

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR
CONFERENCE

SEVENTY-THIRD SESSION
GENEVA, 1987

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE
GENEVA

member of France referred to the statement that he had made in the general discussion on the resolution. His intention in submitting this amendment was mainly to obtain certain clarifications.

122. The Workers' Vice-Chairman admitted that the reference to informal sectors in the text of the resolution was ambiguous. The aim of this subparagraph was, however, to include all sectors and not just certain ones. To take account of the objections raised by the Employers' member of France, he proposed amending the original text of the resolution. The amendment would be to replace the words "urban, rural or informal sectors" by the words "urban or rural areas, formal or informal sectors". This subamendment was adopted.

123. Paragraphs 3(b)(i), as amended, and 3(b)(ii) were adopted.

124. Amendment D.7, submitted by the Workers' group concerned only a typing error in the English version of the resolution.

125. Amendment D.16, submitted by the Employers' group, sought to delete the word "population" in the first line of operative paragraph 3(b)(iii). This amendment was withdrawn.

126. Paragraph 3(b)(iii) and (iv) were adopted.

127. Amendment D.17, submitted by the Employers' group sought to replace the words "working relationships" by the word "co-ordination" in the first line of operative paragraph 3(b)(v). The Workers' Vice-Chairman stated that his group preferred the reference to working relationships which implied a more positive inter-action. The Employers' Vice-Chairman emphasised that it was possible to have working relationships without co-ordination. He proposed to modify the amendment by adding the words "and co-ordination" after the words "working relationships" in the initial text of the resolution. The Government member of Sri Lanka stated that he had no objection to this subamendment.

128. Paragraph 3(b)(v), thus amended, was adopted.

129. Paragraph 3(b)(vi) was also adopted.

130. Amendment D.20, submitted by the Government members of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, did not aim at introducing new questions of substance but merely sought to rearrange the order of the various operative subparagraphs of the resolution. Presenting this amendment on behalf of the Nordic countries, the Government member of Denmark stated that the aim of the amendment was to make the structure of the operative part clearer.

131. The Workers' Vice-Chairman proposed the following subamendment to clarify the text: to insert the words "to urge the governments of the member States" at the beginning of subparagraph 3(a)(i). The following words would then be inserted as the new subparagraph (a) "to take the following actions:". The Employers' Vice-Chairman and the Government member of Denmark agreed to this subamendment, which was adopted.

Adoption of the resolution

132. The text of the resolution, thus amended, was adopted by consensus.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AND PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT TO ORGANISE CONVENTION, 1948 (No. 87)

Presentation of the resolution

133. The Workers' member of Mexico, introducing the resolution, stressed that it was based on the fact that the ILO had been created to find solutions to the serious problems of the time in the world of work and to apply the principles that were formulated using the most appropriate method, i.e. by Conventions and Recommendations. Convention No. 87 was fundamental for workers. It enshrined freedom of association and aimed at protecting the right to organise. The Governing Body's Committee on Freedom of Association was set up to implement the principle of freedom of association and to examine infringements of this Convention and of other ILO instruments in this field. The Workers' delegate added that 40 years of workers' activity had passed since the adoption of Convention No. 87. During this long period, the various enshrined rights had been defined and procedures developed. The Committee on Freedom of Association had examined more than 1,400 cases of infringement of freedom of association brought against a considerable number of governments, some of which had ratified the Convention and some of which had not. The ILO, through this Committee, had attached importance to ensuring the observance of these rights in countries that had not ratified the Convention. Although the legal situation in such countries was admittedly different from that of those countries which had ratified the Convention, infringements of freedom of association had been reported and it was necessary to adopt measures in the light of the experience acquired to date. As a result, the resolution launched an appeal for the ratification of Convention No. 87 in 1988. The resolution also called upon governments to take all the necessary measures to apply the Convention, notably by bringing their legislation into line with the Convention's principles, and to ask for assistance from the ILO as quickly as possible in finding solutions to any problems they may encounter in the implementation of these principles. The resolution invited the Governing Body to instruct the Director-General to strengthen the ILO's efforts to promote the ratification and full implementation of the above principles. The situation of certain trade unions had, in fact, deteriorated as shown by the assassination of many trade union leaders, attacks on trade union offices, charges of terrorism brought against groups of workers simply for engaging in trade union activities and by other hostile acts.

General Discussion

134. The Government member of Czechoslovakia welcomed the submission of a resolution celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the adoption of Convention No. 87. It was an appropriate manner in which to recall the principles that should be the basis for the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights and particularly for the effective participation

of workers in economic life and in all decisions concerning them. It was not, however, sufficient to legislate on questions of freedom of association, since it was also necessary to achieve the conditions that were needed for the exercise of these rights and for real participation by workers. It was admittedly worthwhile calling upon member States to ratify Convention No. 87 and to give full effect to it, but that did not suffice in itself. Legal measures alone did not guarantee workers and their organisations the role which should be theirs, in accordance with the fundamental objectives of the ILO and the basic concepts of participation. Difficulties had long existed in this respect in many countries, particularly with regard to rural workers, workers in the informal sector, and at times in the service sector, workers in small private enterprises where trade union representation was not permitted and workers in multinational enterprises. There was a tendency for the situation to worsen, particularly in market-economy industrialised countries. Changes that enterprises were undergoing with regard to their size, structure, management methods, working procedures and other aspects were affecting trade union organisations and reducing their representative base and their importance. In some quarters the very reasons for the existence of trade unions were being questioned. The resolution should take these aspects into account and should contain adequate measures to combat such developments. An amendment would be submitted to this effect.

135. The Government of the German Democratic Republic laid emphasis on the importance of trade union rights within the context of political, social, economic and cultural rights. ILO Convention No. 87 was one of the international instruments which had made the greatest contribution to the implementation of these rights. The German Democratic Republic, which had ratified the convention, could only welcome the resolution and agreed with the principles it embodied. The fortieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention could, however, provide an opportunity for considering the formulation of new standards in this field. In the German Democratic Republic, for example, Convention No. 87 was respected, but the trade unions possessed rights which went well beyond that instrument, such as the right of initiating legislation in Parliament and the right to exercise co-management. In a letter addressed to the Director-General of the ILO on 18 June 1986, the representatives of a number of socialist countries had drawn his attention to these questions. Indeed, the Organisation should pay more attention to these issues and should extend trade union rights. It could do this in two ways: either by supplementing Convention No. 87 with other instruments providing for greater trade union rights, or by revising Convention No. 87 in order to take into account the experience acquired over 40 years in the field of trade union rights. Since 1948 certain trade unions had, in fact, acquired new rights which had been inconceivable at that time. In his Report of the Conference, the Director-General indicated that each organisation had the duty to examine with a certain urgency the ways in which it could adapt to a changing world; this applied especially to the case of the ILO. However great the value of Convention No. 87, on the threshold of the year 2000, other

activities should be envisaged in order to take into account the current situation. An amendment would be submitted to this effect. The German Democratic Republic was in agreement with the content of the resolution; countries should ratify the Convention and the greatest importance should be attached to the machinery for the implementation of the instrument. In order to avoid any ambiguity, the fifth preambular paragraph should be amended and should emphasise that it was necessary to take account of the social and economic systems existing in the different countries.

136. The Employers' Vice-Chairman stated that the resolution was an excellent one and that his group had no objections to the principles it embodied. It would, however, be desirable to amend the text in order to avoid certain ambiguities. The ratification of the Convention, for example, was not in itself a guarantee that the instrument would be respected since most of the problems concerning freedom of association occurred in countries which had ratified the instrument. Commenting on remarks made by a previous speaker, he stressed that multinational enterprises observed the provisions of the Convention in an exemplary manner, as was illustrated by the reports from governments to the ILO questionnaire on the effect given to the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy. Furthermore, these questions were of as much concern to employers and their associations as to workers and their trade unions. Freedom of association was embodied in the Constitution of the ILO, and this was of particular importance for countries which had not been able to ratify the Convention, and which sometimes had excellent reasons for not ratifying it. The Employers' group would submit a number of technical amendments. He also considered that the principles of freedom of association should be universally applied, irrespective of the social and economic systems in the different countries. Furthermore, it was important to ensure the observance of existing rights rather than to change standards in this field.

137. The Employers' member of Egypt also stated that Convention No. 87 was one of the most important instruments adopted by the ILO and raised questions relating to a number of actual situations.

138. The Workers' member of Peru also considered that the adoption of Convention No. 87 had been the most important event for the workers since the introduction of the 48-hour week. The Convention had been of great value to workers' organisations and the resolution celebrating the fortieth anniversary of its adoption should be supported by everyone. Many States had not yet ratified the instrument and it was therefore necessary to launch an urgent appeal to this effect. It was important for the resolution to be adopted unanimously and the Workers would therefore welcome any initiative that strengthened the resolution.

139. The Workers' member of Australia stressed the priority that should be given to this resolution and referred to its particularly topical nature in his own country. Australia supported the principles contained in Convention No. 87. Nevertheless, in view of the autonomy enjoyed by the Federal States, new legislation restricting some of the rights embodied in

the Convention had been adopted in Queensland. It was important to call upon States to ratify the Convention, as was the case in the resolution, and to remind them of their obligations under the instrument.

140. The Government member of Hungary associated himself with the opinions expressed by the authors of the resolution when they emphasised that freedom of association was integral to all the activities of the ILO and was a fundamental human right. In line with other socialist countries in Europe and elsewhere, Hungary had ratified Convention No. 87. The resolution necessarily emphasised the fact that a third of the member States of the Organisation had not ratified the instrument, many of which, admittedly, were developing countries, but which also included industrialised market economy countries. It should be noted that only a very narrow majority of the ten permanent members of the Governing Body had ratified Convention No. 87. Although the fact of being a member State of the ILO implied adherence to its Constitution, and particularly to the Declaration of Philadelphia annexed to the Constitution, which referred to freedom of association, there were nevertheless grounds to wonder why certain States, which were in agreement with this principle, had not ratified Convention No. 87. One of the reasons was doubtless the fact that they did not receive all the assistance that was necessary to implement the instrument. In this connection, consultations with experts sent on mission were a more appropriate method than written reports. This type of assistance could only strengthen the confidence of member States concerning the supervisory machinery and lead to new ratifications.

141. The Workers' Vice-Chairman observed that his group regarded the resolution as being very positive. It did not require fundamental amendment, particularly with regard to the principles that it contained. Convention No. 87 was an essential instrument, since workers needed freedom of association in order to be able to negotiate on equal terms with public and private employers, in view of the economic power wielded by the latter. It was in the interests of the workers for the resolution to be adopted. The majority of the members of the Workers' group, moreover, supported the point of view expressed by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations of the ILO, according to which the principles of freedom of association should be universally applied irrespective of the social and economic systems existing in the different countries. The Convention contained standards which were equally binding for all States. It was important for a new appeal to be launched for the ratification of the Convention in view of the fact that the standards that it contained were among the minimum principles that were applicable in a democratic society. Convention No. 87 might not be complete, but it was first necessary for it to be ratified and fully implemented before consideration was given to the formulation of new standards in this field.

142. The Workers' member of Jordan also believed that the resolution was important. Many countries had yet to ratify this instrument which had been adopted 40 years previously. The speaker also noted the measures taken against the Palestine Labour

Movement, which was the oldest trade union organisation in the Arab world, and had been set up in 1924. This year was also the twentieth anniversary of certain Arab territories. He referred to violations of freedom of association in these territories, which had been confirmed by information collected by the ILO, and considered that the resolution should be strengthened in paragraph 2 of its operative part in order to take this situation into account.

Consideration of amendments

143. Five amendments, numbered from D.26 to D.30, were submitted for examination.

144. The first to fourth preambular paragraphs of the resolution were adopted without discussion.

145. Amendment D.30, submitted by the Employers' group, sought to add the words "in accordance with the ILO Constitution" after the words "considering that" in the first line of the fifth preambular paragraph, move the fifth paragraph up to become the third and reorder the other paragraphs accordingly. The Employers' Vice-Chairman stressed that his group supported the resolution, as he had said during the general discussion. He merely wished to add a reference to the ILO Constitution since one-third of the member States had not ratified Convention No. 87 and were only bound by the Constitution. He also believed that this paragraph would be better positioned as the third paragraph.

146. The Workers' Vice-Chairman stated that his group doubted the need to add a reference here to the ILO Constitution, which had already been mentioned in the second preambular paragraph. He agreed, however, with the change in the order of the preambular paragraphs.

147. The Employers' Vice-Chairman agreed to withdraw the first part of the amendment, namely the reference to the ILO Constitution.

148. The fifth paragraph was accordingly moved up to become the third paragraph and the following paragraphs were reordered.

149. Amendment D.26, submitted by the Government members of Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic, sought to replace the words "irrespective of" by the words "taking into consideration" in the second and third lines of the fifth preambular paragraph.

150. Introducing the amendment, the Government member of the German Democratic Republic referred to the statements he had made during the general discussion of the resolution. It was necessary to avoid misunderstandings. The Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations which had been submitted to the present Session of the Conference, contained a passage which confirmed the basis for the amendment that he was proposing. In paragraph 20 of its General Report, the Committee stated that it was guided by the standards laid down in the Convention alone, mindful, however, of the fact that the modes of their implementation may be different in different States. This position was also in accordance with Article 8(2) of Convention No. 87 under which: "The law of the land shall not be such as to impair, nor shall it be so applied as to impair, the guarantees

provided for in this Convention." This provision established two principles: firstly, that there were different ways of implementing the rights embodied in the Convention; and secondly, that the guarantees provided thereunder should not be impaired. This was the objective of the amendment.

151. The Workers' Vice-Chairman, speaking on behalf of the authors of the resolution and a number of other Workers' members, stated that he was opposed to the amendment, since it was contrary to the intentions expressed in the original text. This text stated that the principles of freedom of association should be universally applied since Convention No. 87 contained compulsory minimum standards in the field of freedom of association. Article 8 of the Convention contained two parts, the first of which provided that workers, employers and their organisations should respect the law of the land, and the second, which should be taken in the context of the first, under which it was specified that the law of the land should not impair the guarantees provided for in the Convention. He could not therefore agree with the interpretation of this provision expressed by the previous speaker. With regard to the General Report of the Committee of Experts, it did not say that the principles of the Convention could differ in the light of economic and social systems. Paragraph 20 should be quoted as a whole. In fact, the Committee began by recalling its statement to the effect that in its evaluation of national law and practice in relation to the requirements of international labour Conventions,

its function is to determine whether the requirements of a given Convention are being met, whatever the economic and social conditions existing in a given country. Subject only to any derogations which are expressly permitted by the Convention itself, these requirements remain constant and uniform for all countries. In carrying out this work, the Committee is guided by the standards laid down in the Convention alone, mindful, however, of the fact that the modes of their implementation may be different in different States. These are international standards, and the manner in which their implementation is evaluated must be uniform and must not be affected by concepts derived from any particular social or economic system.

The Committee once again confirmed this point of view in paragraph 23 of its Report. The purpose of the resolution was to strengthen the Convention, whereas the amendment would weaken it.

152. The Employers' Vice-Chairman stressed the importance of the principle of universality in the implementation of the Convention. He expressed his agreement with the Workers' Vice-Chairman concerning the meaning of Article 8 of Convention No. 87. In a number of countries the law was contrary to the principles of freedom of association and some economic and social systems restricted the rights of workers and employers to organise. It should be recalled that, according to Article 2 of the Convention,

workers and employers, without distinction whatsoever, shall have the right to establish and, subject only to the rules of the organisation concerned, to join organisations of their own choosing without previous authorisation.

He expressed his opposition to the amendment.

153. The Government member of Belgium observed that the amendment raised an old question concerning the application of the Convention. It was possible, when drawing up an instrument, to take into account the social and economic conditions that

prevailed in different countries. At the stage of the implementation of standards it was necessary to adhere to the text of the instrument without making distinctions not contained in the instrument. Difficulties had arisen, particularly with regard to freedom of association, and the case law of the supervisory bodies was very clear in this respect. The Report of the Committee of Experts should be read in its entirety. In this precise connection, two of the Experts had defended a point of view that was similar to the one put forward by the authors of the amendment. Nevertheless, this point of view had not been subscribed to by the other members, that is, by the great majority of the Committee of Experts. Furthermore, the Committee on the Application of Standards had never accepted this point of view.

154. The Government member of the German Democratic Republic stated that he did not question the fact that the present text of the paragraph under discussion was also based on the Report of the Committee of Experts. If all the paragraphs of the Report of the Committee of Experts which dealt with this issue were to be quoted, reference should also be made to paragraph 50. It would be more constructive however to seek a compromise solution since it was clear, for example, that differences could exist according to the degree of development of countries. The text should therefore not be restricted to one point of view alone, but should incorporate the views of all sides in this respect. He accordingly proposed to restrict the paragraph under discussion to its first part, and to end it with the words "universally applied", deleting the rest of the paragraph, namely "irrespective of the social and economic systems existing in the different countries".

155. The Employers' Vice-Chairman referred once again to Article 8(2) of Convention No. 87 in order to justify his position and to maintain the original text of the paragraph concerned.

156. The Workers' Vice-Chairman, again speaking on behalf of the authors of the resolution and a number of other Workers' members, emphasised that the original text of the paragraph was clear and simple, as were the standards contained in Convention No. 87. He did not understand how they could be seen in any other light. It was important to maintain the original text in order to stress the fact that there should not be differences between social and economic systems in observance of the principles of the Convention.

157. The Government member of the German Democratic Republic said that he would not insist on a vote on his amendment. He nevertheless left open the possibility of returning to the question when the resolution was adopted finally.

158. The fifth preambular paragraph, moved up to become the third, was adopted.

159. The sixth preambular paragraph was also adopted.

160. Amendment D.28, submitted by the Government members of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, sought to add the following new paragraph after the sixth preambular paragraph.

Concerned at the fact that the low rate of unionisation in many countries, and particularly in certain sectors of economic activity, appreciably reduces the possibilities for trade union organisations

to protect the interests of workers and to participate in decisions affecting them, and that trends resulting from technological, structural and other types of changes are not encouraging,

Introducing the amendment, the Government member of Czechoslovakia referred to the statements made in this connection during the general discussion. The resolution called for measures to be taken in order to increase the number of ratifications and improve the implementation of Convention No. 87. For this purpose trade unions should play their part in society and should oppose changes introduced as a result of certain economic theories which led to a reduction in the influence of the trade unions.

161. The Workers' Vice-Chairman, speaking on behalf of the authors of the resolution and a substantial number of Workers' members, observed that his present statement applied to both amendment D.28 and amendment D.29 (see below). The resolution should concentrate on Convention No. 87 and give a new stimulus to its implementation. It should be left to the trade unions to concern themselves with the level of unionisation. The ILO could clearly play a role with regard to trade unions, and with employers' organisations, in the areas of information, education and standard-setting activities. Nevertheless, the ILO, which was composed not only of workers, but also of employers and governments, should not concern itself with levels of unionisation or with determining whether they were satisfactory: this was not its responsibility. In conclusion, the amendment served no useful purpose in the resolution.

162. The Employers' Vice-Chairman opposed the proposed amendment. He noted that Article 2 of Convention No. 87 stressed the independence of trade unions and their freedom of choice. The amendment would only be acceptable if subamended in such a way as to refer to the above provision, and also to refer to employers.

163. The Workers' member of the Byelorussian SSR emphasised the value of the amendment. Referring to the discussion that had just taken place concerning the fifth preambular paragraph (which had become the third) to the effect that the principles of freedom of association must be universally applied irrespective of the social and economic systems existing in the different countries, he observed that the same point of view should be maintained in the present discussion. Indeed, it was necessary to seek an increase in the number of trade union members, who were protected under Convention No. 87. In his country this instrument applied to practically all the workers, but this was not the case in industrialised market economy countries, where the number of trade union members was even tending to decline. He hoped that the connection between Convention No. 87 and trade union members would be mentioned.

164. The Government member of Malta observed that freedom of association also presupposed the right not to associate and that low levels of unionisation could result from freedom of choice on the part of workers and employers.

165. The Workers' member of Czechoslovakia emphasised that the issue referred to in the amendment was of vital importance. Indeed it was not

sufficient for there to be a legislative basis in this respect since it was also necessary for adequate material conditions to be fulfilled. The fall in levels of unionisation had been caused by the anti-union policies of employers and of certain governments. This was recognised by the ILO and the report of the Director-General to the Conference had referred to it a few years previously. Furthermore, the ILO had not limited itself to establishing a legal framework with regard to trade unions, since it had initiated activities for the benefit of workers' organisations (and not merely trade union organisations). It sought to promote such organisations and to give them assistance in establishing their structures, particularly in the rural sector. He accordingly supported the amendment.

166. The Government member of Czechoslovakia stated that he had thought the amendment was of particular interest for the Workers' group and other members of the Committee. The majority of the members of the Workers' group, however, considered that this was not a serious problem. He did not wish to impose his point of view on them and would not maintain his amendment. He was convinced however that in the near future the majority of the members of the Workers' group would perceive that the trends he had described did in fact exist and were more serious than they had thought.

167. Amendment D.28 was withdrawn and the seventh, eight and ninth preambular paragraphs of the original text were adopted.

168. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the operative part were also adopted.

169. Amendment D.27, submitted by the Government members of Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic, sought to add the following new paragraph after paragraph 3 of the operative part: "4. Invites the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to request the Director-General to submit proposals to it for standard-setting activities in order to expand trade union rights." Introducing the amendment, the Government member of the German Democratic Republic referred to the statements that he had made during the general discussion of the resolution. Some members of the Committee said that it was first necessary to ensure the full implementation of Convention No. 87 before establishing new trade union rights. He believed, however, that the two options were not mutually exclusive and that other activities should be undertaken at the same time. In his Report to the Conference, the Director-General had stated that the activities of the ILO should be adapted to the current situation. This should particularly apply in a field where the current situation did not appear to correspond to the realities of today. New standards should be established between now and the 21st century, and the resolution should be of assistance in achieving this. Thoughts should not be turned solely towards the past on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of Convention No. 87, but should look towards the future and the elaboration of new projects.

170. The Workers' Vice-Chairman observed that his group had decided to listen to the arguments of the authors of the amendment before taking up a position. Speaking on behalf of the authors of the

resolution and other Workers' members, he emphasised that in his view the resolution dealt with Convention No. 87, which had been ratified by only two-thirds of the member States of the ILO and which was implemented in some countries. It was not appropriate for an appeal for the establishment of new standards to be attached to the resolution itself. The text contained a call for the ratification and implementation of a specific Convention and dealt with a particular issue; it was inappropriate to deal with other matters in the resolution even if they were important. In short, the amendment went beyond the objectives of the authors of the Resolution and would not contribute to its effectiveness. It was admittedly possible to call for the establishment of new trade union rights, but not in the present resolution or at this particular time.

171. The Workers' member of the German Democratic Republic noted that it was not unusual on the occasion of an anniversary; not merely to look to the past, but to make plans for the future. Account should be taken of the developments that had occurred in the past 40 years. In the German Democratic Republic trade unions enjoyed more rights and freedoms than those provided for in the Convention. No laws had negative consequences for the workers and none could be adopted without their agreement.

172. The Employers' Vice-Chairman considered that this issue did not concern Convention No. 87; it should be brought up in relation to the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), and the Workers' Representatives Convention, 1971 (No. 135). He referred to his statements in the general discussion of the resolution. Following the discussion on international labour standards at the Conference in 1984, the Governing Body had set up a Working Party on Standards. The socialist countries had not wanted to participate in the work of this group, which had nevertheless examined possible subjects for new standards. The proposal should have been made in that framework. The amendment should also have referred to the rights of workers' and employers' organisations rather than trade union rights. He opposed the amendment.

173. The Government member of the United States expressed his support for the previous speaker's statement concerning the Working Party on Standards. He was opposed to the amendment which in his view, had nothing to do with the objectives of the resolution.

174. The Government member of the German Democratic Republic observed that, in his view, the 40th anniversary of the adoption of Convention No. 87 should be an occasion for undertaking new standard-setting activities in this field. In view of the limited support given to his amendment, however, he had decided to withdraw it.

175. The Workers' member of Kuwait emphasised that the specific objective of the resolution was to appeal to countries which had not yet ratified the Convention. He was not, therefore, particularly in favour of the amendment. He suggested that the Director-General of the ILO should address letters every year to the countries which had not ratified Convention No. 87 in order to urge them to do so.

176. Amendment D.29, submitted by the Government members of Czechoslovakia and Hungary,

sought to add the following new paragraph after paragraph 3 of the operative part:

4. Invite the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to instruct the Director-General to undertake studies concerning the causes of the low rate of unionisation and the unfavourable trends in certain countries and sectors of activity, with a view to collecting information which would permit consideration of appropriate action to increase the role of trade union organisations in such cases.

177. The Government member of Czechoslovakia referred, as an introduction to his amendment, to the general discussion and to the statements that he had made when introducing amendment D.28. The ILO had every opportunity to undertake studies such as the ones that had been called for in order to gather information and identify the real reasons behind the phenomena referred to in the amendment. In view of the position taken up by the Workers' and Employers' Vice-Chairmen regarding amendment D.28, which this amendment sought to complement, he would not, however, maintain his amendment.

178. The Government member of Algeria welcomed the withdrawal of the amendment. He observed, however, that the resolution was intended to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the adoption of Convention No. 87 in 1988. He considered that it was not sufficiently ambitious merely to call for the ratification of the Convention and that more should be done. In this respect the idea behind the amendment had been good. On this anniversary the situation should be reviewed and it would be possible, for example, to request the Director-General to devote next year's Report to the Conference to freedom of association.

Adoption of the resolution

179. The resolution was adopted by consensus.

180. The Government member of the German Democratic Republic, while associating himself with the consensus, reaffirmed the position that he had taken during the discussion of amendment D.26.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING MEASURES AGAINST DRUGS AND ALCOHOL ABUSE

Presentation of the resolution

181. The Government member of Sweden, introducing this resolution, reminded the Committee that more and more people were using or abusing a wider range of psycho-active substances resulting in a dramatic increase in problems and costs. This trend was not restricted to small subgroups but was to be found throughout society, and the workplace was no exception. Indeed, studies in many countries had indicated that the majority of problem drug and alcohol users were employed. Information collated by the ILO, such as the latest edition of the *Conditions of Work Digest*, which dealt with drug and alcohol assistance programmes in the workplace, brought the following facts to light: some 70 per cent of people with drink-related problems and some 60 per cent of drug users were in full-time employment; fatal accidents at work due to drug or alcohol abuse represented 15-30 per cent of all accident cases; 20-25 per cent of accidents at work involved intoxicated persons resulting both in injuries to themselves and to innocent third parties and causing damage to equipment;