



**American Federation
of Labor and
Congress of Industrial
Organizations**

815 Black Lives Matter
Plaza NW
Washington, DC 20006

202-637-5000

aflcio.org

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

ELIZABETH H. SHULER
PRESIDENT

FREDRICK D. REDMOND
SECRETARY-TREASURER

Cecil Roberts
Matthew Loeb
Randi Weingarten
Baldemar Velásquez
Lee A. Saunders
James Callahan
DeMaurice Smith
Sean McGarvey
D. Taylor
Stuart Appelbaum
Mark Dimondstein
Sara Nelson
Marc Perrone
Eric Dean
Richard Lanigan
Robert Martinez Jr.
Gabrielle Carteris
Mark McManus
Elissa McBride
John Samuels
Vonda McDaniel
Gwen Mills
Charles Wolkanech
Bonnie Castillo
Ernest A. Logan
James Stevin
John Costa
Tim Driscoll
Everett Kelley
Anthony Shelton
Edward A. Kelly
Evelyn DeJesus
Cheryl Eliano
Matthew S. Biggs
Roxanne Brown
Arthur Maratea
James A. Williams Jr.
Ben Valdepeña
Meghann Burke
Bernie Burnham
Gina Cooper
Frank Christensen
Roland Rexha
Rich Santa
Jason Ambrosi
Kenneth Cooper
Brian Renfro
Shawn Fain
Brent Booker
Michael Coleman
Claude Cummings Jr.
David Heindel
Margaret Mock

AFL-CIO

AMERICA'S UNIONS

The Director-General
International Labour Organization
Route des Morillon 4
CH-1211 Geneva 22
NORMES@ilo.org

02/11/2023

Dear Director General,

We make reference to your letter of 11 October 2023 concerning the request of the Employers' group to urgently include a standard-setting item on the right to strike on the agenda of the 112th Session of the International Labour Conference.

For the following reasons, the AFL-CIO finds that the request of the Employer's group will be legally, technically and politically impossible and therefore should be rejected by the Governing Body;

Firstly, there is no gap in the protection and regulation of the right to strike at the international level. The right to strike is protected under Convention 87 of the ILO and is an intrinsic corollary of freedom of association. The supervisory bodies of the ILO have built up an authoritative guidance in that regard over the past 70 years. This is however since 2012 strongly denied by the Employers' group. In such a situation, it is clear that there is no legal certainty as to what would be the basis and starting point for any standard setting exercise. In view of the totally opposite and mutually exclusive views on this fundamental issue, any initiative of a normative nature (for whatever purpose), will be impossible to move forward without first having settled these opposite views, through an authoritative and binding decision of the ICJ.

Secondly, the Employers' group calls for a Protocol to be attached to C87 to 'regulate' the right to strike while at the same time denying that C87 protects the right to strike. However, Protocols in the ILO have been introduced to deal in a flexible manner with partially revising certain provisions of existing Conventions. Therefore, it would be necessary to identify which provisions of C87 would need to be revised or clarified by the adoption of a protocol. If however, according to Employers the right to strike is not in any way addressed in Convention 87 to which the proposed Protocol would be attached, then it would neither be logical nor consistent with ILO's constitutional theory and practice to link such a Protocol to C87. The request of the Employers' group is therefore legally impossible.

Thirdly, the Employers' group continues to emphasize that the only viable solution to the dispute is standard setting. However, taking into account the fundamental disagreement underlying the dispute, it is difficult to understand how to ever achieve such consensus or broad majority. The Employers' group wants to use the proposal of standard setting to take away the existing fundamental right to strike under C87 while forcing the ILO's constituents to discuss the renegotiation of this fundamental principle and right at work as if it never existed. This is wrong and unacceptable. Our (your union) will never accept this. The constitutional objective and mandate of the ILO is to protect the rights of workers including where workers enjoy more favorable conditions. Therefore standard setting to undo, reverse or take away existing rights enjoyed by and relied upon by all workers will be contrary to the objective and mandate of the ILO's constitution and institutional purpose.

In conclusion, we reiterate that for all the above reasons, the Employers' proposal is fundamentally flawed and must be rejected. The only viable way to resolve the outstanding dispute on the right to strike and provide for legal certainty is to refer it, at long last, to the ICJ for an authoritative and binding decision.

We urge you to bring our concerns on this proposal of the Employers' group to the attention of the ILO Governing Body at its 349th session (October-November 2023).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cathy Feingold', written in a cursive style.

Catherine Feingold
AFL-CIO International Director