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**FIRST SITTING**

Wednesday, 18 August 2004, morning

_The sitting opened at 10.50 a.m., with Mr. Chung in the Chair._

**First item on the agenda**

**ELECTION OF THE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY FOR 2004-04**

_Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso (Government representative of Italy and Chairperson of the Government group)_ put forward the candidature of Mr. Philippe Séguin as Chairperson of the Governing Body for the 12-month period between 2004 and 2005. Mr. Séguin was a Public Auditor at the Court of Auditors (Cour des Comptes) of the French Republic; he was well known and respected by all in the ILO Governing Body, where he had represented France since 2002. Given the extraordinary tasks to be faced by the Governing Body over the coming months in the defence of workers’ right to decent work, an extraordinary Chairperson was required, able not only to deal with the Governing Body’s administrative load, but also to give a new impulse to its activities. Mr. Séguin would no doubt bring his eminent skills as a diplomat and orator to the post, as well as his profound knowledge of political life, apparent in all his interventions and in his numerous publications.

_The Employer Vice-Chairperson_ supported the candidature of Mr. Séguin as Chairperson of the Governing Body. He praised the relations between the Employers’ group and Mr. Chung throughout the past year.

_The Worker Vice-Chairperson_ congratulated Mr. Chung on the friendly but firm manner in which he had conducted business. Regarding the election of a new Chairperson, the Workers’ group had always considered it important that the person occupying the post should come from a country that defended and promoted the fundamental principles of the ILO, and was happy that the candidate proposed fulfilled these conditions.

_The Governing Body unanimously elected Mr. Philippe Séguin, Government representative of France, as Chairperson of the Governing Body for the period 2004-05._

_Ambassador Chung_ congratulated Mr. Séguin and, before stepping down as Chairperson, explained that the fact that a recent ILO member State like the Republic of Korea, which became a Member in 1991, should hold the chairpersonship of the Governing Body had made the Korean public more aware of the importance of the ILO and of international labour standards in the promotion of workers’ rights. He stated that on taking up his new responsibilities as a member of parliament of the Republic of Korea he would do all he could to promote and support ILO activities. He was already looking forward to his country hosting the Fourteenth Asian Regional Meeting, to be held in 2005, if the Governing Body accepted the proposal submitted by the Korean Ministry of Labour, with the backing of the governments of the Asia-Pacific group.

_Mr. Séguin took the Chair._

_Mr. Séguin (Chairperson of the Governing Body)_ expressed his deep gratitude to all those who had contributed to his nomination, and thanked them for the honour they had conferred on him. His predecessor, Ambassador Chung, had achieved much in the role of
Chairperson, and had shown particular talent in his conduct of the debates of the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization.

Mr. Séguin had inherited the important legacy of many of his eminent compatriots who had struggled through the difficult founding years of the International Labour Organization to make it a champion of peace and social justice. The attachment of the French Republic to these values was evident in the stamp that so many of its illustrious citizens had left on the history of the Organization, already present at the drafting of the ILO Constitution, and inaugurating the line of prestigious Directors-General – high function taken up with great dedication on two occasions – or guiding the work of the Governing Body, with full respect for the principle of tripartism. It was well known that an organization lacking an institutional memory could not embark on construction, and he therefore intended to follow, with determination and humility, in the footsteps of his predecessors to the benefit of the ILO.

Two matters of particular importance stood out from the Governing Body’s intense work programme: the preparation of the ILO Programme and Budget for 2006-07, and the practical application of the recommendations in the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization. The follow-up of the report was of great importance to the future of the ILO, in consolidating its position in the multilateral system and establishing it as a modern entity. In a word, the very vocation of the Organization, which had to be the motor of a controlled globalization, was at stake. The Chairperson then called for proposals for the Vice-Chairpersons of the Governing Body.

The Governing Body re-elected Mr. Daniel Funes de Rioja (Employer, Argentina) and Mr. Leroy Trotman (Worker, Barbados), respectively, as Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons of the Governing Body, for the period 2004-05.

Second item on the agenda

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 289TH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

A Government representative of Venezuela submitted that his Government’s statement regarding Committee on Freedom of Association Case No. 2249 (Venezuela) had not been adequately reflected in the minutes of the previous sitting. He requested that his Government’s intervention on Cases Nos. 2249 and 2254, to be discussed under item 5 of the agenda of the present session (334th Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association), should be fully represented in the minutes of the 290th Session.

A Government representative of Niger requested that, in the first paragraph on page II/5 of the English text, the sentence: “These workers’ organizations had now been replaced by the CDTN”, should be replaced by: “These organizations were now joined by the CDTN.”

Subject to this request and the aforementioned amendment, the Governing Body approved the minutes of its 289th Session.

Third item on the agenda

QUESTIONS ARISING OUT OF THE 92ND SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

The Worker Vice-Chairperson called for improvements in the electronic voting system, and suggested that the personal identification number (PIN code) should be
distributed to participants as they registered. The Workers’ group proposed that a committee of experts on the fishing sector should be established.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that improvement was needed in the electronic voting system. He requested clarification for all interested parties of the rules which governed the participation of non-governmental international organizations in ILO meetings. In the plenary, it was important to ensure that speakers alternated, in strict compliance with the principle of tripartism. The Employers’ group recognized the advances made in respect of the discussion of the Global Report, but that ways of improving the discussion should still be sought since the group believed that the follow-up under the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work was a matter of priority.

The Committee on Migrant Workers and the Committee on Work in the Fishing Sector had achieved excellent results in their respective sectors, and the ILO was now well prepared to hold an in-depth debate on both subjects. He approved the follow-up to the question concerning the fishing sector being placed in the hands of a committee of experts.

In respect of the Committee on the Application of Standards, he was aware of the need for more transparency in the debates of this body, with an explanation of the reasons why countries figured in the list of observations and information on the reports sent. Regarding the Committee on Human Resources, he explained that the Employers’ group could not support a Recommendation, although approving its basis, on account of the text relative to collective bargaining at international level, which appeared in paragraph 5(f), for the reasons expressed during the debates.

He appreciated the efforts made in the last day’s plenary discussion to allow the Workers’ and Employers’ groups to summarize their comments on the follow-up to the report of the World Commission. A number of issues had been frequently mentioned in the interventions, such as democracy, transparency, good governance, interplay between the local and the global, the informal sector of the economy, migration, and the reinforcement of the ILO’s work programme in the framework of the strategic objectives. These matters could be of great assistance in guiding the discussions of the next session of the Governing Body, to be held in November 2004, and in the measures to be adopted.

The Director-General said that the impact of the report of the World Commission, both politically and in the media, had gone beyond all expectations. The European Commission had presented a communication to the European Council, to the new European Parliament and to the European Economic and Social Committee on better ways of working together. It was clear that the world’s press was increasingly recognizing the ILO’s role in the construction of fair globalization.

Since the publication of the report of the World Commission, the Office had concentrated its activities in three main spheres: making the report known and debated; inserting the report into the United Nations process; and identifying key areas of action for the ILO itself.

Regarding distribution of the report, it had already been sent to all Heads of State and a wide range of other economic and social actors. It had been supported at the highest political level by the notable political personalities present at the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference: Ms. Halonen, President of Finland; Mr. Mpaka, President of the United Republic of Tanzania; Mr. Paranov, President of the Republic of Bulgaria; Ms. Clark, Prime Minister of New Zealand; and Mr. Rodríguez Zapatero, President of the Government of Spain. The report had also been warmly welcomed by other political leaders. Throughout the world, innumerable national or regional events were taking place or were planned, with a view to examining the report of the World
Commission, or to draw on its content. It was worth mentioning, as an example, that it was examined in the World Trade Organization (WTO) public symposium on Multilateralism at a Crossroads (Geneva, 25-27 May 2004); in China, it was taken as one of the texts for the Employment Forum (Beijing, 28-30 April 2004); and in Burkina Faso, it would be used as a reference at the African Union Extraordinary Summit on Employment and Poverty Alleviation, to be held in Ouagadougou in September 2004. It was certainly possible to say that the report of the World Commission had generated a worldwide dynamic that the tripartite constituents of the ILO should keep alive in their respective countries.

With regard to incorporating the report of the World Commission in the United Nations process, it should be noted that in April 2004, the report was presented to the Chief Executive Board; President Halonen presented it at a meeting of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC) and the Bretton Woods institutions. The goal was for the General Assembly of the United Nations to approve a resolution placing the Commission’s report on the agenda of the United Nations and its subsidiary bodies. The President and the Officers of the Governing Body could perform an important role in the contacts established by the ILO with the UN and the Bretton Woods institutions.

Two of the proposals formulated in the report of the World Commission which had been greeted with particular interest were the policy coherence initiative on growth, investment and employment, and the establishment of a globalization policy forum, with the assistance of the ILO, as the only Organization which bridged the gap between the inter-governmental system and private actors, through employers’ and workers’ organizations. The Director-General would keep the Governing Body informed of these initiatives.

Regarding the key areas of action for the ILO, the Report of the Director-General to the Conference already contained indications on the follow-up work within the ILO. The November 2004 Governing Body session would examine the Strategic Policy Framework for 2006-09 which would contain related elements. The goal was to identify the areas where the returns from investment would be highest, most closely reflecting constituents’ priorities, and increasing the effectiveness of the Decent Work Agenda, and which most drew advantage from the ILO’s unique tripartite structure.

The third area of follow-up within the ILO was the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization, which could pursue an in-depth discussion of the report of the World Commission in November 2004. With the agreement of the Governing Body, the Director-General would propose, in consultation with the Officers, to select one or two important issues from the World Commission report and from the Report of the Director-General to the Conference, for examination at the November 2004 session of the Governing Body. The Office would prepare brief documents accordingly. The repercussions of the work of the World Commission could be discussed in ILO tripartite meetings, in the European Regional Meeting, to be held in 2005, and in the Turin International Training Centre, which was examining ways of taking advantage of the report in its training programmes.

The assets of tripartism, combined with the integrating power of the Decent Work Agenda, provided the most important basis on which the ILO could undertake these new activities. At the planning stage, current and prospective human and financial resources must be taken into account, and ways must be found to expand those resources through partnerships, extra-budgetary support and the multiplier effect of work done by the ILO. All this must be achieved without going beyond the Organization’s mandate, while ensuring integrated action and collaboration with the organizations whose mandates intersect with, or affect, that of the ILO in any way.
A representative of the Government of Canada, speaking on behalf of the governments of the industrialized market economy countries, stressed that it was indispensable that the documents arrived in the hands of delegates between six to eight weeks before the opening of the Conference, to allow constituents sufficient time to appoint experts, conclude the necessary consultations and prepare themselves for the discussion. She thanked the Office for having organized the briefing session for delegates and technical advisers on committee rules and procedures. The regional groups should identify qualified chairpersons sufficiently early to enable them to benefit from preliminary briefing sessions.

The IMEC group insisted, in order to avoid costly evening sittings and an accumulation of unnecessary fatigue, that work in committees should begin on the morning of the first day of the Conference and that the sittings should start punctually. It was essential for the time restriction on each individual intervention and on the presentation and discussion of reports of the committees to be respected. Interventions should deal exclusively with the subject in question. To facilitate work in committees, nameplates should be provided. The possibility of limiting the Conference agenda to two technical committees should be examined.

The IMEC group called on the Office to review its document distribution policies, and proposed that documents be delivered to Government group meetings or made available at the distribution centre. The Office should examine further the suggestion made at the June 2003 session of the Governing Body, that draft committee reports should be sent by email to technical experts obliged to leave the Conference before the adoption of the report by the committee.

Regarding the discussion of the Global Report, it could not be said, despite the efforts made, that it had been either dynamic or interactive. To improve it, the Office should ensure planned and careful organization, and possibly seek inspiration in the interactive discussions held within the United Nations organization.

The IMEC group welcomed the outcome of the discussion on migrant workers, arrived at through tripartite discussions. However, the procedure applied in the Committee on Migrant Workers had not been satisfactory, especially as regards the consideration of the draft conclusions by the tripartite drafting committee. The procedure adopted by the Employer and Worker members precluded any consideration of government concerns, and the draft conclusions drawn up by the Office for the drafting group did not appropriately reflect the discussions in the Committee. The ILO should ensure that the principle of tripartism was fully respected in the work of the committees. Conversely, she considered that the work carried out by the Resolutions Committee was a good example of how tripartism could produce effective results.

The IMEC group looked forward to the Governing Body considering, at its session in November 2004, concrete proposals for the follow-up both to the report of the World Commission and to the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference.

Given the relevance of the accommodation of seafarers on board vessels to the second discussion on work in the fishing sector, to be held at the 93rd (June 2005) Session of the Conference, the IMEC group suggested that a proposal be put before the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee (PFAC), to finance the holding of a tripartite meeting of experts on the fishing sector out of the technical meetings reserve fund. This meeting would be held in December 2004 and would examine the question of the accommodation of seafarers on board vessels, and any other pending issues that the Committee on the Fishing Sector had identified.
A Government representative of Malawi was satisfied with the way in which the Conference was organized in general, but was concerned that certain delegations had left meetings before the work of the committees was completed. The Regional Coordinators should inform the constituents on the functioning of the Conference committees. The Office should perfect the use of the electronic voting system, and ensure the availability of adequate resources for groups to conduct their business. Lastly, he requested that the necessary steps be taken to avoid a recurrence of what happened in the Committee on Human Resources, where one of the constituents called for a vote, and on being defeated in the vote, rejected the result. Such action endangered the principle of tripartism in the ILO.

A Government representative of India praised the work of all those who had laboured until late at night during the Conference so that documents and reports would be on time. He also requested that the organization of plenary should be rationalized and that evening sittings should be avoided.

A Government representative of El Salvador supported the proposal made by the IMEC group that a meeting of experts on the fishing sector should be held in December 2004, and that in November 2004 the PFAC should examine the possibility of financing this meeting from the technical meetings reserve fund.

A Government representative of Norway asked for measures to be adopted to avoid what seemed in his eyes virtually to have become a custom during the Conference, namely the holding of evening and Saturday sittings. It would be interesting to see the total cost of overtime hours paid as a result of Conference work. To gain time in the committees, a limit should be set on the number of amendments submitted, as the majority were in any case withdrawn. He repeated the request for screens to be placed in the committee rooms so that all participants could clearly see the text of the amendment as it was under consideration, in order to avoid considerable confusion and loss of time. The Nordic countries were very satisfied that a resolution on the promotion of gender equality, pay equity and maternity protection had been adopted this year, and in this connection, thanks were due to the Workers’ group for their excellent cooperation which permitted this resolution to see the light of day.

A representative of the Director-General, in reply to the proposal submitted by the IMEC group that a meeting of experts on the fishing sector be financed out of the technical meetings reserve fund, said that the Office proposed that this meeting of experts be held in December 2004, and that it be composed of six Government representatives, six Employer and six Worker representatives. The Office proposed inviting the Governments of Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, South Africa and Spain, to send experts. The Employer and Worker experts would be nominated after consultations within the respective groups. There would be a reserve list of countries including Denmark, France, Germany, India, Namibia, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Thailand, the United Kingdom and the United States. The experts from the countries on the reserve list could attend at no cost to the ILO.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson was aware that the discussion planned for November 2004 was of great importance in respect of the adoption of decisions on the recommendations made by the World Commission. As regards the statement of the Government representative of Malawi, it should be clearly understood that the Employers’ group had in no way obstructed the mechanism of adopting decisions by the Conference, but had limited itself to establishing unequivocally its opinion on the resolution submitted to vote.

The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the Workers’ group was in favour of holding the meeting of experts on the fishing sector in December 2004. The group agreed that the costs of the Conference should be reduced, but not by diminishing the number of technical committees. The elaboration of standards and the review mechanisms were essential.
activities. With regard to the organization of the Conference in general, it was important for participants to maintain a dignified attitude at all times and to express themselves in parliamentary language, with respect for the right of each person to speak freely.

_The Chairperson_ noted the statements made by the representatives of the three groups regarding the Committee on the Fishing Sector. That Committee had considered and adopted conclusions on work in the fishing sector, and had agreed that a mechanism should be established to examine the fundamental question of accommodation of seafarers on board vessels, and deal with the issues that had been left pending. To a large extent, the success of the discussion on the fishing sector, planned for the 93rd Session of the International Labour Conference, would depend on this examination. To this end, the PFAC would receive a proposal in November 2004 for a meeting of experts on the fishing sector to be financed out of the technical meetings reserve fund.

_The Governing Body expressed its intention to hold a tripartite meeting of experts on the fishing sector in December 2004, according to the modalities outlined above. The related proposal would be submitted to the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee at its November 2004 session._

**Fourth item on the agenda**

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE FOURTEENTH ASIAN REGIONAL MEETING**

_A Government representative of the Republic of Korea_ thanked the members of the Asia-Pacific group for their unanimous approval of, and support for, the proposal by the Government of the Republic of Korea to host the Fourteenth Asian Regional Meeting. The Office had also made extra efforts to facilitate a departure from the usual practice of holding regional meetings at the ILO Regional Office for the region concerned. The Korean Government had considered the question in the light of recommendations made by the ILO survey team that had visited the Republic of Korea, and proposed the city of Busan, home to the fourth largest harbour in the world, to host the Meeting. The point for decision should therefore be amended to include the name of Busan, and the wording indicating that the Meeting would be held in September should be altered to read “the second half of 2005”. The final text of the point for decision would be: “The Governing Body may therefore wish to decide to transfer the Fourteenth Asian Regional Meeting to Busan, Republic of Korea, and to hold the Meeting in the second half of 2005.”

_A Government representative of Saudi Arabia_ thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea for its proposal to host the Regional Meeting and expressed support for the proposal. Paragraph 2 of the document before the Governing Body referred to informal consultations which included the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. On an issue as important as this, the Arab Office in Beirut should also be consulted. In future, the Asian Regional Meeting should be held alternately in Bangkok and Beirut. Paragraph 4 of the document referred to “small” member States. It was not clear what this meant.

_The Chairperson_ suggested the phrase should read: “all member States”, rather than “small member States”.

_The Employer Vice-Chairperson_ thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea on behalf of the Employers’ group and supported the point for decision as amended.

_The Worker Vice-Chairperson_ added his group’s support to the point for decision.

_The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the report, as amended._
Fifth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

334th Report

The Reporter of the Committee said that there were 108 pending cases and 30 had been examined on their merits. The Committee was very concerned at the increased workload before it, but had taken some action to make its work more efficient. Complaints brought against the same government, including similar allegations from different complainant organizations, were now often combined in the same case to ensure full, fair and rapid treatment.

At the 289th (March 2004) Session of the Governing Body, the governments of Latin America and the Caribbean had urged the Committee to review its procedures. This review had in fact already taken place, and had been reported to the Governing Body at its 283rd (March 2002) Session. The new procedures were currently undergoing a trial period so that their impact could be observed, prior to possible final adoption.

The Committee had drawn special attention to a series of urgent and serious cases: those of Cuba (Case No. 2258), Venezuela (Cases Nos. 2249 and 2254), and Zimbabwe (Case No. 2313). The Committee regretted, with regard to Cuba, that the Government had categorically rejected a direct contacts mission, and that it had not sent the requested judgements on the seven trade union officials sentenced to long-term imprisonment. Clear information was needed in cases where the defence of human rights might have been qualified as unlawful and, given the absence of this information, the Committee urged the Government to release the prisoners immediately. A second problem in this case concerned the trade union monopoly established by law. The Government should adopt new measures enabling workers to establish freely operating organizations of their own choosing. The legislation should be amended to ensure that collective bargaining in labour centres could take place without interference and recourse to compulsory arbitration by the authorities.

Case No. 2249 on Venezuela was unusual in that discrimination was observed in respect of both workers’ and employers’ organizations. On the basis of the facts, the Committee concluded that the detention order against Mr. Carlos Ortega, President of the Venezuelan Workers’ Confederation (CTV), was introduced in order to punish him for his actions in defence of workers’ rights. It should be rescinded forthwith, and the Government should recognize the executive committee of the CTV and avoid action tending to diminish its capacity to operate effectively. The Committee urged the Government to supply its observations and information on the various points raised in its recommendations, including the refusal to register UNAPETROL, the detention orders placed against its president and labour management secretary, and the dismissal of over 18,000 workers from the PDVSA oil company.

Case No. 2254 on Venezuela was brought by the International Organisation of Employers (IOE) and by the Venezuelan Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Manufacturers’ Associations (FEDECAMARAS). The Committee regretted generally the lack of respect for the rights of employers’ organizations, and that the Government was seeking to marginalize FEDECAMARAS by failing to consult with it on a bipartite or tripartite basis. The National Federation of Stockbreeders (FEDENGA) should be reinstated and the Government should desist from promoting the National Confederation of Farmers and Stockbreeders of Venezuela (CONFAGAN) to the detriment of FEDENGA. The Committee deplored the arrest of Carlos Fernández, against whom all judicial action should be lifted, and it called on the Government to investigate the acts of vandalism at the Lasa Chamber of Commerce, the looting of the office of the president of CONSECOMERCIO, the threats of violence against the president of the Bejuma Chamber
of Commerce, and 180 claims of illegal invasion of land. An independent investigation should be conducted into the activities of the paramilitary groups mentioned in the allegations, with a view to disarming and dismantling them.

Case No. 2313 on Zimbabwe concerned allegations of arrests of trade union leaders and members of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions, and of repeated anti-trade union harassment by the authorities and the police in October and November 2003. The Committee said, in reply to the Government’s assertion, that the activities repressed in these months were led by political elements within the trade unions, that the demonstrations in this case were on issues related to the high cost of living and trade union rights. Pending further information, it strongly urged the Government to refrain from arresting and detaining trade union members for reasons connected to their activities, and also to refrain from intervening in legitimate trade union business.

The Employer spokesperson gave his group’s support for the report, and in particular for the qualification of the two Venezuelan cases, the Cuban and the Zimbabwean case as serious and urgent. Case No. 2197, on South Africa, concerned locally recruited personnel at the South African Embassy in Dublin. The Employers’ group continued to have serious reservations about the validity of the allegations made against the Government. The group supported the Committee’s recommendations regarding Case No. 2253, on China – Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, that the Government should undertake consultations in determining the terms and conditions of public employees, and seek ILO technical assistance in this. In respect of Case No. 2258, on Cuba, the aggressive nature of the Government’s response to the allegations was particularly regrettable, as was its refusal to accept a direct contacts mission.

In Case No. 2310, on Poland, the allegations that the Government had failed to negotiate with workers’ organizations in restructuring and privatizing the coal mining industry appeared unfounded, and the Committee declined to examine the case further.

In the two cases regarding Venezuela, the Committee remained seriously concerned about the situation of workers’ and employers’ organizations in the country. Case No. 2254 was initiated by an employer complaint involving the harassment and interference of employers and their organizations, including the arrest of the president of the principal employers’ organization. The group firmly supported the Committee’s strong recommendations.

The Worker spokesperson pointed out that, possibly as a result of the promotion of the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, the Committee’s workload was increasing. However, there continued to be imbalances between the regions in the number of cases presented; some regions were presenting very few cases, despite serious violations being evident in those regions.

Case No. 2313 on Zimbabwe concerned the arrest and detention of trade union members and leaders in October and November 2003, events which mirrored other incidents in March 2002. The Committee’s jurisprudence was very clear: the Government’s interference in the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU) workshops was in violation of freedom of association. In this case, the Committee had been obliged to reiterate that trade union activities could not be restricted to occupational matters alone. In Case No. 2249 concerning Venezuela, the Committee considered that the detention order that had prompted Mr. Carlos Ortega, President of the CTV, to flee the country, was a device to make it impossible for him to continue his activities in defence of
workers’ interests. The Government should recognize the executive committee of the CTV, and avoid issuing potentially damaging statements against the organization. The Government was requested to send its observations on the refusal to register UNAPE\nTROL, on the detention orders against its president and on the mass dismissal of over 18,000 workers from PDVSA, and, in view of the assassination of Mr. Numar Ricardo Herrera on 1 May 2003, the Committee would examine this question at its next review of the case. In the final serious and urgent case – Case No. 2258 on Cuba – the Committee deeply regretted the Government’s rejection of a direct contacts mission, first proposed in November 2003, and that the Government had failed to send copies of the very heavy prison sentences that had been meted out to seven trade union officials. The Committee deplored the infiltration of the Independent National Workers’ Confederation of Cuba (CONIC) and urged the immediate release of the detained trade unionists. Its decisions were those of an impartial and specialized tripartite body with over 50 years’ experience, and were of universal scope, regardless of the level of development of a member State and its political, economic or social system.

With regard to designating a trade union monopoly in law and practice, the Committee urged the Government to adopt provisions recognizing the right of workers to establish organizations of their own choosing, free to conduct their activities as they deemed necessary, and to allow collective bargaining to take place without binding compulsory arbitration or interference from the authorities. Lastly, the Government should protect the right to strike, when exercised peacefully, preventing any form of discrimination.

Case No. 2301, on Malaysia, concerned violations that had been continuing for 15 years, and which included serious encroachments on of the right to organize and bargain collectively. The Committee deplored the Government’s lack of cooperation and reiterated that it was entitled to seek ILO technical assistance if it wished.

Four cases concerned anti-union activity in Colombia, including serious allegations of violations in the public sector. The Committee had not examined Case No. 1787 on Colombia, but would hold in-depth discussions on this at the next meeting in November 2004.

In Case No. 2222, on Cambodia, the Cambodian Independent Teachers’ Association contended that the law governing civil servants and teachers was in violation of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. The Committee recommended that the Government amend its legislation to guarantee fully the right to organize and bargain collectively, and referred some aspects of the case to the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. The Government was reminded that it could seek ILO technical assistance.

Case No. 2224, on Argentina, concerned the retention by the Government of trade union dues paid by members between 1994 and 1996. The Government’s explanation, based on the prevailing economic crisis, could not stand in so far as the dues in question did not belong to the authorities, but were deposited with them prior to their remittal to the appropriate trade union. The amounts, with accrued interest, should therefore be transferred forthwith.

Regarding Case No. 2197, which concerned locally employed staff in the South African Embassy in Ireland, the Committee had requested further information from the Government and would investigate the case further in due course.

*The Governing Body adopted the introduction to the report in paragraphs 1-94.*
A Government representative of South Africa drew the attention of the Governing Body to the great complexity of Case No. 2197 and suggested that it might not even be receivable.


A Government representative of Cuba stated that the Committee had already received sufficient legal and practical information from the Government in respect of Case No. 2258. The Cuban Labour Code established the right of workers to join organizations of their own free will, without seeking prior authorization to do so; trade union organizations were able to carry out their activities in full freedom. There were 19 branch unions and a central federation. Although mention was made of the latter institution in the Labour Code, it was instigated 65 years ago at the will of the Cuban people, and not at that of the State. Workers’ congresses took place regularly, without government interference of any sort. The Labour Code had been discussed in every workplace in the country before enactment. All previous versions of the Code had included proposals made by workers at all levels, in such a way that their true interests had been reflected. Amendments had been introduced to adapt the Code to the prevailing socio-economic situation in Cuba.

The present case was simply one more instance of the defamation of Cuba which had begun in the 1960s. The rights of workers in Cuba were significantly more comprehensive than in many other countries. The country had an unemployment rate of 2.3 per cent; 100 per cent social security cover; 98 per cent unionization. The ILO was being manipulated as part of a strategy, led by the United States, of which the principal aim was to destabilize the Cuban socio-political model. A recent report of the United States Commission for Democratic Assistance in Cuba included details of generous funds for the creation of subversive groups, which in some cases disguised themselves as independent unions. These were nothing more than groups of mercenaries. The ILO was being used to interfere in the affairs of a sovereign State.

Cuba had received 29 technical cooperation missions over the past decade. It fully respected its reporting obligations to the ILO. It had nothing to hide and much to be proud of. The closing of Case No. 2258 would be a clear demonstration of justice, objectivity and independence by the Organization.

A Government representative of Venezuela recalled that at the 288th (November 2003) Session of the Governing Body, his Government had expressed concern under this case that the Committee was being used as an arena for political confrontation, and that the appropriate working methods should be adhered to, taking full account of the information supplied by the Government, so that a balanced, objective and transparent examination of the case could be undertaken. Unilateral measures, repeatedly criticized by the United Nations General Assembly, were being taken to strengthen the economic blockade against Cuba. The Venezuelan Government supported the Cuban authorities in their efforts to apply Convention No. 87.

A Government delegate of Belarus said that Cuba had achieved great success in attaining social welfare for its people, in spite of a harsh economic blockade. It should be helped, rather than hindered on its path to progress. The Cuban Government had shown willingness to cooperate with the Committee and had ratified ILO Conventions. Detailed arguments concerning Case No. 2258 had been submitted to the Committee. The new Labour Code had been drafted with the involvement of the social partners. These positive aspects did not appear in the report which tended to draw attention to various shortcomings. Much evidence was lacking from the report to back up the conclusions that had been reached; given this fact, it was possible to suspect a certain degree of political
interference within the supervisory machinery. The Governing Body should do all in its power to prevent this from continuing.

A Government representative of Viet Nam welcomed the continued efforts of the Government of Cuba in its observance of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, and in its active cooperation with the ILO in fulfilling its reporting obligations and supplying requested information. The Government of Viet Nam believed that the ILO supervisory bodies, when considering the individual case of any country, should take full note of information provided by all parties concerned. In promoting international standards, the ILO would do well to take account of the specific, historical, political, economic and cultural conditions in each country. Cooperation between the Government of Cuba and the ILO on this basis would lead to an effective solution, beneficial to the development of Cuba and in the interests of its people.

A Government representative of Indonesia stated that his delegation was encouraged by the measures taken by the Cuban Government in support of freedom of association in Cuba. The information supplied by the Government should be considered favourably by the Governing Body.

A Government representative of Sudan supported the statement by the Government representative of Cuba, saying that the federation in question did not have official, legal status in Cuba as a trade union. Complaints submitted to the Committee should concern violations of freedom of association, and should not be based on other political considerations.

A Government representative of South Africa said the Government of Cuba appeared to have acted in good faith in this case. The trade union organization had not indicated in what way the actions of the state security agents mentioned could be construed as interference with trade union activities. Without more information, the case did not merit further examination.

A Government representative of China noted that the Cuban Government had responded correctly to requests for information regarding this case. The Governing Body should close the case as soon as possible.

A Government representative of the Arab Libyan Jamahiriya said that Cuba had supplied all information called for and continued to make efforts to comply with Convention No. 87. The additional information supplied by Cuba should be given serious consideration.

A Government representative of Nigeria said that the ILO had earned the world’s respect through its even-handed treatment of all countries, whether developed or developing. Cuba’s politics and the path the country had taken to reach its present state were well known. However, international politics should not be allowed to influence the decisions of the Governing Body. This case should be considered on its own merits, without regard to the social, economic or political situation of Cuba.

A Government representative of Bangladesh urged that the case concerning Cuba should be considered on its merits, in the spirit of promotion and protection of labour rights.

A Government representative of Malawi said that more information was required from both complainants and the Cuban Government on this case.

The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, notwithstanding real admiration for many of the social achievements in Cuba, whenever there was a violation of rights defended by the
ILO, these violations should be clearly signalled and remedied. The Workers’ group was not acting as part of a political coalition in any way. The Cuban authorities claimed to have nothing to hide. They should therefore accept openly a direct contacts mission. This would not indicate subservience, but rather the liberty of belonging to a community which observed the same rules. The report referred to by the Government representative of Cuba, which concerned disruption to the State of Cuba, was certainly disturbing. However, it had no connection to the action of the Workers’ group in this matter. Regarding this specific case, Cuba had a responsibility to respond to the Committee’s requests and the group felt it should accept a direct contacts mission.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson refuted the suggestion that the ILO was being manipulated as part of a political agenda. This case concerned, firstly, respect for the principles of fundamental Convention No. 87 and, secondly, the working procedures of the Committee. Where the scope of this Convention was at stake, and freedom of association threatened, it was essential to act. The group therefore fully endorsed the recommendations of the Committee, and urged all governments who had spoken to do likewise, so that a speedy solution to the case could be found.


A Government representative of Venezuela, with reference to Case No. 2249, said his Government was seriously concerned at the lack of response from the Committee on Freedom of Association regarding the proposals respectfully submitted by the Government some two months previously. ILO standards were being used as a means of unilaterally accumulating complaints. In spite of this failure to reply, the Government of Venezuela had supplied information, including the decisions of the Supreme Court of Justice, on a number of the allegations. This information proved that the action taken by the authorities was in accordance with Conventions Nos. 87 and 98.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 876 of the report.

A Government representative of Venezuela said that his Government’s feelings concerning Case No. 2249 applied equally to Case No. 2254. The conclusions and recommendations in this case did not take account of the progress achieved by the Government to ensure respect for the fundamental Conventions, nor of its firm appreciation of ILO technical assistance. The Committee had taken interim reports, which contained inexact statements, sometimes of a political nature, as the basis for its conclusions. It had consequently made contradictory recommendations, inconsistent with its doctrine of many years. Police investigations in Caracas had revealed the presence of foreign military groups, trained and armed by ultra right-wing groups, which wished to overthrow the democratically elected Government. No explanation was given as to why the recommendations advised the dismantling of the principal political party in the Government, the MVR, which had enjoyed the support of 40 per cent of the electorate at the last elections, and which had pushed forward the reform of the Labour Law, as recommended by the Committee of Experts.

The Committee on Freedom of Association also exceeded its mandate in recommending modifications to the economic and monetary policies of Venezuela, and in proposing legislative changes which would increase the impunity of violators of human rights. The report did not take account of the circumstances surrounding the coup d’état in 2002 – the obstruction of free transit by road blockages, subversion of public order and paralysis of essential public services, threats to the lives, safety and health of 25 million Venezuelans, and unrest in the oil industry, which provided 50 per cent of the PNB. The Governing Body of the ILO should be aware that the Committee on Freedom of Association was in this instance acting on a case which had nothing to do with a violation
of Convention No. 87. Freedom of association enjoyed full respect in Venezuela, when exercised in accordance with the law of the land, as stipulated by Article 8 of the Convention, and not in such a way as to subvert public order, orchestrate action to destabilize the national and international economy, and attack democratic institutions.

The shortcomings in the Committee’s methods were clearly demonstrated by the omission of information and evidence supplied voluntarily by the Government. Hard facts were ignored in the examination of the case, while statements were upheld although they had neither factual nor legal grounding, went beyond the competence of the Committee, and were rooted in prejudice. This constituted blatant disregard of the Committee’s doctrine in respect of public liberties, the rule of law, strikes in essential public services and acute national crisis. It revealed that the methods used lacked academic rigour, transparency, impartiality and the necessary objectivity.

The Government remained confident that the urgently needed improvements would be made to the working methods of the Committee, as called for repeatedly by the governments of Latin American and Caribbean States and by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It also had confidence in ILO technical assistance, and in tripartism and social dialogue, but on a basis of inclusiveness, and through working methods that helped States to apply Conventions Nos. 87 and 98.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 1089 of the report.

A Government representative of South Africa wished to place on the record his congratulations to the Government of Zimbabwe, and the present Minister of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare, Mr. Paul Mangwana, and the leaders of the Zimbabwean Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU), for their responsible leadership at the meeting convened by the speaker, the Minister of Labour for South Africa, together with the Congress of the South African Trade Unions and the National Congress of Trade Unions in South Africa. He expressed gratitude that the Government and the ZCTU had agreed that the process of amendment to Zimbabwean labour law should continue, that the ZCTU had contributed to this process, and that the Kadoma Declaration was being taken as a basis for agreement on the economic problems the country was currently experiencing. It was particularly encouraging that the Labour Ministers of Zimbabwe and South Africa had been given authorization to sign a bilateral agreement in this regard. This was an example of successful social dialogue.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 1121, and the report as a whole.

Sixth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

[No business.]

Eighth item on the agenda

COMPOSITION AND AGENDA OF STANDING BODIES AND MEETINGS

Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 1 of the report, and appointed Ms. Angelika Nussberger (Germany) and Mr. Michael Halton Cheadle (South
Africa) as members of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations for a period of three years. The Governing Body further adopted the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the report.

**Tripartite Meeting of Experts to Develop Joint ILO/WHO guidelines on Health Services and HIV/AIDS**

*(Geneva, 1-3 December 2004)*

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 7 and 9 of the report.

**Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Code of Good Drafting Practices**

The Governing Body approved the following composition for this Meeting:

- **Government experts:** to be nominated by France and Canada;
- **Employer experts:** Mr. Edward Potter (United States)
  Ms. Marie-Paule Roiland (France)
- **Worker experts:** to be supplied later.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 12 of the report.

**Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group**

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

**Appointment of a Governing Body delegation to the Extraordinary Summit of the African Union on Employment and Poverty Alleviation in Africa**

*(Ouagadougou, 3-9 September 2004)*

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 17 of the report.

**Programme of meetings as approved by the Officers of the Governing Body**

*Approved symposia, seminars, workshops and similar meetings*

The Governing Body took note of these information papers.

The Worker Vice-Chairperson informed the Governing Body that Ms. M. de Vits (Belgium) had become a member of the European Parliament and was quitting her functions on the Governing Body. She was replaced by Mr. T. Etty (Netherlands). Likewise, Mr. D. Cunniah had resigned from his post as Secretary of the Workers’ group, and was to be replaced by Ms. Anna Biondi.

The sitting closed at 2.25 p.m.
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Mr. F. CHEN, Official, Office of General Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme M. KALATI LOBE, chargée d’études, assistant n° 1, ministère de l’Emploi, du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canada Canada Canadá</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. D. ROBINSON, Director, International Labour Affairs, Department of Human Resources and Skills Development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
substitute(s):
Mr. D. MACPHEE, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Ms. L. L’HEUREUX, Deputy Director, International Labour Affairs, Department of Human Resources and Skills Development.

---

El Salvador

Sr. J. ESPINAL ESCOBAR, Ministro de Trabajo y Previsión Social.
suplente(s):
Sra. E. AVILA DE PEÑA, Directora de Relaciones Internacionales de Trabajo, Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social.
acompañado(s) de:
Sr. M. CASTRO GRANDE, Encargado de Negocios a.i., Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

---

Espagne     Spain     España

Sr. J. BOSCH BESSA, Representante Permanente Adjunto, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
suplente(s):
Sr. G. LÓPEZ MACLELLAN, Consejero Diplomático, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. C. LÓPEZ-MONÍS, Consejero Laboral y de Asuntos Sociales, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. R. GARCÍA CONDE, Consejero Laboral adjunto, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

---

Ghana

Mr. Y. BARIMAH, Minister of Manpower, Development and Employment.
substitute(s):
Mr. S.J.K. PARKER-ALLOTEY, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:
Mr. K. BALADO-MANU, Chairman, Parliamentary Select Committee.
Ms. A. BENYIWA-DOE, Member of Parliament (Rankin Member).
Mr. P. AMOGEE, Assistant Chief Labour Officer.
Mr. E. NYARKO, Assistant Chief Labour Officer.

---

Iran, Rép. Islamique d’ Islamic Republic of Iran República Islámica del Irán

Mr. S. HEFDAHTAN, Director-General for International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
substitute(s):
Mr. M. SALAMATI, Deputy Labour Minister for Coordination and International Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
accompanied by:
Mr. M. RAJABI, Director-General, Labour Relations Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms. E. ALAFAR, Director-General, Women’s Employment Office, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. B. SHEIKH, Deputy Director-General, International Relations Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms. S. TASDIGHI, Senior Expert, International Relations and ILO Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

### Jordanie Jordan Jordania

Mr. S. MADI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*substitute(s):*

Mr. W. OBEIDAT, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. S. DAJANI, Adviser ILO issues, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. G. AL-RUSAN, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. J. AL-SHEIKH, Labour Inspector, Inspection Directorate.

### Kenya

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

*substitute(s):*

Mr. E. NGARE, Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*accompanied by:*

Mr. P. KARANJA, Labour Officer, ILO Duties, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.

### Luxembourg Luxembourg Luxemburgo

M. A. BERNS, Ambassadeur, mission permanente, Genève.

*suppléant(s):*

M. G. TUNSCH, inspecteur principal, ministère du Travail et de l’Emploi.
Mme P. FURLANI, attachée de gouvernement, ministère du Travail et de l’Emploi.
M. M. GODEFROID, premier secrétaire, mission permanente, Genève.
Mme J. RIPPERT, attachée, mission permanente, Genève.

### Malawi

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

*substitute(s):*

Mr. Z. KAMBUTO, Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

### Maroc Morocco Marruecos

M. O. HILALE, Ambassadeur, représentant permanent, mission permanente, Genève.

*suppléant(s):*

Mme S. BOUASSA, conseillère, mission permanente, Genève.

### Niger Niger Níger

M. S. KASSEYE, ministre de la Fonction publique et du Travail.
accompagné(s) de:
M. S. HAMADOU, directeur général de l’administration du travail et de la formation professionnelle par intérim.

Nouvelle-Zélande
New Zealand
Nueva Zelandia

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

substitute(s):
Mr. T. CAUGHLEY, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Oman
Oman
Omán

Mr. A. AL-ABDUWANI, Adviser to the Minister for Manpower Planning, Ministry of Manpower.

substitute(s):
Mr. Z. AL-SA’ADI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Philippines
Philippines
Filipinas


Roumanie
Romania
Rumania

M. B. NEMES, expert principal, ministère du Travail, de la Solidarité sociale et de la Famille.

suppléant(s) :
Mme G. CONSTANTINESCU, premier secrétaire, mission permanente, Genève.

Singapour
Singapore
Singapur

Mr. V. MENON, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):
Mr. S. MANIAR, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Slovénie
Slovenia
Eslovenia

Mr. A. GOSNAR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):
Ms. K. RIHAR BAJUK, Adviser, International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.
Mr. A. ZIDAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Turquie
Turkey
Turquía

Uruguay

Sr. R. GONZÁLEZ ARENAS, Ministro, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sra. A. ROCANOVA, Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Venezuela

Sr. R. CANO-MANUEL, Viceministro de Trabajo.

suplente(s):
Sr. F. LÓPEZ, Consultor Jurídico.
Sr. R. DARÍO MOLINA, Director de la Oficina de Relaciones Internacionales y Enlace con la OIT, Ministerio de Trabajo.
Sr. R. HANDS, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. J. ARIAS, Asesor Político, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Viet Nam

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

substitute(s):
Mr. PHAM HONG NGA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. VU HUY TAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Ms. PHUNG THI LAN HUONG, Officer, Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. NGUYEN THANH HAI, International Cooperation Officer, Department of International Relations, Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membres employeurs titulaires</th>
<th>Regular Employer members</th>
<th>Miembros empleadores titulares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Président du Conseil d'Administration:</td>
<td>Sr. D. FUNES DE RIOJA (Argentina), Presidente del Departamento de Política Social, Unión Industrial Argentina (UIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Body:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. B. BOISSON (France), conseiller social, Mouvement des entreprises de France (MEDEF).

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

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

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

Mr. M. LAMBERT (United Kingdom), Representative, Confederation of British Industry.

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

M. A. M’KAISSI (Tunisie), conseiller directeur central, Union tunisienne de l’industrie, du commerce et de l’artisanat (UTICA).

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

Mme L. SASSO MAZZUFFERI (Italie), conseiller spécial des affaires internationales, Confédération générale des employeurs d’Italie, CONFINDEUSTRIA.

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

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

Mr. G. TROGEN (Sweden), Director-General, ALMEGA.

M. Y. WADE (Sénégal), président, conseil national du patronat du Sénégal.
Mr. I. ANAND (India), Chairman, Shivathene Corporate Centre.

M. F. BALBOUL (Liban), membre, Association des industriels libanais.

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

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

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

Sr. A. ECHAVARRÍA SALDARRIAGO (Colombia), Vicepresidente de Asuntos Jurídicos y Sociales, Asociación Nacional de Industriales (ANDI).

Mr. A. FINLAY (Canada), Chairperson, Canadian Employers Council.

M. L. GLÉLÉ (Bénin), président, Conseil national du patronat du Bénin.

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

Mr. T. HUNTJENS (Netherlands), Adviser, International Social Affairs, Federation of Netherlands Industry and Employers.

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

Mr. G. KONDITI (Kenya), Deputy Executive Director, Federation of Kenya Employers.

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

M. E. MEGATELI (Algérie), secrétaire général, Confédération générale des opérateurs économiques algériens.

M. B. NACOULMA (Burkina Faso), directeur de société, Conseil national du patronat burkinabé.

Mr. P. TOMEK (Austria), Director, Legal and Staff Division, Boehringer-Ingelheim Austria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K. AHMED</td>
<td>General Secretary</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. H. ANDERSON NEVÁREZ</td>
<td>Secretaria de Acción Femenil del Comité</td>
<td>México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. G. ATTIGBE</td>
<td>Secrétaire général</td>
<td>Bénin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. B. BYERS</td>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. U. ENGELEN-KEFER</td>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. B. MAHAN GAHÉ</td>
<td>Secrétaire général</td>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. S. NAKAJIMA</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. OSHIOMHOLE</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A. SIDI SAÏD</td>
<td>Secrétaire général</td>
<td>Algérie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. E. SIDOROV</td>
<td>International Secretary</td>
<td>Russie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. S. STEYNE</td>
<td>International Officer</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. VACCARI NETO</td>
<td>Secretary-General</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. ZELLHOEFER</td>
<td>European Representative</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sir R. TROTMAN (Barbados), General Secretary, Barbados Workers' Union
Sr. A. ALVIZ (Colombia), Presidente, Confederación de Trabajadores de Colombia.

Sr. J. ARCINIEGA AGUIRRE (Ecuador), Presidente, Confederación Ecuatoriana de Organizaciones Sindicales Libre (CEOSL).

M. M. BLONDEL (France), secrétaire général, Confédération générale du travail force ouvrière (CGT-FO).

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

Sra. B. CORTEZ (Perú), Secretaria de Integración y Diálogo Social, Central Unitaria de Trabajadores del Perú (CUT).

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

Mme R. DIALLO (Guinée), secrétaire générale, Confédération nationale des travailleurs de Guinée (CNTG).

Sr. J. GÓMEZ ESGUERRA (Colombia), Secretario General, Confederación de Trabajadores Democráticos (CGTD).

M. M. GUIRO (Sénégal), secrétaire général, Confédération nationale des travailleurs du Sénégal (CNTS).

Mr. K. GYÖRGY (Hungary), Member of the Executive Board, National Confederation of Hungarian Trade Unions.

M. B. HOSSU (Roumanie), président, Confédération nationale syndicale.

Ms. R. LEKANG (Norway), Confederal Secretary, Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO-Norway).

Sr. P. PARRA (Paraguay), Miembro, Central Nacional de Trabajadores.

Mr. J. SITHOLE (Swaziland), General Secretary, Swaziland Federation of Trade Unions.

M. T. SONNY-COLE (République centrafricaine), secrétaire général, Union syndicale des travailleurs de Centrafricque (USTC).

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

Mr. T. WOJCIK (Poland), National Commission Member, Solidarnoscope.

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

Ms. H. YACOB (Singapore), Assistant Secretary General, National Trade Unions Congress.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Représentants d’autres Etats Membres de l’Organisation assistant à la session</th>
<th>Representatives of other member States of the Organization present at the session</th>
<th>Representantes de otros Estados Miembros de la Organización presentes en la reunión</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algérie</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Argelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. B. SEDKI, ministre, mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombie</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. C. FORERO UCROS, Embajadora, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. L. ARANGO DE BUITRAGO, Viceministra de Relaciones Laborales del Ministerio de la Protección Social.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. V. GONZÁLEZ ARIZA, Ministra Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. J. MESA CÁRDENAS, Jefe de la Oficina de Cooperación y Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de la Protección Social.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. A. SÁNCHEZ ACOSTA, Coordinadora de Derechos Humanos, Ministerio de Protección Social.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. J. MORA GODOY, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. M. HERRERA CASEIRO, Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. C. HURTADO LABRADOR, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. M. LAU, Directora del Ministerio de Trabajo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. P. FANEGO, Especialista del Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. G. HERNÁNDEZ, Especialista del Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. M. SÁNCHEZ OLIVA, Tercer Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danemark</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Dinamarca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K. PEDERSEN, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypte</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egipto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. N. GABR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. N. EL-GAZZAR, Labor Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. ROUSHDY, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finlannde</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finlandia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irlande</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Irlanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. M. PENDER, Assistant Principal Officer, Employment Rights Division, Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. MCDONNELL, Higher Executive Officer, Employment Rights Division, Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israël</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. WAXMAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. N. FURMAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Panama**

Sra. I. ROSAS PÉREZ, Viceministra de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral.
Sra. X. ORTIZ, Asesora Legal del Ministerio de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral.

---

**Pays-Bas**

Ms. A. KOOPMAN, Directorate for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Ms. M. NOTEBOOM, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

---

**Pérou**

Sr. J. SALINAS, Ministro, Representante Permanente Alterno, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sra. E. BERAUN ESCUDERO, Segunda Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

---

**Pologne**

Ms. M. WYSOCKA, Expert, Social Partnership Department, Ministry of Economy and Labour.
Ms. R. LEMIESZEWSKA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

---

**Thaïlande**

Mr. K. NAKCHUEN, Director, Bureau of International Coordination, Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. P. AMORNCHEWIN, Minister Counsellor (Labour Affairs), Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. C. THONGTIP, Senior Labour Officer, Bureau of International Coordination, Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
Mr. C. CHAVALITNITIKUL, Deputy Director-General, Department of Labour Protection and Welfare.
Mr. O. PONGPANGAN, Deputy Director-General, Department of Employment.
Ms. A. ROJVITHEE, Senior Expert in Skill Development, Department of Skill Development, Ministry of Labour.

---

**Rép. Dém. du Congo**

Mme J. BUNDA BITENDWA, vice-ministre du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale.
M. B. BOLA BOLAIOLOKO, secrétaire général au travail.

---

**Zimbabwe**

Mr. L. MUSEKA, Secretary for Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare.
Mr. P. MUDYAWABIKWA, Deputy Director, International Relations Division, Labour Administration.
Mr. P. DZVITI, Director, Labour Administration.
Mr. K. NYAMWANZA, Legal Adviser, Legal Division.
Mr. S. MHANGO, Minister-Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. L. NGORIMA, Labour Officer, International Relations Division, Labour Administration.
Représentants d'Organisations internationales non gouvernementales assistant à titre d'observateurs

Representatives of international non-governmental organizations as observers

Representantes de organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales presentes con carácter de observadores

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

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

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

M. E. ESTEVEZ, secrétaire général adjoint.
M. H. SEA, représentant permanent à Genève.

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

Mr. A. PEÑALOSA, Secretary-General.
Mr. B. WILTON, Deputy Secretary-General.