Special Representative to the UN and the WTO.
Mr. Z. TZANNATOS, Adviser of the Managing Director.

---

Organisation météorologique mondiale
World Meteorological Organization
Organización Meteorológica Mundial

Mr. C. WANG, External Relations Officer.

---

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

Mr. A. DI LISCIA, Assistant Director-General and Director.
Mr. B. CALZADILLA-SARMIENTO, Senior Adviser.

---

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

Ms. J. RISSANEN, External Relations Officer.

---

Organisation mondiale du commerce
World Trade Organization
Organización Mundial del Comercio

Mr. J. VIGANÓ, Counsellor, Trade and Environment Division.
Mr. K. FINGER, Counsellor, Economic Research Division.

---

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

Mr. R. PERRUCHOUD, Executive Officer, Legal Adviser, Office of the Director-General.
Mr. P. SCHATZER, Director, Department for External Relations, Senior Regional Adviser for Europe.
Mr. H. MOSTAFA, Senior Regional Adviser for the Middle East/South-West Asia, Egypt/Sudan and Special Envoy to the Gulf States.
Mr. J. OROPEZA, Regional Adviser for the Americas and Special Envoy to the Spanish Government.
Ms. M. KLEIN SOLOMON, Deputy Director, Migration Policy and Research Programme.
Ms. E. USHER, Senior Policy Advisor, Migration Policy and Research Programme.
Ms. S. NONNENMACHER, Technical Cooperation Assistant.
Ms. S. ASIMENYE KALINDE, Ambassador and Permanent Observer.
Mr. I. MENSA BONSU, Minister-Counsellor.

Organisation arabe du travail
Arab Labour Organization
Organización Arabe del Trabajo

Dr. I. GUIDER, Director-General.
Mr. M. AL-HUMSI, Counsellor, Assistant of the Head of ALO in Geneva.
Ms. A. HILAL, Permanent Delegation of the ALO in Geneva.

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

Mr. S. ALFARARGI, Ambassador, Permanent Observer.
Mr. M. MOUAKI BENANI, Counsellor.
Dr. O. EL-HAJJE, Member.

Organisation de coopération et de développement économiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
Organización de Cooperación y Desarroilo EconÓmicos

Mr. A. DALE, Head, Trade Policy Linkages Division.
Ms. E. ARNAL, Administrator, Employment Analysis and Policy Division.

Conseil de l'Europe
Council of Europe
Consejo de Europa

Ms. M. AKIP, Deputy Head of the Social Policy Department, Directorate General III - Social Cohesion.

Commission européenne
European Commission
Comisión Europea

Mme F. DEVONIC, Chef d’Unité, Direction générale de l’Emploi et des Affaires sociales.
Mme M. CONINSX, Ministre-Conseiller auprès de la Délégation de la Commission européenne à Genève.
M. C. DUFOUR, Membre de la Délégation de la Commission européenne à Genève.
Représentants d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales
assistant à titre d'observateurs
Representatives of international non-governmental organizations as observers
Representantes de organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales presentes
con carácter de observadores

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

Mr. D. CUNNIAH, Director, Geneva Office.
Ms. A. BIONDI, Assistant Director, Geneva Office.
Ms. M. BELLAMY, Assistant, Geneva Office.

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

M. E. ESTÈVEZ, Secrétaire général adjoint.
Mme B. FAUCHÈRE, Représentante permanente.
M. H. SEA, Représentant permanent adjoint.
M. J. GOMEZ ESGUERRA.

Fédération syndicale mondiale
World Federation of Trade Unions
Federación Sindical Mundial

M. R. CARDONA, Deputy General Secretary.
Ms. A. AVELLA, Adviser, Geneva Office.

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

Mr. A. PEÑALOSA, Secretary-General.
Mr. B. WILTON, Deputy Secretary-General.
Mr. S. DE SILVA, Senior Adviser.

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

Mr. H. SUNMONU, Secretary-General.
Mr. M. ABUZEID, Permanent Representative to the ILO and UN Mission in Geneva.
Mr. D. DIOP, Assistant Secretary-General in charge of International and Organization Departments.
Association internationale de la sécurité sociale
International Social Security Association
Asociación Internacional de la Seguridad Social

Mr. D. HOSKINS, Secretary-General.
Mr. Y. D’HAENE, Chef du Service Développement, Communication et Recherche.
Mr. W. MCGILLIVRAY, Chef du Service Etudes et Opérations.

* * *