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Preface

With the adoption in June 1999 of the ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, No. 182, eliminating the worst forms of child labour has been set as the priority of national and international action toward the total abolition of child labour.

Child labour and the worst forms of exploitation exist everywhere. The Caribbean is no exception. While the true nature and extent of the problem might not yet be known, efforts must be made to prevent new children from suffering and to find and help those that are. Pressures on the economies, the social fabric of the region and a growing tourist trade can lead to increased risk of child labour. Without a renewed commitment to quality education, many children and their families may succumb to other temptations and exploitation.

To address these concerns and make Convention No. 182 known in the region, the ILO organized the ILO Caribbean Tripartite Meeting on the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Kingston, Jamaica, from 6 to 7 December, 1999. This publication contains the proceedings and conclusions of that Meeting.

The real work now begins to follow-up those conclusions. It is hoped that governments in the region will move quickly towards ratification of Convention No. 182 and effective implementation in practice. We trust that this publication will provide guidance in this process.

Willi Momm
Director
ILO Caribbean Office

Frans Röselaers
Director
InFocus Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
Part one: The problem of child labour - Overview

The ILO estimates that in developing countries alone, about 250 million children between the ages of five and 14 years work in economic activity and at least 120 million of these children work full-time. Africa has the highest incidence of child labour with approximately 41 per cent of children between the ages of five and 14 working, compared to 22 per cent in Asia and 17 per cent in Latin America and the Caribbean. Latin America and the Caribbean account for about 7 per cent of the global figure. More boys than girls work. Surveys, however, do not take into account domestic work in one's own household or caring for sick or disabled family members. More girls than boys perform this type of work. If such work were taken into account, there would be little or no variation among the sexes in the total number of working children, and the number of working girls might exceed that of boys.

Of the 250 million working children, approximately 50 to 60 million between the ages of five and 11 are working in circumstances that could be termed hazardous considering their ages and vulnerability. In some cases nearly 70 per cent of working children are engaged in hazardous work. From five per cent to more than 20 per cent of working children suffer actual injuries or illnesses; some have to stop working permanently. Recent surveys at the national level have demonstrated that a very high proportion of working children are physically injured or fall ill while working.

In many countries, including in the sub-region, data on working children either do not exist or are incomplete, since traditional survey methodologies often do not cover the hidden activities of school age children. The ILO has developed and tested comprehensive child labour surveys, special modules, and in collaboration with UNICEF, rapid assessment techniques to address the deficiencies in information on the true nature and extent of child labour.

Hazards children face at work

Children toil for long hours in fields, factories and private homes, in small workshops and garages, in mines and quarries, and in situations that are dangerous or hazardous to their health and development. They are also bought and sold, forced to work in conditions of slavery and engaged in prostitution, pornography and other illicit activities.

Child labour on average is twice as high in rural as in urban areas. It is estimated that 70 per cent of all working children are engaged in agriculture. Occupational health and safety experts consider agriculture to be among the most dangerous of occupations. Climatic exposure, work that is too heavy for young bodies and accidents such as cuts from sharpened tools are some of the hazards children face. Modern agricultural methods bring further hazards in their wake, use of toxic chemicals and motorized equipment, usually without the benefit of training or safety precautions. While generally found only in larger agricultural enterprises, small family farms also increasingly make use of such methods. The hazards associated with agriculture are numerous, and this is reflected in the number of injuries and illnesses recorded for children working in this sector. In many
countries the hazards and risks to health are compounded by poor access to health facilities and education, poor housing and sanitation, and inadequate diets of rural workers.

Children in domestic service are among the most vulnerable and exploited of all. These children are the most difficult to protect as they are largely invisible, hidden and ignored. Most come from extremely poor or single-parent families, or have been abandoned or orphaned. Improved statistical survey methods pioneered by the ILO indicate that the practice is widespread. In Indonesia, for example, an estimated 5 million children are in domestic service, and 20 per cent of all Brazilian, Colombian, and Ecuadorean girls between the ages of ten and 14 work as domestics. In rural areas the percentages rise, for example, in Brazil 36 per cent of girls between the ages of ten and 14 work as domestics; in Colombia, it is 32 per cent; and in Ecuador, as many as 44 per cent of girls of this age group work as domestics. (3)

Another abhorrent situation is the use of children in illicit activities such as the sale and trafficking of drugs. Children can be engaged in the process at different levels, from smuggling drugs across borders to selling drugs on the street. Children are often exposed to violence and are given weapons to use, such as firearms. Some children are lured into the drug trade by getting them to use drugs and then maintaining their participation by paying them with drugs. Other children may be induced to sell drugs for the financial gains it promises.

The commercial sexual exploitation of children is one of the most brutal forms of violence against them. Even more worrying is that there are indications that the problem is on the rise. Child victims suffer physical, psychological and emotional abuse. They are exposed to sexually transmitted diseases such as HIV/AIDS. They are often introduced to drugs to control them, further endangering their lives and making recovery difficult. Younger and younger children are being sought in the belief that they will be free of HIV/AIDS, yet it is they who are most likely to be infected since younger persons have greater biological vulnerability to sexually transmitted diseases. Both girls and boys are subject to exploitation in prostitution and pornography. Sex tourism has led to an increase in the number of boy victims.

The effects of hazardous work and conditions on children can be devastating, causing irreversible damage to their psychological, physical and physiological development. The impact of physically strenuous work such as carrying heavy loads or being forced to adopt unnatural positions at work can permanently distort or disable growing bodies. There is evidence that children suffer more readily from chemical hazards and radiation than adults, and that they have less resistance to diseases. Children are also much more vulnerable than adults to physical, sexual and emotional abuse, and suffer more devastating psychological damage from living and working in an environment in which they are denigrated or oppressed. Thus, the assessment of the dangers of child labour go beyond the relatively limited concept of work hazard as applied to adults and includes the developmental aspects of childhood.
Child labour in the Caribbean

The reports prepared by the participants to the ILO Caribbean Tripartite Meeting on the Worst Forms of Child Labour and the discussions during the Meeting indicate that an unknown number of children are working in the sub-region, sometimes in violation of national law and international standards. Children in the Caribbean are reported to be working in agriculture, selling on the street, involved in the drug trade, and in domestic work. They are also exploited in prostitution and pornography. There is a lack of data, however, on the numbers involved, or how many can be considered to be involved in activities that would fall under the ILO's new Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention. The potential threats from a growing tourism industry are sometimes ignored or misunderstood and certain forms of entertainment, such as go go clubs, exploit girls. There is a sense in some countries that the problem is small or does not exist. An increased awareness to what might be going on, what can happen and keen attention to prevention is thus necessary.

The participants in the Meeting concluded that in addition to quick ratification of Convention No. 182, efforts at awareness raising and data collection were needed, as well as strong government leadership and the commitment from the social partners and civil society to determine the extent and nature of the problem and to join action against child labour in the region.

ILO action against child labour

ILO activities include adopting international standards and supervising their implementation, carrying out research and analysis, disseminating information, creating public awareness, mobilizing a worldwide movement against child labour, assisting countries in the development of policy and law and carrying out direct action to remove children from hazardous situations and rehabilitate them. The ILO also assists and strengthens the ability of employers' and workers' organizations to become involved, as well as other parts of civil society.

International standards provide the broad framework for national legal and practical action. The most comprehensive standards are the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 183) and its accompanying Recommendation, No. 146. Given the persistence of child labour in the world and the serious hazards and violation of human rights associated with much of it, the International Labour Conference adopted the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182) and Recommendation No. 190, to complement the earlier standards and set elimination of the worst forms as priority for national and international action.

National policy development and practical action is assisted by the ILO through its International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC).

The International Programme on the Elimination of
Child Labour (IPEC)

The ILO's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (5) is the world's largest technical cooperation programme on child labour. It works by strengthening national capacities to address the problem of child labour and by creating a worldwide movement to combat it. Support is given to partner organizations to develop and implement measures which aim at preventing child labour, removing children from hazardous work, providing for their rehabilitation and social reintegration, and providing alternatives for them and their families.

Member States express their political will and commitment to address child labour by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with IPEC. Steering committees are set up at the national level to develop policies and programmes to be carried out in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, NGOs and other concerned groups in society. Action in preparation for full participation in IPEC is also carried out in a large number of countries.

To address the need for sound information for the development of policies and programmes and their effective monitoring, the ILO has set up the Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC). The intent is not only to refine methodologies for conducting child labour surveys, but also to maintain data banks of institutions, projects, legislation and other information necessary for evaluating and designing effective policies and programmes to combat child labour. In the aftermath of a recent training workshop on child labour survey methodologies (6), several countries in the Caribbean will participate with SIMPOC in improving their data collection on child labour.

Future action

Much has been achieved in the past few years in raising the awareness of world public opinion, governments and powerful interest groups to the scourge of child labour, and in deepening understanding of its causes and consequences. It is now increasingly recognized that the fight against child labour is inevitable and irreversible. The children of the Global March against Child Labour (7) propelled a global movement expressing great hopes and expectations for a better future for children around the world. The challenge now is to ensure that these hopes and expectations are not disappointed and that a brighter future awaits the world's children.

The participants at the ILO Caribbean Tripartite Meeting on the Worst Forms of Child Labour committed themselves upon return to their countries to seek early ratification of Convention No. 182. The conclusions of that Meeting were also presented to the Third Meeting of the Council for Human and Social Development (COHSOD) of CARICOM. The Council urged member States to ratify all ILO core Conventions including Convention No. 182.
ILO support is also planned for activities in Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname. The social partners are also being encouraged to undertake awareness raising and promotional campaigns. The ILO has made ratification and effective implementation of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, No. 182, a priority. The ILO Director-General, Mr. Juan Somavia has said,

"With this Convention, we now have the power to make the urgent eradication of the worst forms of child labour a new global cause. This cause must be expressed, not in words, but deeds, not in speeches, but in policy and law".


(5) Visit the ILO's website: www.ilo.org/childlabour. Current programming activities in the ILO will bring together all ILO activities on child labour under an InFocus Programme on child labour, retaining the designation of IPEC.


(7) The Global March began in 1997 as a broad alliance of civil society, including non-governmental organizations, workers' organizations and child rights and human rights groups. Members of the March travelled through Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and North America demonstrating against child labour, for education and for the new Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour. Representatives of the March addressed the delegates to both the 1998 and 1999 International Labour Conference.
Part two: Introduction to the Meeting and opening ceremony

The ILO Caribbean Office and the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour of the ILO organized the Caribbean Tripartite Meeting on the Worst Forms of Child Labour in collaboration with the Jamaican Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport. The Meeting was held from December 6 to 7, 1999 in Kingston, Jamaica.

Objectives of the meeting

- inform representatives of government, workers’ and employers’ organizations about the provisions of the new ILO Convention concerning the prohibition and immediate action for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour (No. 182) and their respective roles under the new Convention
- provide for an exchange of views about the problem of child labour
- determine the necessary action to ensure rapid ratification of Convention No. 182
- begin a sub-regional assessment of what is known about child labour, national legislative frameworks and policy initiatives

Participants

Tripartite delegations were invited from Antigua & Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago. The Secretariat of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the British Department for International Development (DFID) sent observers. A list of participants is provided in Annex 6.

Opening ceremony

Mr. Anthony Irons, Permanent Secretary in the Jamaican Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport, welcomed delegates and chaired the opening session.

Mr. Willi Momm, Director of the ILO Caribbean Office placed the meeting in the context of the ongoing negotiations at the World Trade Organization and the debate about linking trade and labour standards. The full text of the speech is reproduced in Annex 1.

Senator Leroy Trotman, representing the Caribbean Congress of Labour (CCL) congratulated the Minister, The Honorable Portia Simpson-Miller, for having spoken out in ILO fora and for trying to develop a common Caribbean position on child labour matters. Equally, he commended the ILO for recognizing that the Caribbean needed to protect its moral and social fabric by preventing the problem of child labour from becoming out of hand. If prevention were to be effective, however, states needed to guarantee the right to education and equality of opportunity regardless of colour, gender or sexual orientation. Further, he pointed to the need to enhance the political leverage of the ministries of labour in the region.
Mr. Walton Hilton Clarke, Vice-President of the Caribbean Employers' Confederation (CEC), thanked Senator Trotman, who served as the Workers' Vice-Chairperson on the International Labour Conferences' Committee on Child Labour, for his contribution to the successful adoption of the ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour. He noted the importance of the Meeting and the need for the Caribbean to look inward in order to move from plans into measurable results. None of the employers should be content as long as some persons were employing or exploiting children in any of the worst forms of child labour. It was crucial to disseminate the findings of the Meeting, as child labour was often highly secretive and presented a great challenge to regional actors to move from words to action.

Mr. Frans Röselaers, Director of the ILO’s International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), stated that child labour was the principal cause of exploitation and abuse of children. Child labour robbed children of their health, education and even their lives. It had many faces. For example, children were found digging in mines, sold into bonded labour and toiling long hours as domestic workers. Mr. Röselaers drew attention to the children in the Caribbean who spent their days wiping windshields to earn money or doing back-breaking agricultural work and to those who were working in more hidden situations, such as in domestic service. These hidden forms of work were done most often by girls.

In view of these facts, global concern and consensus on the need to do something against child labour was growing. He referred to the Global March Against Child Labour and the unanimous adoption in 1999 of the new ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour. In addition to the specific ILO Conventions on child labour, the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work provided a further and much broader framework for the elimination of child labour.

Mr. Röselaers focussed attention on the following goals for the Meeting:

- to discuss the process of ratification of Convention No. 182, the possible obstacles to ratification and assistance needed to facilitate ratification, as well as implementation
- to learn about the characteristics of the child labour problem in the Caribbean and to explore follow-up collaboration on a national basis
- to consider the setting up of a sub-regional education programme jointly with other UN organizations, such as UNICEF and UNESCO to focus on preventing child labour

Ms. Majorie Taylor, Ambassador and Special Envoy for Children in the Jamaican Ministry of Health, commended the ILO on the opportune time for hosting the Meeting as the issue of child rights was only just becoming accepted in Jamaican society. Formerly, the welfare of children was largely left to the discretion of parents who, at times, saw nothing wrong, for example, in taking children out of school on Fridays, when their help was needed. The problem of prostitution was only now coming to the forefront.

Ms. Taylor noted the outdated nature of Jamaica's Juvenile Act which allowed children to work as early as 12 years of age. She also welcomed the draft legislation on child
protection that was currently being debated. Against the background of growing national awareness, the restructuring of the Government's children's services and intensified cooperation with international agencies, she saw this as a good basis for early ratification of the new ILO Convention.

In her keynote address, the Honorable Portia Simpson-Miller, Minister of Labour, Social Security and Sport welcomed all participants and commended the organizers of the Meeting on their foresight. She stressed that the decision to focus on the worst forms of child labour sent a clear message to protect the welfare of society's most vulnerable members and to take the necessary action urgently.

Minister Simpson-Miller pointed out that the Caribbean challenge was special since little was known about the full extent of these worst forms of child labour in Caribbean societies. She acknowledged that such forms of child labour were usually `hidden' and that poverty was one of the main contributing factors. She argued that the growing numbers of street children were potential victims of these forms of exploitation and that there was a need for greater social consciousness of the problem. Accordingly, a much better and more coordinated policy response was needed, together with comprehensive legal reform in order to put an end to conflicting signals about statutory age or conditions under which children may work.

To meet this challenge, Minister Simpson-Miller called for a massive investment initiative so that public budgets, corporate sponsorship and international support could be enlarged. An attack on poverty was required to help build skills, change attitudes and create the necessary framework for improving educational strategies. She stressed her high expectations and the need for new commitments as well as revamped strategies that would lead towards an effective social contract for the protection of children.

Mr. James Williams, Permanent Secretary at the Ministry of Education, Labour and Social Security, in Saint Kitts and Nevis, gave the vote of thanks.
Part three: International perspective

International labour standards and the new ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (No. 182)

Mr. Geir Myrstad, Senior Programme Officer at IPEC, chaired the first session on international standards on child labour.

Ms. Michele Jankanish, Senior Specialist on International Labour Standards and Labour Law in the ILO Caribbean Office, placed the new Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 in the context of the broader problem of child labour and existing international standards (see Annex 2). One of the most important tools available to the ILO for improving the legislation and practice of its member States in the fight against child labour was the adoption and supervision of international labour Conventions and Recommendations.

The ILO adopted its first Convention on child labour in the year of its formation, 1919, the Minimum Age (Industry) Convention, (No. 5). Subsequently, a number of sectoral Conventions on the minimum age of admission to employment were adopted. In 1973, the ILO consolidated the principles in the Minimum Age Convention, (No. 138) and its accompanying Recommendation No. 146. These applied to all sectors of economic activity, whether or not the children were employed for wages. The Convention contained flexibility provisions which acknowledged different levels of development and a progressive approach toward the total elimination of child labour.

The new Convention did not revise or replace Convention No. 138, but complemented it. While Convention No. 138 set standards of minimum age for admission to employment or work, the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 focussed on the need for immediate action to prohibit and eliminate the worst forms of child labour. The basic obligation of ratifying States was to take immediate and effective measures to prohibit and eliminate the worst forms of child labour as a matter of urgency for all those under 18 years of age. Urgency of action was emphasized as the forms of child labour covered by the Convention were those that could not be tolerated in any country, regardless of the level of development.
The "worst forms of child labour" comprise:

(a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labour, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict

(b) the use, procurement or offering of a child for prostitution, production of pornography or pornographic performances

(c) the use, procurement or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs

(d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it was carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children

The Convention set out the process for determining which work was likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children and directed that consideration be given to those hazards spelled out in the Recommendation. The Convention also obliged ratifying States to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of the Convention, including the provision and application of sanctions, penal or otherwise. The orientation to preventive and practical action was illustrated by Article 7, Paragraph 2, which required States, taking into account the importance of education in eliminating child labour, to take effective and time-bound measures to:

(a) prevent the engagement of children in the worst forms of child labour

(b) provide the necessary and appropriate direct assistance for the removal of children from the worst forms of child labour and for their rehabilitation and social integration

(c) ensure access to free basic education, and wherever possible and appropriate, vocational training, for all children removed from the worst forms of child labour

(d) identify and reach out to children at special risk and

(e) take account of the special situation of girls

Preventing children from falling into the worst forms of child labour was key. At the same time, removal of those children already found in the worst forms was urgent and was to be accompanied by attention to their need for rehabilitation. Because of the particular vulnerability of girls and their often hidden work situations, the new standards made specific mention of the need to take account of their situation in designing preventive, removal and rehabilitative measures. Outreach to other children at special risk was also provided for.
The Convention also required the development or designation of monitoring mechanisms to be decided upon after consultation with workers' and employers' organizations. To further ensure effective action, countries were to design and implement programmes of action to eliminate the worst forms of child labour as a priority. The Recommendation provided that such programmes should aim at prevention, removal, rehabilitation and social integration, through measures to address the educational, physical and psychological needs of children. Furthermore, attention should be given to younger children, the girl child, hidden work situations and children with special vulnerabilities or needs. Communities where children were at special risk should be particularly targeted. In addition, society in general should be mobilized through raising awareness.

Finally, the Convention called for member States to cooperate and assist each other. This reinforced the sentiment that all countries were concerned with children trapped in the worst forms of child labour no matter where they might be. In addition, while urgent action was required, there was also the commitment to finding longer-term solutions to the poverty and lack of educational opportunities that led children into intolerable work situations. The donor community was invited to play a critical role in assisting countries with eliminating the worst forms of child labour.

Recommendation No. 190 elaborated further on the hazards which would constitute the worst forms of child labour; the type of data to be collected; effective enforcement measures and the need to cooperate with international efforts to control the cross-border aspects of the worst forms of child labour; ways to address the legal, social and economic needs of the affected children and their families; and awareness raising, mobilization and training activities.

The new Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour - Challenges for the Caribbean

Mr. Leroy Trotman, President of the ICFTU and Member of the Governing Body of the ILO, focussed on challenges for the Caribbean and the significance of addressing child labour, in particular its worst forms. The requirements for education and training had dramatically changed over time - people could no longer be seen merely as tools. He warned against the societal dangers of maintaining certain traditions and cultures that nurtured privilege or class.

Mr. Trotman pointed to the complex sources of child labour: poverty, "vulgar capitalism", suspended human values as well as human greed and perversity. He welcomed the provisions of the new ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour, which drew an important line against unacceptable exploitation. However, he stressed the difficulty of making Caribbean people accept that the region did indeed have a problem. In order to protect and develop the region's human resources, children needed to benefit from improved education. Efforts should also focus on an awareness raising campaign which would anticipate problems and seek to prevent deteriorating economic and social conditions.
Further, countries of the Caribbean needed to step up their political will so that they could ratify the relevant Conventions and put in place necessary legislative reforms. The region should be made aware of the important provisions of the Convention and should receive necessary incentives to develop its human resources. As a result of the Meeting, he would welcome the beginning of pilot activities in Jamaica as well as in other Caribbean countries. However, he again emphasized that the entire educational system ought to be upgraded and provided with a new regulatory mechanism which would no longer make distinctions on the basis of social class.

In the discussion a number of questions were raised concerning assistance to poor working children and the consequence of removing them from work. The ILO representatives responded by emphasizing the principle of "nobody loses" which was based on rehabilitation, education and a secure family income. Based on ILO experience in removing children from child labour and providing for their educational needs, for example, an environment had to be created to build the self-confidence of the children before they could return to formal education. The rehabilitative process might be supported through non-formal programmes before children were put back into the mainstream of the regular school system. Depending on the age and situation of the child, various education or training alternatives might be appropriate. Efforts were also made to replace lost income. Ideally, an unemployed family member could take up the former work of the child, but if this was not possible, direct or indirect support for schooling could be considered. There were many approaches and considerations to be given to possible action, but the goal was always to make the child better off through interventions. In some cases not involving the worst forms of child labour, transition measures could be provided, such as improved conditions of work.

The role and involvement of NGOs and other members of civil society were also discussed. The Convention gave priority to consultations with workers’ and employers’ organizations, while the views of other concerned groups were to be considered in national programmes of action. The necessity for greater dialogue with civil society was strongly underlined by the participants and the important role of NGOs recognized. This was coupled, however, with concerns expressed by workers’ organizations about the representativeness of some non-governmental institutions in civil society and that some were not dedicated to the principles of the ILO.

**Group work - Ratification and implementation of Convention No. 182**

The first session of group work was conducted with groups comprising government, employer, and worker participants. The following questions were considered by each group:

- what steps could be taken by governments, employers’ and workers’ organizations to initiate, as quickly as possible, the ratification process of Convention No. 182?
- what role could each group play toward effective implementation of the Convention?
Governments' views

The government representatives concluded that to initiate the ratification process, national consultations with all members of society should be held with a view to preparing a draft document on ratification for presentation to Cabinet. To prevent child labour from spreading, improvements in the labour inspection functions of the ministries of labour needed to be complemented by general improvements in education.

Workers' views

The workers' representatives stated that more awareness raising was necessary about the worst forms of child labour which would lead to improved networking between relevant actors. This had to be supported by enhanced data collection and the establishment of national as well as regional monitoring systems that needed also to target schools and workplaces. Trade unions in general should be used as fora for lobbying, and teachers' unions, in particular, should be considered as potential monitoring agents. Moreover, governments should be pressured to take a more proactive stance that included the provision of improved employment opportunities for adults.

Employers' views

The employers' representatives agreed that in order to initiate the ratification process, the relevant issues should be referred to the appropriate tripartite bodies for further study and consultation. The private sector should lobby relevant government officials who should recommend ratification of Convention No.182.

The ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)

The approach of IPEC

Mr. Frans Röselers, Director of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) outlined the approach of the ILO to child labour. He pointed out that the ILO had a three-pronged approach, namely standard setting, technical cooperation and advocacy. Concerning technical cooperation, IPEC was the ILO's 'operational arm'. Thirty-three countries had signed a Memorandum of Understanding since the programme's inception in 1992. Currently, 22 donors supported the Programme.

The structure of IPEC consisted of collaborative frameworks at both the national and sub-regional level. Based on a Memorandum of Understanding, representatives of the implementing government agencies, workers' and employers' organizations as well as other non-governmental organizations formed a National Steering Committee (NSC). The NSC together with a National Programme Coordinator, provided the key structure at the national level. At the sub-regional level, technical advisers coordinated regional activities with a special focus, such as on tourism in Eastern Africa, footwear in South Asia or commercial agriculture in Southern and Eastern Africa.
Goals and steps of IPEC

IPEC's strategy is multi-sectoral and phased. Its aim is to strengthen the capacity of partner organizations to address the complex child labour problem. Its goals and steps include:

- motivate ILO constituents to engage in a dialogue on child labour and to create problem solving alliances
- carry out situational analyses to document the nature and magnitude of child labour in a given country
- assist the concerned parties in devising national policies to address specific child labour problems
- strengthen the existing organizations and set up institutional mechanisms to guarantee national 'ownership' of the programme on child labour
- create greater awareness of the problem in the community and at the workplace
- promote the development and application of protective legislation
- support direct action with (potential) child workers to demonstrate that it was possible to prevent children at risk from entering the workforce prematurely and to withdraw working children from exploitative and hazardous work
- reproduce and expand successful projects in order to integrate their strong points into the regular programmes of a country's social partners
- integrate child labour issues systematically into social and economic development policies, programmes and budgets

In view of the complex nature of child labour and the difficulty of eliminating it overnight, IPEC gave top priority to ending the worst forms of child labour. Priority action concerned children working under forced labour conditions or in bondage, children in hazardous working conditions and children who were particularly vulnerable, such as very young working children under 12 years of age.

ILO's Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC)

SIMPOC was created to improve the information base and data collection methodology on child labour. SIMPOC was launched in 1998 as an interdepartmental programme, managed by IPEC with technical assistance from the ILO's Bureau of Statistics, to assist its member countries in establishing the following:

(a) a programme for the collection, use and dissemination of tabulated and raw quantitative and qualitative data that allows for the study of the scale, distribution, characteristics, causes and consequences of child labour

(b) a basis for child labour data analysis which would be used in planning, formulating and implementing multi-sectoral integrated interventions, monitoring their implementation, and assessing the impact of policies and programmes
(c) a database on child labour consisting of quantitative and qualitative information on institutions and organizations that are active in this field, child labour projects and programmes, industry-level action, and national legislation and indicators which would be updated on a continuing basis whenever new information became available.

(d) comparability of data across countries

**Cooperation with other agencies**

The ILO was actively exploring the possibilities for enhanced joint action as well as capacity building with UNICEF. A framework had been developed for a joint IPEC/UNICEF inter-regional initiative on child labour in domestic service. A project on data collection and analysis of child labour would soon start operations under the auspices of the ILO, UNICEF and the World Bank.

**IPEC in the Caribbean**

In closing, Mr. Rösgelaers summarized areas for potential IPEC support as follows:

a) networking, social mobilization and sub-regional initiatives

b) research and the identification of the worst forms of child labour

c) country programmes
Part four: Regional and national trends and experience

UNICEF: The socio-economic experience of children in the Caribbean

The Representative of UNICEF in Jamaica, Ms. Afshan Khan, quoted ILO estimates for 1995, where some 7.6 million children between the ages of 10-14 were thought to be working in Latin America and the Caribbean. She argued that there were several reasons for the participation of children in labour and that poverty was not sufficient to explain child labour. Other factors, such as cultural norms and attitudes affected the perception of the role of children. Furthermore, from a political point of view, child labour existed simply because neither the state nor civil society had done enough in terms of policies and programmes for eradicating it.

In the Caribbean, global economic trends, such as the looming collapse of preferential trade and a decline in the competitiveness of major agricultural exports were leading to unemployment and other manifestations of social disintegration. Other factors affecting increases in poverty included increased competition in the light manufacturing sector, serious deficiencies in human skills development, inadequacies of existing safety nets, restricted access to traditional emigration centers as well as the emergence of a violent drug culture. Moreover, the quality of education was increasingly being questioned as performance indicators for school leavers continued to be poor and the acquisition of skills minimal. The problem partly rested with the school curriculum and instructional methodologies which were often irrelevant to the life experiences of Caribbean children. Child labour, therefore, was the result of the interplay between complex macroeconomic trends, inadequate legislative frameworks and institutions, and socio-economic family circumstances.

Existing poverty assessments and some of the situation analyses done by UNICEF indicated that there was a correlation between certain high risk groups affected by poverty and the incidence of child labour. High risk groups included rural landless farmers, single female-headed households and urban squatter communities. Children in rural communities, especially those in banana producing states, often helped with agricultural work and frequently had only limited access to school. Single female-headed households were prevalent throughout the region and circumstances sometimes required girl children to stay at home to take care of younger siblings while mothers went out to work.

By way of further examples, Ms. Khan referred to urban squatter communities in Guyana where children had increasingly turned to the streets and also reports about child prostitution in Trinidad and Tobago. She also pointed to both Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Dominica where children were said to be scavenging from solid waste dumps, and Suriname where documented evidence existed of children engaged in economic activities. In 1994, results from an National survey on child labour in Jamaica (incomplete) revealed that 4.6 per cent, or just over 22,000 children under age 16 were working.
Ms. Khan said that work which exposed children to exploitative forms of labour (such as full-time work at too early an age, work which exerted undue physical, social or psychological stress, or work which hampered access to education) threatened their full social and psychological development. On the contrary, light work that involved activities whereby children acquired life skills or improved their nutrition and self-esteem could be beneficial. However, the denial of the basic human right to freedom and dignity posed a serious risk to social investment since such children might well be incapable of assuming responsible social roles in the future. Consequently, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the ILO Minimum Age Convention (No. 138), and the ILO's new Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (No. 182) were the essential bases for guiding policy and protecting children from such work.

Ms. Khan stated that there was a serious deficiency in child labour-related research and data collection in the Caribbean. She characterized the regional data situation as not reliable, comparable nor periodic in nature. She underlined the strong interest in creating a module for household surveys to collect pertinent information on the subject and to systematize the dissemination of statistics. However, in addition to monitoring compliance with existing agreements, specific research projects were needed to identify alternatives to rural and domestic child labour in the region.

As elements of a necessary strategy, Ms. Khan proposed legislative reviews for harmonization of existing laws, the stimulation of micro-enterprise development and other forms of assistance in vulnerable communities, targeted support for underachieving students at primary level or out-of-school youth, and greater advocacy for the enforcement of existing legislation on compulsory education and child labour. In closing, she called for a broad multi-pronged programme surpassing conventional partners with the overall objective of promoting a culture of rights and alliances to protect children from all forms of hazardous work.

**Working with street children in Jamaica: The experience of Children First**

Ms. Claudette Pious, Executive Director of the non-governmental organization, Children First, summarized its origins and approach. She pointed out that Children First was Jamaica's largest NGO working with "children out of place". It pursued a holistic approach in its attempt to improve the life chances and rights of children.

With the input of the children, Children First assisted in devising 'personal plans' for the children. The plans centered around remedial education programmes, counselling, youth advocacy, environmental education and skills training. So far, about 648 children had benefitted and the approach had successfully moved away from a focus on welfare to a developmental one that aimed to get children better prepared for the global market place. She called for a 'cost-benefit-analysis' to measure the effects from children working versus the costs of supporting initiatives such as Children First.

Ms. Pious warned that some of the worst forms of child labour, such as child prostitution and drug pushing, were a sad reality. According to her assessment, in Jamaica, much of
this might occur in the context of minors involved in "go go dancing" or the sexual exploitation of domestic workers. Therefore, the preventive work of Children First included an apprenticeship programme and entrepreneurial training such as hairdressing, photography, sewing, art and crafts. The programme also provided information about sexually transmitted diseases.

In the past, the Government of Jamaica, the United States Agency for International Development, the Embassy of the Netherlands, UNICEF and Save the Children, among others, had contributed to the programme. Despite seasonal support from community members and other income-generating activities, financial difficulties persisted. In closing, Ms. Pious expressed her willingness to have the experience of Children First explored as a potential model for the region.

Child labour in the Caribbean: Country profiles

Ms. Suné Bethelmy, representing the Ministry of Labour and Co-operatives from Trinidad and Tobago, chaired a panel discussion with representatives from Belize, Guyana and Jamaica, who made presentations on their country experiences concerning child labour. This was followed by discussion and summaries of the situation in the other countries represented at the Meeting.(8)

Belize

Ms. Margarita Burrowes noted that while Belize had not ratified the ILO's Minimum Age Convention (No. 138), the general principles were recognized in the Families and Children's Act.(9)

The age for compulsory schooling covered those between the ages of five and 14. However, she identified the main challenge for Belize as the lack of reliable statistics on working children and sufficient manpower in the Labour Department to monitor the situation. Furthermore, no available programmes for drop-outs from primary schools existed and the situation of migrant children compounded the problem.

As reported in the country paper prepared for the Meeting, it was the general belief that there was a problem of child labour in Belize. This impression, however, was based on mere observation of children's activities and available statistical information on the educational status of children in Belize. Especially in rural areas, children were reported to be engaged in agricultural work in the sugar cane, citrus, bananas and rice industries, on small family farms/plots and in small businesses.

The Government of Belize viewed the situation with grave concern since the development and welfare of the country depended to a great extent on its ability to provide the highest possible level of education and skills training for the young population. As of April 1999 persons below the age of 18 years comprised 50 per cent of the population.
The diverse cultural and ethnic composition of Belize society had also complicated the issue of child labour and other child-related social problems. For instance, in both the Mayan Indian and the Mennonite communities, children had traditionally been brought up to participate in agricultural work and other family chores. Many of the new immigrants formed part of the large informal sector of vulnerable people. The number of children from this diversified population had not been ascertained.

The basic principle of the effective abolition of child labour was recognized by virtue of the Labour Regulations, the Families and Children's Act as well as the Education Act. Child labour as defined in the Labour Regulations referred to any person below the age of 14 engaged in employment and this would be considered an offense. The Labour Act extended the definition to dangerous work which meant any occupation likely to be injurious to a person's life, limb, health or education, depending on his or her physical condition.

The National Committee for Families and Children (NCFC) was set up in 1994 as a special advisory body to the Government on services and support for families and children. The NCFC is an advocate for children and is expected to monitor the progress of Government and civil society towards meeting the goals of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and the World Summit for Children.

The Government and its social partners advocated that to address the problem of child labour in Belize, further research needed to be carried out to determine the extent of the problem. With the assistance of the ILO, they hoped that a child labour survey would be carried out in October, 2000 and would consist of quantitative as well as qualitative information on children's activities.

Jamaica

Ms. Glenda Simms presented the situation in Jamaica based on the country paper which had been produced in consultation with the social partners. Jamaica had created the position of an Ambassador for Children within the Ministry of Health and had embarked upon the streamlining of existing laws. The Jamaican tripartite delegation at the International Labour Conference had strongly supported the adoption of ILO Convention No. 182.

Jamaica had made significant improvements in the quality of and access to education for the majority of its population. However, according to the 1997 Jamaica survey of living conditions, although enrolment rates were high, 95.7 per cent at primary level, there continued to be a disparity in enrolment and attendance rates between children of the poorest and wealthiest consumption groups. Another survey in Jamaica found that 4.6 per cent, or 22,000 children under age 16 were active in the labour market. Some child labourers were as young as six years old. Information on street children was more difficult to obtain, but the findings from special
interviews conducted with persons and organizations working with street children indicated that as of 1993 there was an estimated 2,500 street children. It was believed that this number had increased dramatically. Boys between the ages 6-17 made up the overwhelming majority of this group. Dr. Simms pointed out that the majority of the working children were from poor backgrounds and of African decent which was a socio-political issue that could not be disassociated from the situation of their mothers.

In Jamaica, girls were generally less visible in the labour market. They supplied labour for mainly household tasks. Some girls, however, could be seen in markets working under the watchful eyes of a guardian. It was widely assumed that some of the children were engaged in commercial sexual activity, especially in the tourist areas. Ms. Simms argued that some local institutions, such as the 'Go Go Clubs' should be looked at more carefully, but that child labour in the Caribbean, and in Jamaica in particular, might not fall within the "worst case" scenario. However, she called for an end to the cultural and psychological barriers that prevented Jamaican society from addressing such issues and urged the Government to take the lead.

Finally, Ms. Simms made it clear that the ratification of ILO Conventions was just the first step and that the Government should be held accountable through the engagement of civil society. Moreover, employment creation and a careful gender analysis had to be part of the struggle against child labour. Likewise, this had to be complemented by education reforms and better support programmes.

Guyana

Ms. Charlene Parris-Sinclair presented the country paper on Guyana. Guyana had ratified the ILO Minimum Age Convention (No.138) and was a signatory to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Guyana's legislation defined a child as "a person under the age of fifteen years" in the Employment of Young Persons and Children's Act. This Act stipulated that no such person should be admitted to employment. Accordingly, the Education Act as well as the Factories Hours and Holidays Amendment Act had recently been amended to adjust the age from 14 to 15 years. However, Ms. Parris-Sinclair pointed to remaining gaps in the relevant legislation which a tripartite forum under the leadership of the Ministry of Labour was now reviewing.

In addition, the country paper emphasized the need for comprehensive data collection on all forms of child labour as documented evidence was still lacking. In 1999, a national forum looking at available statistical information on the subject had endorsed the need for an improved database. It seemed clear that despite compulsory schooling until the age of 15, the phenomenon of street children, including cases of teenage prostitution were increasing. This was recently confirmed by a situation analysis of children in especially difficult circumstances. In spite of a mass rehabilitation effort for schools, average drop-out rates continued to be comparatively high for secondary schools (1997/98: 6.2 per cent) and student absenteeism had increasingly given reason for concern. Large student/teacher ratios and the lack of qualified teachers added to the problem. Moreover, many female-headed households relied on children to take care of younger siblings and to
help with household chores. Thus, all forms of child labour were of great concern to the Government, workers' and employers' organizations in Guyana, which were determined to prevent further social disintegration.

**Antigua and Barbuda**

In the report of Antigua and Barbuda, no reported incidents of child labour were mentioned. Both primary and secondary education were said to be accessible, free of charge, and the Labour Code effectively guaranteed protection for children up to age 16. Legally, a child was defined as "a person under the age of sixteen years" and the law provided that "no child shall be employed or shall work in a public or private agricultural or industrial undertaking". However, according to the participants from Antigua and Barbuda, the situation would require a reassessment in light of the deliberations of the Meeting, as the possibility for child prostitution or drug trafficking could not be ruled out in an economy based almost entirely on tourism.

**Grenada**

The experience of Grenada revealed no official evidence of child labour. The compulsory schooling age was 5-16 years. The Employment of Women, Young Persons and Children Act (1990) prohibited the employment of children except for work being done in recognized schools, under certain protective conditions or when the establishment was owned by the family.

However, a lack of relevant statistics, as well as a chronic lack of secondary school places and regular incidents of children dropping out of school due to financial constraints, indicated potential problem areas. Furthermore, there were unconfirmed reports of children assisting their parents in the agricultural industry and of children being absent from school to sell agricultural produce during normal school hours. In order to assist poorer families, a number of agencies sponsored students both in primary and secondary schools, and the Government operated a school-feeding programme.

**Suriname**

The country report of Suriname revealed that under the Compulsory Education Act, children between the ages of 7-12 had to be in school. Child labour, with or without payment, was prohibited in Suriname under its Labour Act. It also prohibited children from working outside an undertaking, except:

- in the family household of the child, at schools, in working places, in nurseries, in educational institutions and similar institutions provided that the activities had an educational character and were not for financial profit
- in agriculture, horticulture and cattle-breeding for family needs

Article 18 of the Act stated that children who had passed the age of compulsory education could perform certain activities, to be decided by law, provided that these
activities were necessary to learn a job, or were by their nature to be done by children. They could not, however, be allowed to do work which was too physically or mentally demanding, dangerous or risky.

Nonetheless, children were thought to be active in economic activities, especially in the informal sector, in fishery, child care and agriculture. The situation was not considered a problem until recently and because of its limited extent. In the last few years, however, the phenomenon of child labour had received the special attention of the social partners and incidents of child prostitution had been detected. These activities, together with gold mining, were the direct result of the deteriorating national economy. A preliminary child labour survey had identified increasing poverty as the main cause. The Government had already stated that there were no obstacles to ratifying ILO Convention No. 182.

**Trinidad and Tobago**

In Trinidad and Tobago, the two core pieces of legislation concerning children and employment were the Education Act and the Children Act. The Children Act provided that a child less than 12 years could not be employed; persons under 14 years were not to be employed in any public or private industrial undertaking or on vessels. Further, Section 91 stated that children under 14 years could not be employed in any enterprise other than a family undertaking. The Education Act required compulsory attendance at school up to age 12. However, pursuant to the regulations of the Statistics Act, the minimum age of 15 years was used for the purpose of the collection and analysis of labour force surveys.

In spite of these provisions, there were children within all age groups who were outside the school system. For those in the 5 to 11 age cohort, the 1995 data from the Ministry of Education gave an enrolment ratio of 89.1 per cent. In addition, in 1997/98 a total of 1,629 students had dropped out of the primary and secondary school system. A study entitled *The situation analysis of children in especially difficult circumstances in Trinidad and Tobago* (1993) provided statistical evidence that child labour was on the increase. There were approximately 770 child workers under the age of 14 who were employed in activities such as street vending, mechanic and tire repairs, furniture making and so on. Furthermore, the numbers of street children were said to be visibly increasing and these were both male and female, with the majority being male. A few of the cases revealed the existence of child prostitution.

In its initial *States parties report* (1995) to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago noted that "no mechanisms exist for the continuous collection of statistical and other data to inform policy formulation". Accordingly, a project proposal was developed by the Ministry of Labour and Co-operatives in April 1998 to create an information database on child labour called a Child Indicators Monitoring System. This project however, had not yet been implemented due to a lack of funding.
In view of this and in an attempt to rationalize all the related laws, a Legislative Review Committee had been established to assess all the various provisions. The output of the deliberations of this Committee had been several draft pieces of legislation which had yet to be tabled in Parliament for discussion. They included The Miscellaneous Provisions (Children) Bill, 1999 that proposed to raise the age of a child from 14 to 18 years. The Children's Authority Bill, 1999 proposed that a central authority be established under whose jurisdiction would be placed all persons under the age of 18. It would be an independent body subject only to the lawful directives of the Minister responsible for Social and Community Development. The proposed mission of the authority would be to ensure that a coordinated and integrated package of social services, both preventive and curative, was provided for all children and their families. Notwithstanding these efforts, the challenge was for government agencies, employers’ organizations, trade unions and NGOs to come together and form a broad alliance against child labour.

**Saint Kitts and Nevis**

In Saint Kitts and Nevis, figures for child participation in the workforce were not available and it was thought to be negligible because of the existence of protective legislation. However, the country paper acknowledged that the risk for exploitation was ever present and listed possible areas such as agriculture, domestic service and illicit activities in which juveniles could find work and as a result were put at risk. Many families in rural areas engaged in livestock farming and vegetable production. Children were often required to assist in these activities as part of the family effort at subsistence. This involvement, except for a few cases, was not seen to have a negative impact on their educational status and achievement.

Concerning domestic service, children, particularly girls, may often engage in child labour. It could be family oriented, where the children were made to look after younger siblings or ailing parents and grandparents at the expense of their schooling. They might also be engaged in other households as domestic servants or baby-sitters where they could be exposed to dangerous situations. By far the greatest threat to this vulnerable age group, however, was the potential for their involvement in illicit activities. These included housebreaking and larceny, distribution of drugs, pornography and prostitution.

As far as national legislation was concerned, the question of child labour was addressed in the Employment of Women, Young Person and Children Act and the Employment of Children (Restriction) Ordinance. These Acts defined a "child" as a person under 14 years of age and made provision for the protection of children from work situations which were hazardous to their health and development. Although, in Saint Kitts and Nevis, the compulsory age for education was ages 5-16 years. The Department of Labour, under the Labour Ordinance provided a monitoring mechanism as far as direct employment of child labour was concerned, and labour officers had the power to investigate any abuses which might come to their notice.
**General discussion**

In the general discussion, Mr. Geir Myrstad (IPEC) highlighted the importance of targeted support for women's (self-)employment when working children were removed from work. Early childhood care needed to be addressed as well. He warned that past studies had indicated that tourism-based economies often presented a special risk for child labour. Important legislative protective measures included the freedom for trade unions to act as watchdogs over contractors, to ensure that they abstained from using child labour in their operations.

Another ILO programme "Action against child labour through education" was also discussed. It emphasized preventive measures. The programme included the following:

- mobilizing teachers and other educators
- intervening through formal and non-formal education to keep children in school
- building strong national alliances that make the prevention of child labour one of the primary goals of the education agenda
- closing the gap between primary and secondary schooling in order to avoid producing `children who have been dropped out'

**Group work - National programmes of action**

The following questions were discussed in three separate tripartite groups (10):

- What is the envisaged timetable for ratification of the ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No.182)?
- What intergovernmental and consultative bodies are necessary to ensure effective implementation of the new Convention?
- What should be elements of national programmes of action under Convention No. 182 and its accompanying Recommendation No. 190?
- What should be included in the conclusions and recommendations coming out of the Meeting?

The group presentations showed agreement on the following major points: The timetable for ratification of Convention No. 182 should be by the end of 2000. Effective implementation required an intergovernmental approach in which the ministries of labour had an important and leading role to play. Representation from the Ministries of Education, Finance, Planning, Social Welfare, as well as from non-governmental organizations would also be crucial. Trade unions and employers' organizations should render support. Media campaigns, as well as national consultations should provide the framework for effective dissemination of information. Countries should not stop short of ratifying or improving implementation of Convention No. 138. Efforts to gather relevant data and information needed to be strengthened. However, no country should wait until all data had been collected or the education system fully improved, if children were engaged in any of the worst forms of child labour since these would require immediate action.
Programmes of action should include awareness-raising measures, pilot activities, research and documentation as well as the prosecution of offenders. New policy strategies should be centered on prevention, rehabilitation and evaluation. Social dialogue mechanisms as well as national inspection systems needed strengthening. Policy suggestions found in Recommendation No.190 were all considered highly relevant and technical assistance from the ILO would be sought. Special consideration should be given to the informal sector and employment creation for women.

(8) Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago presented country papers to the Meeting on which the country profiles are based. The discussion on the child labour situation in the Caribbean was guided by the following questions -- What kinds of child labour exist and what are the differences in the situation of boys and girls? What legal and practical measures are already in place? What areas do law and enforcement not yet cover?

(9) The Government of Belize has since ratified Convention No. 138 and declared 14 as the minimum age.

(10) The composition of the groups were Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago (I); Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, Saint Kitts and Nevis (II); Belize, Guyana, Suriname (III).
Part five: Conclusions of the Meeting

The Meeting reached consensus on the following conclusions:

1. Convention No. 182 should be ratified by the end of the year 2000. The participants agreed to inform their respective ministers and constituents about the programme of the Meeting with a view to urging the members of national tripartite committees to recommend ratification of Convention No. 182. Those countries that were already in the process of ratifying Convention No. 138 were urged to bring Convention No. 182 into the process. In addition, the outcome of the Meeting should be brought to the attention of the Council of Human and Social Development of CARICOM as well as to the next Meeting of Caribbean Ministers with responsibility for Labour.

2. A strong lead agency in government was needed to make the prevention of child labour its principle cause. Ministries of labour would generally fill this role. Yet, the elimination of child labour and its worst forms also required the involvement of many agencies and support from civil society as well.

3. National efforts for awareness-raising were needed to generate greater commitment and should involve schools as well as the wider community.

4. Further data collection and in-depth research was crucial. The cooperation of the central statistical offices should be sought to carry out surveys, conduct rapid assessments or develop modules as part of the 2000 census.

5. Preventive measures needed to be devised around structural improvements in educational systems. Immediate action should include the rehabilitation or counselling of children found to be engaged in the worst forms of child labour as well as the prosecution of offenders.

The ILO Caribbean Office was requested to provide institutional support to ministries of labour, assistance with the promotion of Conventions No. 182 and No. 138, research and general awareness-raising. IPEC indicated that it would support such ILO activities in the Caribbean. Furthermore, the ILO constituents were invited to explore the realization of national action programmes, spearheaded by pilot activities and supported by sub-regional activities. The ILO Caribbean Office stood ready to assist national information campaigns with material, and possibly, the production of a short video.
Annex one: Introductory remarks
Willi Momm, Director, ILO Caribbean Office

As our discussions on the issue of child labour in the Caribbean begin, the Seattle meeting of the WTO has concluded without achieving its objective of advancing the framework for global free trade. One of the issues that contributed to the failure of the meeting was the unresolved question of the labour dimension of international trade.

Many leaders from this region have gone to Seattle with the hope that the WTO rules could allow for greater fairness to the vulnerable economies. Some have gone there to make sure that they are fair to the workers, hoping that efforts to establish a social clause, which links trade rules to performance with respect to fundamental labour standards, could be successful this time.

Others however, went to Seattle determined to prevent a social clause discussion. They feel that labour issues should be de-linked from trade rules and they claim that the ILO has a sufficiently strong mechanism to ensure the world's compliance with fundamental labour standards. If the proponents of this view were right - and we hope they are - one might indeed be inclined to deny the need for a social clause approach.

There is a third group, however. These are those countries and companies who want neither the WTO nor the ILO to interfere in the way they organize their production. Some of these pay lip service to the efforts of the ILO to promote the universal recognition and observance of its fundamental labour standards, but are determined not to let this interfere with their business, hoping that they might gain a competitive advantage from ignoring these standards. Others are overtly opposed to any social conditionality. As long as these forces that resist the idea that global production and trade should be regulated are strong, the discussion about how to link trade and labour will not go away.

Assuming that the ILO mechanism were strong enough to effect compliance with fundamental labour standards without being able to resort to any sanctions, what would be the scenario? First, we would see much progress in countries ratifying the eight fundamental labour standards identified in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. In fact all countries should ratify these fundamental labour standards so as to create more of a level playing field. Second, we would have reliable reports from all countries indicating that there is compliance with these standards or, at least, a clear movement towards creating the conditions for compliance. Third, though not part of the ILO approach, there are those that hope to complement the ILO efforts by some form of substitute for a sanction mechanism, namely consumer pressure that may compel multinational companies and their subcontractors to comply with such standards.

The ILO has indeed embarked on the systematic pursuance of its new mandate to promote universal adherence to its fundamental labour standards. There is no guarantee of success, of course. However, if it were to fail, the system of free global trade may have to be revisited again and many countries, in particular in the industrial world, would find other ways of sanctioning those countries which choose to undermine or to ignore the
global standards. In fact, many predict a backlash for the current efforts to establish a
global trade regime if agreement on minimum labour, and for that matter, ecological
standards cannot be achieved.

As this would probably be in no one's interest, there are strong reasons to back up the
ILO approach and to help make it succeed. This means that a genuine and broad-based
national campaign is called for in all countries to review its approach to international
labour standards and to give this system a real chance to succeed. This means also that
the ILO standards are no longer to be looked at solely as promoting workers' rights and as
moral or social standards, but also as a prerequisite for a functioning global trade system.
This means finally that it is high time that the issue of fundamental labour standards is no
longer treated as an affair of a small and select group of officials from labour
departments, employers' organizations and unions, but is discussed and actively
supported by those concerned with economic and trade policies. We still have a long way
to go in this regard in this region.

I have chosen to put this seminar on child labour in this larger context, because it
highlights the importance of acknowledging and finally ratifying this latest Convention of
the ILO, the Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour. What this means is that
ratification of this fundamental labour standard which was adopted only this year is not
solely a matter of protecting children. It has not only to do with the question whether
child labour is a problem or not in this region and what we can do to prevent it from
becoming a problem. It has also to do with the feasibility of the current efforts to create a
global trade system that accepts social rules of behaviour, to give globalization a human
face, to recognize its social dimension. Such a system only functions if all abide by it.

In this regard, it is of utmost significance that the United States, which has so far only
ratified a few international labour standards, has been one of the first countries to ratify
this new Convention. I think this happened not only because the Convention deals with
particular loathsome practices, but because of a resolve to contribute to countries
respecting a world standard of behaviour without which the advantages of free trade
couldn't be enjoyed. In this regard the significance of President Clinton signing the
ratification document last week in Seattle should be noted.

The Caribbean region will probably be at a relative ease with ILO's fundamental labour
standards, including the new Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour. Non-
ratification is probably more an indicator of practical problems than an issue of political
divergence. Nevertheless, some countries in this region could still improve their record
with respect to the social ground rules under which the world will have to conduct its
global business. It must be in the interest of the smaller countries, that these rules apply to
everyone.

Having pointed out the larger implications of our efforts to promote the ratification and
application of fundamental labour standards, let me not overlook the importance of the
specific provisions of this particular Convention which will be the reference for our
discussions.
Child Labour, in all its forms, is to be eliminated. However, there are forms of exploitation, which are so unspeakable that non-action on the part of the State and the social partners equals complicity. By pointing to this scourge, we do not want to simply generate a moral outcry. We want to see decisive legal and enforcement action to ensure that those who violate such a fundamental standard of human behaviour do not get away with impunity. Child exploitation exists everywhere, most likely in one form or the other also in the Caribbean. However, we cannot wait until research has found out whether this is a significant problem or only affects a few. No country can tolerate that children and youth mean good business for the drug or sex trade or provide a pool of cheap and non-protesting workers who are ready to accept abominable working conditions.

Let us not wait until many children have suffered, let us prevent the suffering. This is the message that we would like to get over to the policy makers and the public with this seminar and with the follow-up work that we intend to undertake over the next years in the Caribbean region in close collaboration with the Governments and the Social Partners.
Annex two: Background paper for the Meeting: Child labour in an international perspective

Michele Jankanish Senior Specialist, International Labour Standards and Labour Law, ILO Caribbean Office

Introduction

Eliminating child labour has no simple solutions. The response to such a complex problem must necessarily be multi-pronged. Effective poverty reduction policies and programmes and the provision of universal basic education are critical in ensuring the elimination of child labour. The need for preventive measures is paramount if long-lasting results are to be obtained. Thus, preventing the next generation of child workers is a major goal. At the same time, child labour must also be tackled by other measures that specifically address the current situation of millions of children already trapped in child labour. Particular priority must be given to the most intolerable situations, such as children in slavery-like practices and forced labour, those who are forced to participate in armed conflict, those who are sexually exploited in prostitution and pornography and those who toil in hazardous work and conditions. Removing children from such situations and providing them with effective rehabilitation and integration into society is no easy task. While governments have the primary responsibility, they need the assistance of employers' and workers' organizations, and a broad range of civil society including NGOs and professionals in various fields.

International standards, while not sufficient alone, provide the broad framework for national legal and practical action against child labour. The ILO has long-standing policies and standards against child labour. In recent years this work has been reinforced by an emerging global consensus that the protection of children's rights should be a priority for all countries. This is evidenced by the near universal ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989, which includes the right of children to be free from economic exploitation. The adoption of the new ILO Convention on the worst forms of child labour further emphasizes the need for urgent action to eliminate the severe exploitation of many of the world's children.

ILO standards on child labour

One of the most important tools available to the ILO for improving the legislation and practice of its member States in the fight against child labour is the adoption and supervision of international labour Conventions and Recommendations. The ILO adopted its first Convention on child labour in 1919, the year of its foundation (The Minimum Age (Industry) Convention, 1919 (No. 5). Subsequently, nine sectoral Conventions on the minimum age of admission to employment were adopted applying to industry, agriculture, trimmers and stokers, maritime work, non-industrial employment, fishing and underground work. In 1973, the ILO consolidated the principles that had been established in earlier instruments and adopted comprehensive instruments on child labour, the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138) and its accompanying Recommendation No. 146, which apply to all sectors of economic activity, whether or not the children are...
employed for wages. In June 1999, the ILO adopted its most recent instruments on child labour, the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention and Recommendation, 1999, which target the worst forms of child labour as a matter of urgency. Convention No. 138 remains a fundamental instrument on child labour. However, it is recognized that total abolition will take time, and there is a need for urgent action to eliminate the worst forms of child labour.

Another recent important development is the adoption of the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up by the International Labour Conference in June 1998. It is expected to contribute significantly to the fight against child labour in all member States, since it requires adherence to the principle of the elimination of child labour even in countries which have not ratified the relevant Conventions.

**Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)**

The cornerstone of Convention No. 138 is the requirement that ratifying States undertake to pursue a national policy designed to ensure the effective abolition of child labour and to raise progressively the minimum age for admission to employment or work to a level consistent with the fullest physical and mental development of young persons. It is a dynamic instrument aimed at encouraging the progressive improvement of standards and promoting sustained action to attain its objectives. Recommendation No. 146 provides guidance on necessary policy and enforcement measures.

Fixing the minimum age for admission to employment or work is the basic obligation of ratifying States within the framework of a national policy (see Table 1). The Convention establishes that the minimum age should not be less than the age of completing compulsory schooling and in no event less than 15 years. However, the Convention allows a developing country to specify initially a general minimum age of 14 instead of 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General minimum age (Article 2)</th>
<th>Light work (Article 7)</th>
<th>Hazardous work (Article 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In normal circumstances:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more (not &lt; compulsory school age)</td>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>18 years (16 years conditionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where economy and educational facilities are insufficiently developed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>18 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another important requirement is that a higher minimum age of at least 18 must be set for hazardous work - work which by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out is likely to jeopardize the health, safety or morals of young persons. The determination of the specific content of these activities is the obligation of individual countries, after consultation with employers' and workers' organizations.
The Convention also allows a lower age for light work from 13 to 15, provided that the work is not hazardous to the child's health or development, and does not hinder the child's education. A minimum age for light work at 12 instead of 13 can be set in countries where the basic minimum age of 14 is allowed, after consultation with the employers' and workers' organizations.

To date, 79 countries have ratified Convention No. 138, including Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica and Guyana. (11)

**Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)**

The Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), also protects children against some of the worst forms of exploitation. Convention No. 29 aims at suppressing the use of forced or compulsory labour - defined as "all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty and for which the said person has not offered himself voluntarily". This Convention is one of the most widely ratified of the ILO Conventions with ratifications by 149 countries. Since it applies to everyone, whatever age, it protects children from forced or compulsory labour and is applicable to some of the most intolerable forms of child labour, such as children in bondage and their exploitation in prostitution and pornography.

**The Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention and Recommendation, 1999**

It is a matter of great concern that children continue to be enslaved in bonded labour, isolated in domestic service, abused in the commercial sex trade, endangered in mines and quarries, and exposed to hazardous conditions, such as toxic substances in agriculture. In response to this grave situation, the government, employer and worker delegates to the International Labour Conference in 1999 unanimously adopted the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention and Recommendation to promote a concerted global effort to stop these practices immediately. They must, as a matter of urgency, be eliminated to protect the human rights of children, and ensure that a new generation can grow up healthy and educated. This is essential if the poverty and underdevelopment that persist in so many areas of the world are to be eradicated.

Convention No. 182 aims at prohibiting and eliminating the worst forms of child labour everywhere. It contains no exceptions for any branches of economic activity. The new Convention does not revise or replace Convention No. 138 but complements it. While Convention No. 138 sets standards of minimum age for admission to employment or work, the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999, is focussed on the need for immediate action to prohibit and eliminate the worst forms of child labour.

The basic obligation of ratifying States is to take immediate and effective measures to prohibit and eliminate the worst forms of child labour as a matter of urgency for all those under age 18.

The "worst forms of child labour" comprise:
(a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labour, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict;

(b) the use, procurement or offering of a child for prostitution, production of pornography or pornographic performances;

(c) the use, procurement or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs;

(d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.

The Convention allows the determination of what constitutes work that is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of a child, to be made at the national level. The Convention stipulates that the national authority must, after consultation with the employers and workers concerned, make such determinations. It also provides that consideration should be given to Paragraph 3, inter alia, of the Recommendation as it provides further guidance on which types of work are likely to be harmful to children.

It suggests that particular attention should be given to:

- work which exposes children to physical, psychological or sexual abuse;
- work underground, under water, at dangerous heights or in confined spaces;
- work with dangerous machinery, equipment and tools, or which involves the manual handling or transport of heavy loads;
- work in an unhealthy environment which may, for example, expose children to hazardous substances, agents or processes, or to temperatures, noise levels, or vibrations damaging to their health;
- work under particularly difficult conditions such as work for long hours or during the night or work where the child is unreasonably confined to the premises of the employer.

The Convention also obliges ratifying States to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of the Convention, including the provision and application of sanctions, penal or otherwise. Moreover, Article 7, Paragraph 2 requires States, taking into account the importance of education in eliminating child labour, to take effective and time-bound measures to:

(a) prevent the engagement of children in the worst forms of child labour;

(b) provide the necessary and appropriate direct assistance for the removal of children from the worst forms of child labour and for their rehabilitation and social integration;

(c) ensure access to free basic education, and, wherever possible and appropriate, vocational training, for all children removed from the worst forms of child labour;
(d) identify and reach out to children at special risk; and

(e) take account of the special situation of girls.

The establishment or designation of monitoring mechanisms, after consultation with workers' and employers' organizations, to monitor the implementation of the Convention is also required. Convention No. 182 does not specify what these mechanisms should be, as this will depend on the types of action being taken in a country to prohibit and eliminate the worst forms of child labour. Such monitoring mechanisms may be, for example, national committees or advisory bodies on child labour or other means of assessing and evaluating national programmes of action. In addition, they may be specially designed to oversee sectors such as the informal sector, where many children work, but where official institutions such as labour inspection cannot easily reach them.

Another requirement of the new Convention is the design and implementation of programmes of action to eliminate the worst forms of child labour as a priority. These should be designed and implemented in consultation with employers' and workers' organizations and take into consideration the views of other concerned groups. The Recommendation adds that the views of children directly affected by the worst forms of child labour and their families should be considered. It also recommends that action programmes should identify and denounce the worst forms of child labour. They also should aim at prevention, removal, rehabilitation and social integration, through measures to address their educational, physical and psychological needs. Attention should be given to younger children, the girl child, hidden work situations and children with special vulnerabilities or needs. Communities where children are at special risk should be particularly targeted. In addition, society in general should be mobilized through awareness raising.

The Convention and Recommendation call for special attention to be given to girls and other groups of children at special risk.

The Convention also calls for member States to cooperate and assist each other to effectively prohibit and eliminate the worst forms of child labour. This reflects the consensus that these abuses are a problem that concerns all. Ratifying States should work towards their elimination wherever they may exist in the world. The Convention does not spell out precisely which kind of international cooperation or assistance should be provided, allowing flexibility to member States to decide on the nature and level of cooperation or assistance. It does, however, state that "support for social and economic development, poverty eradication programmes and universal education" should be provided.

(11) Since the Meeting, Belize and Barbados have ratified Convention No. 138
## Annex three: Ratification of Child Labour Conventions in the Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Convention No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 7 10 15 33 58 59 60 112 123 138 182 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 8 6 6 0 3 0 1 0 3 0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - x - x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>x x x - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>x x x - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>x x x x - x - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - x - x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>x x x x - x - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>x x x x - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>- x - x - x - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>x x - x - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>x x x - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - x - - - x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12) Titles of Conventions are as follows: No 5, Minimum Age (Industry) Convention, 1919; No. 7, Minimum Age (Sea) Convention, 1920; No. 10, Minimum Age (Agriculture) Convention, 1921; No. 15, Minimum Age (Trimmers and Stokers) Convention, 1921; No. 33, Minimum age (Non-Industrial Employment) Convention, 1932; No. 58, Minimum Age (Sea) Convention (Revised), 1936; No. 59, Minimum Age (Industry) Convention (Revised), 1937; No. 60, Minimum Age (Non-Industrial Employment) Convention (Revised), 1937; No. 112, Minimum Age (Fishermen) Convention, 1939; No. 123, Minimum Age (Underground Work) Convention, 1965; No. 138, Minimum Age Convention, 1973; No. 182, Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999; No. 29, Forced Labour Convention, 1930.
### Annex four: Compulsory education and minimum ages for admission to employment in selected Caribbean countries (13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Age limits for compulsory schooling</th>
<th>Basic minimum age for work</th>
<th>Minimum age for light work</th>
<th>Minimum age for dangerous work or hazardous work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>12-16 (by sector)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) Based on country data obtained during the Caribbean Tripartite Meeting on the Worst Forms of Child Labour (Kingston, 6 to 7 December, 1999) as well from ILO: Child Labour: Targeting the Intolerable, op.cit.
### Annex five: Programme of the Meeting

**Sunday, 5 December**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.00-19.30</td>
<td>Registration in the Conference Secretariat with interactive multi-media display of CD-ROM on the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and ILO Core Conventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday, 6 December**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00-10.00</td>
<td>Opening Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.20</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.45</td>
<td>The new Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour - Challenges for the Caribbean Mr. Leroy Trotman, Member of the ILO Governing Body; General Secretary of the Barbados Workers’ Union and President of the Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations of Barbados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-15.30</td>
<td>Group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports by government, workers’ and employers’ groups and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-15.45</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.45-17.00</td>
<td>The IPEC experience: Presentation of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour Mr. Frans Röselers, Director, InFocus Programme on Child Labour: IPEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday, 7 December**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00-9.30</td>
<td>The socio-economic situation of children in the Caribbean and the experience of UNICEF Ms. Afshan Khan, UNICEF Jamaica Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30-10.00</td>
<td>Working with street children in Jamaica Ms. Claudette Pious, Executive Director Children First, Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.45</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-12.45</td>
<td>Panel discussion on the existing framework for the protection of children from the worst forms of child labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion based on country reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-14.45</td>
<td>Tripartite group work: National programmes of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45-15.30</td>
<td>Reports to the plenary and general discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-15.45</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.45-17.00</td>
<td>Conclusions of the meeting and plans for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.15</td>
<td>Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex six: List of participants

### ANTIGUA & BARBUDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hesketh Williams</td>
<td>Deputy Labour Commissioner</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>Redcliffe Street, St. John's</td>
<td>268-462-0011;</td>
<td>268-462-4988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Arlene Joyce Martin</td>
<td>Industrial Relations Officer</td>
<td>Antigua</td>
<td>Factory Road, P.O. Box 298</td>
<td>268-462-0449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BARBADOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. LeRoy Trotman</td>
<td>General Secretary</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Harmony Hall, P.O. Box 172</td>
<td>246-426-3492/95/97</td>
<td>246-436-6496</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bwu@caribsurf.com">bwu@caribsurf.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Harcourt Husbands</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>43 Dundonald Street</td>
<td>868-625-3023</td>
<td>868-624-7588</td>
<td><a href="mailto:natuc@carib-link.net">natuc@carib-link.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BELIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dorla Grant</td>
<td>Labour Officer/ ILO Desk Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Suné Bethelmy</td>
<td>Planning Officer</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>Riverside Plaza, Besson Street, Port of</td>
<td>868-623-0405/4045</td>
<td>868-624-4091</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rplann@tstt.net.tt">rplann@tstt.net.tt</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sylvestre McLaren</td>
<td>Central Executive Member</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>91 Abercromby Street, Port of Spain</td>
<td>868-625-3023</td>
<td>868-627-7588</td>
<td><a href="mailto:natuc@carib-link.net">natuc@carib-link.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ann-Marie Byer</td>
<td>Member, Board of Directors</td>
<td>The Employers' Consultative Association of Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>43 Dundonald Street</td>
<td>868-625-4723; 623-6588</td>
<td>868-624-7195; 625-4891</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eca@wow.net">eca@wow.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CARIBBEAN CONGRESS OF LABOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lilieth Harris</td>
<td>(Representative of CCL)</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1a Hope Boulevard, Kingston 6</td>
<td>876-977-5170/3545</td>
<td>876-977-4575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of The Public Service and Labour</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:jctu@cwjamaica.com">jctu@cwjamaica.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Block</td>
<td>CARIBBEAN EMPLOYERS’ CONFEDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmopan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. 501-2-44891/44907</td>
<td>Mr. Walton A. Hilton Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax. 501-2-34545</td>
<td>1st Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caribbean Employers’ Confederation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 Dundonald Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port of Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel. 868-625-4723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax. 868-625-4891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:cec@wow.net">cec@wow.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. George Frazer</td>
<td>OBSERVERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
<td>Mr. Steven Mac Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trade Union Congress of Belize</td>
<td>Deputy Programme Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize City Centre</td>
<td>Labour &amp; Manpower Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>P.O. Box 2359</td>
<td>CARICOM Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Belize City</td>
<td>P.O. Box 10827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. 501-2-72864</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax. 501-2-72864</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:ntucb@wgs1.btl.net">ntucb@wgs1.btl.net</a> / <a href="mailto:bntu@btl.net">bntu@btl.net</a></td>
<td>Tel. 592-2-51961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax. 592-2-58039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:steven@caricom.org">steven@caricom.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Margarita Burrowes</td>
<td>Ms. Marjorie Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to the Board</td>
<td>Ambassador/Special Envoy for Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize Chamber of Commerce and Industry</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent's Street</td>
<td>Oceana Complex, 2-4 Kins Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize City</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. 501-2-70668/73148</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax. 501-2-74984</td>
<td>Fax. 876-924-9988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:bcci@btl.net">bcci@btl.net</a></td>
<td>Mrs. Claudette Richardson-Pious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Monk Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish Town, St. Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel. 876-984-0367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax. 876-984-2839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:kidz@cwjamaica.com">kidz@cwjamaica.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRENADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Legal Affairs, Labour and Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Gardens, St. George's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. 473-440-3080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax. 473-440-4923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chester Humphrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada Trades Union Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel./Fax. 473-440-3733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:gtuc@caribsurf.com">gtuc@caribsurf.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Justin Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grenada Employers’ Federation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 129, St. George's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. 473-440-1832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax. 473-440-6627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:gef@caribsurf.com">gef@caribsurf.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GUYANA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Charlene Parris-Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health and Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestretch Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durban Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel. 592-2-57510/66997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax. 592-2-53477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>JAMAICA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Glenda Simms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Bureau of Women's Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Women's Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ellesmere Road, Kingston10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tel. 876-754-8575-8  
Fax. 876-929-0549  
E-mail: jbwa@cwjamaica.com

Mr. Danny Roberts  
Vice President  
Jamaica Confederation of Trade Unions  
1a Hope Blvd., Kingston 6  
Tel. 876-977-5170/3545  
Fax. 876-977-4575  
E-mail: jctu@cwjamaica.com

Mr. Garfield Bryan  
Research Officer  
Jamaica Employers’ Federation  
2a Ruthven Road  
Kingston 10  
Tel. 876-926-6762/5524  
Fax. 876-968-4576  
E-mail: jef@cwjamaica.com

SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS

Mr. James Williams  
Permanent Secretary  
Ministry of Education, Labour and Social Security  
Greenlands, P.O. Box 333  
Basseterre  
Tel. 869-466-4952  
Fax. 869-465-9069  
E-mail: minelss@caribsurf.com / jjjvv@caribsurf.com

Ms. Jacynth Francis  
2nd Vice President  
Saint Kitts-Nevis Trades and Labour Union  
"Masses House"  
P.O. Box 239, Basseterre  
Tel. 869-465-2229/2891  
Fax. 869-465-5519  
E-mail: sknunion@caribsurf.com / nemaskb@caribsurf.com

Ms. Euphemia Brice-Roberts  
Member, Human Resource Committee

Fax. 876-929-8084

Ms. Jennifer Green  
Manager, Manpower Unit  
Planning Institute of Jamaica  
10-16 Grenada Way  
Kingston 10  
Tel. 876-906-446314 Ext. 4302  
E-mail: Jennifer_Green@pioj.gov.jm

Ms. Claudine Petgrave  
ILO Desk Officer  
Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport  
1F North Street  
Kingston  
Tel. 967-2469  
Fax. 967-0996

Mr. Dwight Mc Kenzie  
ILO Desk Officer  
Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport  
1F North Street  
Kingston  
Tel. 967-2469  
Fax. 922-0996

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

Mr. Frans Röselaers  
Director  
International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)  
International Labour Organization  
CH-1211 Geneva  
Switzerland  
Tel. 4122-799-6028  
E-mail: rosellaers@ilo.org

Mr. Geir Myrstad  
International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)  
International Labour Organization  
CH-1211 Geneva
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts Nevis Chamber of Industry and Commerce</td>
<td>P.O. Box 332, Basseterre</td>
<td>869-465-2980</td>
<td>869-465-4490</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sknchamber@caribsurf.com">sknchamber@caribsurf.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>Mr. R. Naarendorp, General Secretary, Progressive Trade Union Federation (C-47) Wanicastraat 230, Paramaribo Tel. 597-401120 Fax. 597-401149</td>
<td>597-401120</td>
<td>597-401149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Mr. Willi Momm, Director, Caribbean Office and Multidisciplinary Advisory Team 11 St. Clair Avenue P.O. Box 1201 Port of Spain Trinidad Tel. 868-628-1453-6 Fax. 868-628-2433 Email: <a href="mailto:momm@ilocarib.org.tt">momm@ilocarib.org.tt</a></td>
<td>4122-799-8094</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:myrstad@ilo.org">myrstad@ilo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>Mr. George R. Bijnoe, Representative of the Suriname Trade &amp; Industry Association Human Resource Officer Suriname Aluminum Co. L.L.C. P.O. Box 1810, Paramaribo Tel. 597-323281 ext. 242 Fax. 597-323314 Email: <a href="mailto:vsbstia@sr.net">vsbstia@sr.net</a> / <a href="mailto:GeorgeBijnoe@Alcoa.com">GeorgeBijnoe@Alcoa.com</a></td>
<td>597-323281</td>
<td>597-323314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>Ms. Michele Jankanish, Senior Specialist, International Labour Standards and Labour Law, Caribbean Office and Multidisciplinary Advisory Team 11 St. Clair Avenue P.O. Box 1201 Port of Spain Trinidad Tel. 868-628-1453-6 Ext. 223 Fax. 868-628-2433 Email: <a href="mailto:jankanish@ilocarib.org.tt">jankanish@ilocarib.org.tt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Mr. David Nii Addy, Coordinator for Child Labour Activities/Associate Research Officer Caribbean Office and Multidisciplinary Advisory Team 11 St. Clair Avenue, P.O. Box 1201 Port of Spain, Trinidad Tel. 868-628-1453-6 Ext. 229 Fax. 868-628-2433 Email: <a href="mailto:addy@ilocarib.org.tt">addy@ilocarib.org.tt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>Mr. Emru D. Millette, Senior Specialist, Employers’ Organizations Caribbean Office and Multidisciplinary Advisory Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>