



Nineteenth sitting

Thursday, 16 June 2005, 10.25 a.m.

President: Mr. Chiriboga

SECOND AND THIRD REPORTS OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE: SUBMISSION AND NOTING

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

We shall now proceed with the examination of the second and third reports of the Credentials Committee, which are published found in *Provisional Records* Nos. 4C and 4D.

I invite the Officers of the Credentials Committee to take the rostrum: Mr. Oni, Chairperson and Reporter of the Committee; Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi, Employer Vice-Chairperson; and Mr. Edström, Worker Vice-Chairperson.

I invite Mr. Oni, to submit the reports.

Original French: Mr. ONI (Government, Benin; Chairperson and Reporter of the Credentials Committee)

It is an honour for me to present to the Conference a brief summary of the activities of the Credentials Committee for this year, which can be found in the Committee's second and third reports (*Provisional Records* Nos. 4C and 4D).

During the Conference, the Committee received 19 complaints relating to the nominations of delegations and nine complaints relating to the payment, non-payment or partial payment of the expenses of representatives of social partners.

We also received two communications. We have not received so many cases since 2000 and the complaints examined by the Committee were mainly related to government interference regarding the nomination of Employer or Worker delegates to the Conference.

The Committee notes with concern that a certain number of situations arise year after year. In this regard, the Committee highlights the importance of fully respecting the constitutional obligation of the Governments to ensure that employers and workers may freely choose the members of their respective delegations.

We note with concern that the cases of Djibouti and Venezuela remain on the Committee's agenda and we invite the Government concerned to take into account our comments and to fulfil their constitutional obligations.

Complaints regarding one particular member State, Burundi, are of especial concern. We received two complaints, one regarding the nomination of the Employers' delegate and the other regarding that of the Workers' delegate. We also received an extremely worrying communication concerning the

personal safety of the author of one of the complaints.

It is not the first time that the Committee has been called on to examine complaints concerning Burundi and that it has expressed concern at the way that Employers' and Workers' delegations are nominated by the Government. That is why we decided to make use of the new mandate conferred upon us by the Conference that is set out in article 26bis, paragraph 7, of the Interim provisions of the Standing Orders of the Conference concerning the verification of credentials. The Committee unanimously recommends that, to ensure that there is a follow-up to our work, the Conference request that the Government of Burundi submit to the next session of the Conference, at the same time that it submits its credentials for the delegation of Burundi, a detailed report on the procedure utilized to nominate the Workers' delegate and advisers.

Thus, I should like to draw the Conference's attention to paragraphs 8 and 12 of our third report. In the context of our new mandate, we also received two complaints concerning the failure to submit credentials of the Workers' delegates of the Members concerned. We have reminded the Government in question that, without the participation of full tripartite delegations, the Conference can neither function correctly, nor achieve its goals. We hope that the Government in question will do everything in its power to ensure that a similar situation does not arise again next year.

The Committee also noticed that an unacceptably high number of modifications were made to credentials during the Conference, even well after the publication of the revised provisional list of delegations.

On behalf of the Committee, I request the Governments present, as far as possible, to submit full and clear credentials which are as definitive as possible, within the deadline envisaged, in order to facilitate the task of verifying credentials.

As to complaints, the Committee notes with concern that certain Governments have not even fulfilled the minimum obligation of paying the travelling and subsistence expenses of its delegates and their advisers and of its representatives attending the meetings of the Conference for its entire duration. We invite all Governments to scrupulously respect the obligations established in article 13, paragraph 2(a), of the ILO Constitution. The Committee notes with satisfaction that the International Labour Office responded favourably to the sugges-

tion that a database concerning the verification of credentials be made accessible to the public. It has proved to be extremely useful so far this year and we invite all interested parties to make full use of it in the future.

Finally, I would like to thank the Conference for once again showing confidence in me by yet again appointing me as a member of the Committee. I should also like to thank my two colleagues, Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi (Employer, Italy) and Mr. Edström (Worker, Sweden), for the spirit of cooperation and consensus in which we worked this year and which has prevailed over the seven years that this Committee has had the same membership.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of the secretariat of the Committee for their unstinting efforts and efficiency.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

The Credentials Committee adopted these reports unanimously, and the Conference is invited to note them and to take a decision on the proposals contained in paragraphs 8 and 12 of the third report. Are there any delegations that wish to take the floor?

Mr. CHIPAZIWA (Government, Zimbabwe)

I wish to commence by saying that we are unhappy with the seating arrangement imposed upon us. We trust that what we say will not be judged trivial in consequence of our hidden presence in this august chamber.

The Government of Zimbabwe notes with concern the concluding remarks by the Committee in the case relating to the objections concerning the nomination of the Workers' delegation of Zimbabwe. The report is biased as it left out essential elements submitted by the Government orally and in writing. The Committee also entertained an objection to the Workers' delegate from a dubious organization by the name of Zimbabweans Abroad, which has no link to labour issues. In fact, it is part of the Zimbabwe political opposition.

The Committee, in its conclusion, accused the Government of being deeply involved in the internal problems of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU). It based its conclusion on the fact that the official who represented the Government during the hearing had detailed information about the internal squabbles in the ZCTU. Let me point out that it was indicated to the Committee that the internal squabbles in the ZCTU are in the public domain. There is no secret about that. The squabbles have been reported almost daily in both the private and public media since February 2005.

It is also noteworthy that the ZCTU's own publication *The worker* has published details of the discord in the organization (see the April-May 2005 issue). In this regard, my Government found it mind-boggling for the Committee to conclude that the Government's knowledge of the internal problems in the ZCTU suggests its involvement in the internal affairs of the centre in question.

Article 3, paragraph 5, of the ILO Constitution does not bar the government from knowing what happens in trade unions with regard to their nominations. It encourages governments to liaise and consult with the trade unions in order to arrive at a mutual nomination. The calling for ZCTU minutes by the Government was taken out of context by the

Credentials Committee. It was to verify the legitimacy of the claimants and no more.

He who alleges must prove. Governments cannot just fund a delegate on the say-so of a claimant where there is an evident dispute. It is taxpayers' money. One must account.

Our Committee must be equipped with basic tools of analysis and guided by principles of natural justice if they are to preside over disputes and hand down reasonable, fair and credible conclusions. We are afraid the Credentials Committee was found wanting in this respect. The position of the Worker representative must have prevailed over the Committee, if not imposed.

The Zimbabwe Government will continue to discharge its constitutional obligations. It was also put across to the Committee that it was free to interrogate the Worker delegate, the subject of objection, who in fact is no other than the elected third Vice-President of the ZCTU. The Government of Zimbabwe still maintains that the selection of the Workers' delegate was above board since all interested parties in the ZCTU were consulted.

Finally, the ILO as an organization concerned about the welfare of workers, should be seen to be protecting workers from those individuals who fail to respect their own founding constitutions. Transparency and legitimacy in the labour organization should be promoted. It bears saying here that the interests of workers in our country will never be faithfully served by self-seekers who are paid from abroad to advance alien interests. It is our hope that the Zimbabwe workers will formally democratically choose their true leaders soon.

Original Spanish: Mr. JIMENEZ (Worker, Nicaragua)

I would like to share with you the deep concern of the Nicaraguan trade union movement over the conclusions on the objection regarding Nicaragua. The Committee refers to a question of representativeness of our organizations that is, apparently, to the detriment of the fundamental rights of the most representative workers' organizations in the country.

With all due respect, I wish to object to the conclusions presented by the distinguished Credentials Committee on the representativeness of the Nicaraguan workers' delegation to this 93rd Session of the International Labour Conference. My position is based on the fact that the considerations lack all the objective information required for the assessment of the case. On the contrary, they are based on very superficial information and are, thus, partial. The issue at stake is to ensure that the process applied to the nomination of the respective workers' delegations is democratic and transparent, without excluding or discriminating against anyone.

For the past 13 years, the complainants have partaken in this forum without complying with the procedures laid down by the ILO. On the contrary, they have been appointed unilaterally by the Government without any consultation, in a process that is flawed and lacks transparency, based on interests that result in economic benefits for a limited group of pseudo-trade union leaders who, no doubt, have taken advantage of the good faith of the Committee in question.

With all due respect, I request that my position on this issue be taken into consideration. For the sake of all Nicaraguan workers, as well as the standing and credibility of the ILO, I recommend that the Committee request both the Government and all

other parties involved in this case to provide the necessary information.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

If there are no objections, may I take it that these two reports are noted and the proposals contained in paragraphs 8 and 12 of the third report are adopted?

(The reports are noted and the proposals adopted.)

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Officers of the Credentials Committee for the excellent work they have done. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the secretariat which assisted them in their work..

**FINAL RECORD VOTE ON THE PROPOSED CONVENTION
CONCERNING WORK IN THE FISHING SECTOR:
ADOPTION**

We shall now proceed with the final record vote on the proposed Convention concerning work in the fishing sector, which is published in *Provisional Record* No. 19.

(A record vote is taken.)

(The detailed results of the vote will be found at the end of the record of this sitting.)

The result of the vote is as follows: 288 in favour, 8 against, with 139 abstentions. As the quorum was 297, and the required two-thirds majority is 290 (435 votes cast), the Convention is not adopted because the quorum was not reached.

(The proposed Convention is not adopted.)

**FINAL RECORD VOTE ON THE PROPOSED
RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING WORK IN THE
FISHING SECTOR: ADOPTION**

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

We shall now proceed with the final record vote on the proposed Recommendation concerning work in the fishing sector, which is also published in *Provisional Record* No. 19.

(A record vote is taken.)

(The detailed results of the vote will be found at the end of the record of this sitting.)

The result of the vote is as follows: 292 in favour, 8 against, with 135 abstentions. As the quorum of 297, and the required two-thirds majority is 290 (435 votes cast), the Recommendation is adopted.

(The Recommendation is adopted.)

A number of delegates have asked to take the floor to explain their vote.

Mr. TROTMAN (Worker, Barbados)

We recognize and respect the vote that was cast. The Workers' group, however, would wish to refer to the Standing Orders governing this Conference. We should like, arising out of those Standing Orders – more particularly articles 41 and 76 – to be able to put a motion to this house. However, before we do that, we would wish to have a suspension to allow us to consult among our group for about 20 minutes.

Original Spanish: Mr. FUNES DE RIOJA (Employer, Argentina)

On behalf of the Employers' group which I chair, I intended to explain why we abstained, but in the light of the request which has been put forward by Mr. Trotman, namely that the meeting be suspended for 20 minutes, I would request the right to speak after the suspension, to which my group agrees, given the special nature of Mr. Trotman's request.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT (Mr. CHIRIBOGA)

Given the request made by the Workers' representative Barbados and the words of the Employer representative, and in the light of the wording of articles 41 and 76 of the Standing Orders, we are going to request a 20-minute suspension of this sitting.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.10 a.m. and resumed at 11.55 a.m.)

We shall now resume our work following the suspension of this sitting requested by the Employers and the Workers in accordance with articles 41 and 76 of the Standing Orders.

Original Spanish: Mr. FUNES DE RIOJA (Employer, Argentina)

On behalf of the Employers' group, I would like to explain why our group abstained in the vote we have just taken on the Convention and Recommendation concerning work in the fishing sector.

First of all, I would like to emphasize that the Employers' group remains unambiguously committed to the standard-setting work of the International Labour Organization in a context of modernization and efficiency. When we say "efficiency", what we want are standards that can be ratified and applied.

When we see that the universality of standards is being lost, or has to be abandoned owing to a given set of circumstances, this is a cause for concern. We would like a Convention on the fishing sector to have three main characteristics: it should be a single and hence universal Convention tailored to the specific needs of this important sector of production; its purpose should be to offer protection to the largest possible number of fishers, and it should be an instrument which is widely ratifiable.

We believe that neither of the proposed instruments – neither the Convention, nor the Recommendation – meets these criteria. We would like to make it clear that our message is not one of rejection of the standards or of an instrument on the fishing sector, quite the opposite: we are in favour of the desired standards having real content. The aim must be to come up with integrable, flexible, modern instruments which can be universally ratified. We do not believe that standards are the conscience of the ILO. The conscience of the ILO is our tripartite mandate. A standard is an instrument, but one which must reflect and tally with our conduct. If the standard is divorced from reality we are responsible for this situation and that is why we come here, to this Conference, to the Governing Body, to exercise our responsibility.

We believe that instruments must be applicable to all member States of the ILO, irrespective of their level of development, and we are absolutely convinced that the proposed Convention and the Recommendation in question are not universally applicable, let alone in developing countries. The Convention is excessively detailed and prescriptive. For example articles 34 and 35 of Annex III on accommodation and the many exceptions which undermine its universality, exclude the vast majority of

Asian, African and Latin American fishers from its scope.

This being so, we are convinced that it would have suffered the same fate as some other instruments; if it had been approved, it would not have been ratified. We do not want a graveyard of standards. What we want is an ILO which thrives through standards which are complied with. Our vote indicated that we cannot support these instruments and we hope that our tripartite mandate can be transformed straight away into provisions for the fishing sector which can really be applied to everyone. That is our position and that is the reason why we voted as we did.

Mr. TROTMAN (*Worker, Barbados*)

I sought earlier to get the position of the house to be able to put forward a motion, and I intend to do that with your kind permission.

The reason for our wishing to have such a motion before the house is that we were of the view that most governments whom we had contacted, the Employers themselves and, quite naturally, the Workers' group, were all agreed that there were several inequities within the fishing industry. There were several matters within the fishing population that needed to be corrected, particularly as they relate to conditions under which the fishing industry folk work today.

We still feel so. Beware of the view that everybody was satisfied that there should be a Convention. Mr. Funes de Rioja has just confirmed that the Employers still feel that way, but he has gone on to say that there are certain difficulties. We do not wish to be particularly critical, especially at this late hour, of positions taken by anyone. We merely wish to say that if there are specific areas of difficulty we have remained of the view that those specific areas of difficulty might have been addressed by being put to the leader of the Employers, and that he might have been in a position to discuss them with myself and my colleagues.

We are still satisfied that things of that nature can be done through dialogue. This is always provided that we are not moving to accommodate anyone who thinks that he or she may be a big fish feeding on us smaller fish. And though I do not wish to make a pun concerning the fishing industry, we cannot afford to have any big fish taking advantage of the smaller ones.

Having made that point, and having had the benefit of the kindness and the kindness of the President and that of the delegations of Governments and Employers, I would wish to say that we have been persuaded by the sincerity of Mr. Funes de Rioja and of the governments with whom we have spoken; we therefore wish to put the following motion before the house.

The motion is as follows: the International Labour Conference requests the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to place on the agenda of the 96th Session of the Conference in 2007 an item concerning work in the fishing sector, based on the report of the Committee on the Fishing Sector of the 93rd Session. That is the way the motion would read. I should like to explain to explain that the report that would be the basis for those discussions would be the same report that we have been using over the last three weeks.

Therefore, everybody would know right here and now exactly what would be the basis for the discus-

sion. We would recommend, therefore, that the house take another decision and that is to allow the Recommendation also to flow from the discussions in 2007.

We are of the view that if there is a will, then there can be a way. We say to those numbers of persons, whether Employers or Government, who abstained, that we now have the basis and the foundation for an instrument which is necessary for all of us, one which can allow each side to be able to believe that it benefits from the exercise.

So, I beg that this motion which is before you be adopted.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

I give the floor again to Mr. Funes de Rioja, Employer, Argentina.

Original Spanish: Mr. FUNES DE RIOJA (*Employer, Argentina*)

Since it is clear why the Employers' group voted as it did earlier, I think the proposal just made by the Worker Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Body and the Chairperson of the Workers' group, Mr. Trotman, is a constructive one, and one which should be conducive to re-establishing the conditions for dialogue, which this time, unfortunately, did not yield consensus that I think we would all like to have reached.

Bearing in mind that there are specific areas involved here, and that dialogue is our basic goal, and on the understanding that the Conference in 2007 would be discussing the issue of fishing based on the report submitted by the Committee on the Fishing Sector this time round, including the issue of a Convention and Recommendation, our group supports the proposal made by the distinguished Vice-Chairperson and Chairperson of the Workers' group.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

If there are no objections to this proposal, we will forward it so that this item will be included by the Governing Body in the agenda of the 2007 session of the International Labour Conference. May I consider the proposed adopted?

(The proposal is adopted.)

Ms. ROBINSON (*Government, Canada*)

I had actually intended to provide an explanation of vote. I will be extremely brief, given the circumstances.

Recognizing that many of the world's fishers need improved health and safety protection and working conditions, the Government of Canada voted in favour of the adoption of the proposed instruments. We appreciate the work of the Office and the efforts made by many Worker, Employer and Government representatives over a number of years to develop meaningful standards for what is a very diverse sector.

However, we did have concerns that the level of detail in the Convention would have made its ratification difficult for many countries, including federal States such as Canada.

In view of the outcome of the vote, we hope that constituents will work together to reach a tripartite consensus on a more ratifiable Convention that can be globally implemented.

Mr. SMEFJELL (*Government, Norway*)

Let me first extend this delegation's appreciation to the social partners for agreeing to bring this important matter before the session of the International Labour Conference in 2007.

I am also heartened by the agreement that we really need this instrument.

This delegation, as you will have seen, supported both the Convention and the Recommendation. We have, of course, taken note of the concerns of the Employers, and we want to work hard to find the best possible solution for those who really need it.

Whilst I have the floor, though, I will ask the Office to continue its hard work on this and extend again my appreciation of its hard work and ask it to work to identify the concerns that the constituent parties might have with the instrument, so that we can focus our work in 2007 on those areas that are of real consequence for the adoption of the instruments.

Original French: Mr. THIERRY (*Government, France*)

I think that the situation we have on our hands today is paradoxical for two reasons. The first paradox is that we have not adopted a Convention due to a lack of one or two votes, and yet at the same time, we have adopted a Recommendation. That is the first paradox that we have to handle.

The second is that this Convention was seen as being a very complex Convention – which it is indeed, reading it shows just how complex and detailed it is. However, that complexity was largely caused by the concern to produce prescriptive standards, which are needed in this area, but also standards which take into account the wide range of circumstances in the sector in terms of the boats, the industry and the activities involved, and the differing levels of economic development.

The need to take these diversities into account led to more dispensations being introduced for certain categories of fishers, for certain types of fishing vessel, for fishing in inland waters, for short fishing trips. There were a lot of dispensations, waivers and adjustments, but they were only designed to ensure that the standard could in fact be universally applied. Unfortunately, they did make the Convention rather weighty and appeared to be very complex.

In these circumstances, I have to support the proposal tabled by the Workers' and Employers' representatives to come back to these texts as soon as possible.

I do, however, have a legal question about the Recommendation: clearly the Convention has to be re-examined, but, as I understand it, we have already adopted the Recommendation. I think that this point needs some legal clarification.

Like my Norwegian colleague, I would like to thank the Officers of the Conference for the extraordinary and very intense work they have done; I hope that we will be able to examine very closely, particularly with all the delegates who abstained, the points that caused their reticence about this instrument.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

I now give the floor to the Legal Adviser, so that he can now respond to the question raised by the Government delegate of France.

Original French: Mr. PICARD (*Legal Adviser*)

The Recommendation which was adopted today is a Recommendation supplementing a Convention that was not adopted. So we are indeed in a paradoxical situation. On the one hand, we have a text which does not exist and on the other we have a Recommendation, i.e. a text which has been adopted by this session of the Conference in a perfectly valid manner and which refers to this text, which does not exist.

From what I have heard, and from the motion which was tabled a few moments ago, the motion refers to the report of the Committee on the Fishing Sector. That report refers to both a proposed Convention and a proposed Recommendation, so it will probably be necessary, when we do come to reviewing this matter, to review the Recommendation and probably to adopt a new Recommendation which will then replace the Recommendation which has been adopted today.

I hope that I have been clear.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

I thank the Legal Adviser for that opinion. . We will leave this point for the time being, because we cannot open a legal debate on this issue right at this moment.

I have been fortunate enough to have the opportunity to preside over an unconventional plenary this morning. It is certainly interesting, from a personal point of view, if nothing else.

Before we move on, to the next agenda item, I should like to inform you that the Legal Adviser of the International Labour Office, Mr. Loïc Picard, will be retiring shortly. It is likely that this meeting will be the last time that we have him here with us and have the benefit of his advice at the Conference.

Mr. Picard came to work in the ILO in September 1974. Since then he has held various positions of responsibility, here at headquarters and in the field offices. Outside headquarters, he has worked in Kinshasa, in particular. In headquarters he has been on the staff of the standards department and his last position, as we know, has been in the office of Legal Services.

In the course of our discussion, his name has been raised many times. Most of the time it has been raised because people wanted to express their thanks to him for his legal advice, for the very efficient way in which he has organized the work of the various drafting committees in which he has participated, and for his indispensable support to tripartism here, within this Organization.

I should like to pay tribute to him on my own behalf and, I think, on behalf of everyone in this room, for the kindness he has always shown, for his skills and for the respect and dignity which have always been characteristic of his work with all the ILO's constituents and with everybody.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE APPLICATION OF STANDARDS: SUBMISSION, DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

I shall now proceed with the examination of the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards, which is published in *Provisional Record* No. 22 and comprises three parts. I invite all the Officers of the Committee on the Application of Standards to come up to the rostrum: the Chairperson, Mr. Sérgio Paixão Pardo; the Employer Vice-

Chairperson, Mr. Potter; the Worker Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Cortebecq; and the Reporter, Ms. Parra. I invite Ms. Parra to take the floor to submit the report.

Original French: Ms. PARRA (Government, France; Reporter of the Committee on the Application of Standards)

It is a great honour for me to present the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards to this plenary of the International Labour Conference. The Committee held 20 meetings, in the course of which it received information on the situation in 69 different countries from their respective governments.

As you know, the Committee is a Conference Committee, whose terms of reference are defined in article 7 of the Standing Orders of the Conference.

Its mandate is to report on the extent to which member States fulfil their constitutional obligations in respect of international labour standards. The Committee's work gives evidence regarding the commitment of member States to take measures to give effect to the Conventions to which they are States Party. The tripartite nature of the Committee means that it is a unique setting for dialogue on the application of international labour standards worldwide. This dialogue is enhanced by the experience and in-depth knowledge of all the constituents on social issues. The report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations is a major contribution to the discussions; the legal expertise of that Committee of Experts is a guarantee of the independence, objectivity, and impartiality of this institution. Testifying to the close working relationship between the two committees, our Committee, as is traditional, was honoured by a visit from Ms. Robin Layton, Chairperson of the Committee of Experts, whose clarity enriched our work.

There are three parts to the report, which reflect the three major issues discussed by the Committee. The first part is the general report about the Committee on the discussion of general questions relating to standards and on the General Survey of the Committee of Experts on the Hours of Work (Industry) Convention, 1919 (No. 1), and the Hours of Work (Commerce and Offices) Convention, 1930 (No. 30). The second part covers discussions on all the individual cases examined by the Committee and the conclusions reached thereon. Part three covers the special sitting on the question of compliance by the Government of Myanmar with the provisions of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29). I will go through each of these questions so that you can grasp the gist of the discussion.

This year, the general discussion was shorter than usual. However, it highlighted very important aspects of the standard-setting activities of the ILO and the work of its supervisory bodies.

I should first like to mention that the Committee welcomed the new Director of the International Labour Standards Department, Ms. Doumbia-Henry, and noted with interest her vision of an outline strategy on international labour standards.

During the first stage of the general discussion, the Committee continued its discussions on its working methods. There are two points here to which we should pay careful attention, as they respond to concerns expressed by members of the Committee at previous sessions. This year, for the first time, the Committee adopted the list of indi-

vidual cases very early at the beginning of its general discussion. This allowed the governments concerned sufficient time to prepare. Furthermore, the Committee formally accepted the recent practice of ensuring that the Chairperson had sufficient time to consult with the Reporter and the Vice-Chairperson before proposing conclusions on each individual case in the Committee. This makes it possible to reflect the tone and content of the discussions more accurately. Tripartite dialogue on working methods that can always be improved will continue. Moreover, some changes have been made by the Committee of Experts to the report, bearing in mind suggestions made earlier.

During the second stage of the general discussion, the Committee considered the General Survey of the Committee of Experts on the Hours of Work (Industry) Convention, 1919 (No. 1), and the Hours of Work (Commerce and Offices) Convention, 1930 (No. 30). During the discussion strong opinions were expressed about the current relevance of these two Conventions and on whether or not it might be necessary to revise them. The need to maintain a balance between flexibility and the protection of workers was emphasized. The importance of regulation and collective bargaining was also stressed. Various types of action which could be taken by the ILO in the future were mentioned, including the possible holding of a tripartite meeting of experts responsible for preparing a road map on hours of work. Consideration was also given to the possibility of, at a second stage, holding a general discussion on the issue at a future session of the Conference. It will be up to the Governing Body to select which approach is taken.

The main job of the Committee is to examine at individual cases of compliance by member States with Conventions which they have ratified. However, before the examination was carried out, the Committee spent two sittings, half a day in length each, considering serious failures on the part of the member States to comply with their obligations to submit reports and with other obligations related to standards. This year, the Committee particularly wanted to emphasize the importance of these cases and obligations, because if these obligations are not respected, the supervisory system cannot function effectively and might not even maintain its credibility. The Committee emphasized that we need to look more closely at the reasons behind failure to comply with obligations and to learn lessons from them, particularly as regards technical assistance. I should point out that, in ten of these cases, technical assistance was requested so that governments could use it to help meet their constitutional obligations and other obligations related to standards.

Concerning the individual cases of application of Conventions ratified, this year the Committee invited 25 governments to discuss the way in which they apply Conventions in law and in practice. Twenty-four governments responded to the invitation from the Committee. The Committee nonetheless regrets that Bosnia and Herzegovina did not respond to the invitation extended to it.

At this stage, I should make it clear that the importance of cases of progress, highlighted by the Committee of Experts in its report, was deliberately stressed. The Committee is aware of the need to give these positive cases a still higher profile.

Turning now to discussions of the 25 cases, their purpose is to use tripartite dialogue to identify is-

sues and to listen to what countries have to say about their situation at national level. This helps the Committee to determine the way in which governments can best make progress in applying Conventions. The Committee decided that, in 19 of the 25 cases discussed, conventional missions should be undertaken and conventional technical assistance should be provided. In almost half of these 19 cases, the missions and/or technical assistance were accepted by the governments concerned. The missions envisaged by the Committee consist of technical assistance missions, missions of inquiry, and, in one case, a high-level tripartite visit and, in one other, a direct contacts mission. This clearly shows that the Committee is aware of the need to use all the tools available to the Organization to provide specific support to member States and to find appropriate solutions to their problems. This often means a mission being sent to the country as part of an overall process of cooperation with its authorities. Governments have a duty to respect the obligations which they took on when they ratified Conventions and it is the responsibility of the supervisory system of the ILO to help them do that.

The Committee felt it necessary to include special paragraphs in this report on the cases concerning the application of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), by Belarus and Myanmar respectively. The Committee decided to classify the latter case as continued failure to implement the Convention. The Committee also had a special sitting to deal with the application by Myanmar of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29). The conclusions of the Committee can be found in the third part of the report.

The discussions of the Committee were, as usual, very detailed and lively. Once again, they proved that the application of international labour standards is a whole, all the elements of which are interlinked. These elements include the submission of instruments to competent authorities, the ratification of Conventions, sending reports to the supervisory bodies, and dialogue with those bodies. These different stages are backed up and supported by a combination of various areas of action taken by ILO and, among other things, the independent legal analysis of the Committee of Experts, tripartite dialogue in the Committee on the Application of Standards, and technical assistance supplied by the Office. The work of this Committee shows that ILO technical assistance is being used more and more frequently in the field of international labour standards. Given the number of requests made for technical assistance this year, and the positive results already obtained in terms of better application of standards ratified by member States, it would seem that this is a source of real added value.

I would like to conclude by expressing my warmest thanks to the Chairperson, Mr. Paixão Pardo, and the two Vice-Chairpersons, Mr. Potter for the Employers and Mr. Cortebeek for the Workers, for the skill, efficiency and cooperation which they showed, enabling this Committee to complete its work successfully. I should also like to thank Ms. Doumbia-Henry and all her staff, along with the interpreters, for the assistance which they provided to us.

I would like to conclude by recommending to the Conference that it adopt the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards.

Mr. POTTER (*Employer, United States; Employer Vice-Chairperson of the Committee on the Application of Standards*)

On behalf of the Employers' group, I commend to you the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards to this plenary today.

Most of you will know very well my predecessor, Mr. Alfred Wisskirchen. During his 35 years of attending the International Labour Conference, he served as the Employer spokesperson on the Committee on the Application of Standards for 22 years with great dedication and commitment. His skills as a great jurist were reflected in the meticulous attention to detail that he brought to every case which he executed with integrity, compassion and vigour. Words are inadequate to express the Employers' group's gratitude and appreciation for his most important contribution to the ILO supervisory machinery and international law.

There is no need for me to summarize the Committee's report. You have it before you and it will be well described by the Chairperson and the Reporter.

All institutions must engage in a process of continuous improvement, even a Committee like ours with an 80-year history, which has been the heart and soul of the ILO. The central purpose of the Committee's work is the examination of cases concerning the implementation of ILO Conventions that dominates our work during the second week of each session of the Conference. The Employers' group has several suggestions to improve this process.

Firstly, we believe that there should be a greater diversification in the list of cases and suggest that we go back to the system that existed during the Cold War under which the Committee alternated between years in which half the cases, as was the case this year, were Freedom of Association cases, and the following year in which the list of cases was much lighter on freedom of association cases, thereby permitting consideration of cases involving other Conventions. Returning to such a system would broaden the subject matter of cases to include important technical standards such as occupational health and safety, and to include cases of progress. Such a system would undoubtedly expand and provide greater balance to the list of countries that would appear before the Committee. Until such a practice is reinstated, the Employers' group will begin next year to press for a list of six or seven cases that include more technical standards and cases of progress. In our view, being placed on the list of cases should not be viewed negatively by governments, but rather as a part of the process of social dialogue leading to full implementation of ratified Conventions.

Secondly, the Workers' group is to be commended for finalizing a list of cases within 24 hours of the beginning of the work of the Committee. Unfortunately, this year's experience of discussing and reaching conclusions in half the cases in the last two days of the second week demonstrates that governments appearing on the list must be more willing to participate earlier in the week. A list proposed on the first Wednesday of the Conference session gives governments adequate notice and time to prepare to present their case by the beginning of the second week. The Employers' group encourages the Workers' group to repeat and improve on their practices and procedures next year for finalizing the cases to

be included on the list by taking advantage of the Internet and other communication strategies.

Thirdly, the Committee needs to adopt time management strategies in discussing the cases. If all the time that is available is used in the second week, we have up to 45 hours to examine cases when we conclude our work at 1 p.m. on Saturday. This means that we have slightly less than two hours to discuss just 25 cases. Under our current practice, this is the outer limit of the number of cases that can be discussed. A two-hour limit should be placed on the discussion of each case and the adoption of conclusions, with the speaking time of individual speakers adjusted accordingly.

Since 1957, a regular part of the work of the Committee has been the treatment of serious failures to report cases. Reporting by countries on how they implement in law and practice their international obligation under ratified Conventions is essential for the supervisory system to work. Without such work, without such reports, the ILO regular supervisory process cannot function. In our view, extended failures to report and respond to Committee of Experts' requests for additional information are as serious as fundamental failures to implement ratified Conventions. Serious failures to report have the same level of importance as substantive cases which the Committee places in special paragraphs, and continued failure to apply paragraphs. We are pleased that the Committee will no longer refer to these cases as automatic cases.

In the spirit of better utilization of time by the Committee on the Application of Standards, we think that there can be better use of Committee time by consolidating the various reporting categories in a more streamlined procedure, saving up to a half day, or coming up with a more effective and meaningful procedure with respect to serious failures to report. We believe that the Committee of Experts can help us resolve serious failures to report by providing the Committee on the Application of Standards with country-specific analyses of the reasons for non-reporting as well as the common characteristics of serious non-reporters. This kind of information will help the Conference Committee better target ILO technical assistance.

The Employers' group was happy to welcome Justice Robyn Layton, Chairperson of the Committee of Experts to the Conference Committee's general discussion. We value the technical support of the Committee of Experts and the important role that their work plays in the tripartite dialogue. There were improvements in the presentation of their report this year which we applaud.

Just as there is need for continuous improvement in the Conference Committee, the Committee of Experts can be more helpful to our Committee if they engage in continuous improvement as well.

Firstly, because of the substantial turnover in the composition of the Committee on the Application of Standards each year, the Reader's note at the front of the Committee of Experts' report needs to be expanded to provide more history and background on the relationship of the Committee of Experts with the Conference Committee. Content from the information briefing conducted by the Standards Department needs to be brought into the Readers' note.

Secondly, there needs to be a common, clearer, more understandable presentation of the Committee of Experts' observations. At the present time, some are too cryptic and some are too opaque. A more

consistent organization of observations is required that differentiates between allegations and the Committee of Experts' views, consolidates information requests and provides more information on the content of outstanding direct requests. The Committee of Experts' observations should be sufficiently detailed to provide a solid basis for a Conference discussion of the case.

Consequently, the Employers urge the Committee of Experts to emphasize the quality of their observations over the quantity. In particular, the Committee of Experts should re-examine the practice of publishing an observation solely based on the fact that a third party has made an allegation or other representation: a third party representation without any evaluation by the Committee of Experts is not helpful, and poses the prospect that inclusion of an observation concerning a country in such circumstances is subject to manipulation.

Thirdly, we respectfully ask the Committee of Experts to limit their use of special surveys; they should be the exception and not the rule. The Employers' group believes that the General Survey is the preferred approach because they are comprehensive and go through the Governing Body vetting process.

Fourthly, the Employers' group believes that the potential of Report III(2), the Information document on ratifications and standards-related activities, is underutilized. Part III of this Report contains country profiles, which could be enhanced by providing for a relevant time period. Information on the experts' observations by Convention and year, discussion in the Conference Committee by Convention and year, and current cases that may be before the Committee on Freedom of Association.

We hope that some of these suggestions will be incorporated into next year's Committee of Experts' report. We will continue to look to the developments reported in the general part of the Committee of Experts' report regarding the SubCommittee on working methods, which we felt to be exceedingly brief this year and last year. We hope that more information will be made available to the Conference next year.

In the course of the general discussion, we highlighted the importance of involving the social partners in all stages of the supervisory procedure. In particular, we would urge Governments to consult with the social partners in preparing their reports concerning the application of ratified Conventions. This practice will not only improve the quality of the information submitted to the supervisory bodies, but will also foster a culture of dialogue and tripartism at the national level.

Also in the course of the general discussion, the Committee held an interesting debate concerning member States' obligations to submit new instruments to competent national authorities. In this context, we would highlight that this obligation only requires governments to submit new ILO instruments to those authorities for them to consider further actions regarding their ratification or implementation. Although this obligation constitutes an important step in promoting the coherence of the ILO's system, it is not meant to promote ratification per se, as this decision should be taken in the context of national circumstances and realities.

This year, the Committee discussed a General Survey on the very important subject of "hours of work". From the debate, it is clear that hours of

work is a multifaceted subject, which calls into question its suitability for international regulation. We believe that it would be impractical, if not impossible, to impose a universal approach to this topic.

Therefore, we would not support the development of a new standard on working time; instead, we recommended that the matter be addressed through a comprehensive process which should involve the ILO Governing Body and use of the Committee of Experts' meetings. Only after these steps have been taken can the next step be considered, which would include a general discussion at a future session of the International Labour Conference.

We would call the attention of the Conference to the discussions held in relation to Venezuela, Myanmar, Belarus and Colombia, as well as the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Committee discussed the application of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), by the Government of Venezuela concerning serious deficiencies in its respect for freedom of association. In its conclusions, the Committee reminded the Government of the importance of Article 3 of the Convention, which requires governments to abstain from interfering in the internal affairs of employers' and workers' organizations. The Committee also took note with great concern that there were restrictions to the basic freedoms of Employers' representatives, and requested the Government to eliminate immediately any restriction to the right to movement of the Federation of Chambers and Associations of Commerce and Production's (FEDECAMARAS) current president, Ms. Muñoz, and former president, Mr. Fernández.

The discussion of the application of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), and the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), with respect to Myanmar, makes clear that this Government no longer has any credibility with the Committee on the Application of Standards. There is much work this Government needs to do to rehabilitate itself. The special sitting with respect to Convention No. 29 continues to be a preoccupation of the Conference Committee, with its conclusions calling for renewed consideration by the Governing Body of Article 3. We call special attention of the Conference to Myanmar's failure to apply Convention No. 87. Due to its gravity, Myanmar was not only singled out in a special paragraph, but the Committee also decided to cite this case as a "continued failure to implement" this Convention.

As regards Belarus in its application of Convention No. 87, the Committee regretted that, despite the many efforts undertaken by the ILO, including a Commission of Inquiry, there remain important shortcomings by the Government on the full implementation of this Convention. The Government's presentation to the Committee suggests that it is not yet ready to implement fully, in law and practice, Convention No. 87. The Committee had no option but to also include this case in a special paragraph.

The Committee deplored that, despite being present at the Conference, the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina failed to provide information to the Committee. We would remind the Government that the supervisory machinery can only function through continuous dialogue with governments;

failure to do so will only hamper the credibility of the ILO and of the Government itself.

Demonstrating that social dialogue can work, the Government of Colombia invited a high-level tripartite visit, headed by the Chairman of the Committee on Freedom of Association, and accompanied by the Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons of the Conference Committee, to look at, in particular, the country's implementation of Convention No. 87 and the ILO technical cooperation programme that has been in place for several years.

In closing, I would like to thank the Office for its excellent support in the development of our work; in particular, Ms. Cleopatra Doumbia-Henry, Ms. Karen Curtis and their staff. I would also like to thank Mr. Sérgio Paixão for his excellent leadership as Chairman of the Committee; Ms. Carine Parra, who made excellent contributions as Reporter. In particular, I want to thank my friend, Mr. Luc Cortebeeck, Worker spokesperson, for his continued collaboration and goodwill.

I would also like the Employers' group, and especially my colleagues Sonia Regenbogen, Treasure Maphanga, Andiswa Ndoni, Bernard Boisson, Kevin Coon, Thomas Prinz, Patricio Spaghi, Roberto Suárez and Chris Syder, for helping me to prepare and present several of the individual cases. Last but not least, I would like to thank the International Organisation of Employers team, Sandy Gros-Louis, Maria Barbara León and Andres Yurén, for their valuable support, and Christian Hess of the Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP) for his help.

In conclusion, I reaffirm continued support of the Employers' group for the ILO supervisory machinery. We support this report without reservation.

Original French: Mr. CORTEBEECK (Worker, Belgium; Worker Vice-Chairperson of the Committee on the Application of Standards)

I would like to begin with a few words of thanks.

First, to Mr. Sergio Paixão Pardo from the Government of Brazil, our Chairperson, for his untiring commitment to our Committee, and to Ms. Parra from the Government of France for doing her job as Reporter.

I would also like to thank the services of the ILO, in particular the International Labour Standards Department, through Ms. Cleopatra Doumbia-Henry, Ms. Karen Curtis, as well as the whole team, the coordinators, the secretariat and the technical services, all of whom have made our work a lot easier, without forgetting the interpreters.

I would like to thank Mr. Edward Potter and the other members of the Employers' group and their teams of staff, the Government representatives for having attended and for having undertaken dialogue on the application of standards in their countries.

I would also like to thank the Officers of the Workers' group, our secretary, Mr. Khursheed Ahmed, and our Vice-Chairperson, Ms. Halimah Yacob, Ms. Judit Czeglerné-Ivány, Mr. Mademba Sock and Mr. Eduardo Fernandez.

I would like to thank also the staff of the Workers' group, namely Ms. Monique Cloutier and Mr. Claude Akpokavie from ACTRAV, Ms. Isabelle Hoferlin from the WCL and Mr. Janek Kuczkiewicz from the ICFTU, Ms. Andrée Debrulle, Mr. Gilbert Deswert and Mr. Jan Dereymaeker.

My presentation will be based on three major areas: first, the supervisory procedures and importance of ILO standards; second, the importance of tripartism; and third, an assessment of the activities of the Committee following the work of the June 2005 session.

First of all, I will address supervisory procedures.

The Committee on the Application of Standards plays a fundamental role here. We do not just play the role of grand inquisitor as has been seen in history before. Of course it has a supervisory role, but it also has other roles. The Committee, though the continuing work of workers' and employers' organizations in the field, has the role of being a watchdog to identify discrepancies between law and practice in the implementation of ILO standards. It also encourages the application of labour legislation at the international level.

Indeed, one of the main tasks of our Committee is to persuade the governments of member States to continue to make progress in making their obligations under international labour standards in order to guarantee that social concerns are not forgotten as the world economy globalizes.

The discussion of individual cases should, therefore, take place in this positive atmosphere that encourages improvements in law and practice to the working and living conditions of workers.

However, as the representative of the Secretary-General underlined, the Committee owes a large part of its effectiveness to the synergy which exists between our Committee, the Office and the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. This leads me, once again, to welcome the changes made to the presentation of the report of the Committee of Experts which made our work much easier. We would be even more pleased if at future sessions the Committee of Experts report would contain a more far-reaching examination of certain more technical Conventions.

These examinations would enable us to gain a better overview of less high-profile Conventions and to focus attention on less-known parts of the world of work and less-known parts of the world.

The report of the Committee of Experts has enabled us once again to emphasize our desire to see the supervisory mechanism recover strength according to the wishes of the representative of the Secretary-General when she spoke of transparent, fair and effective supervision.

The failure to submit new instruments adopted by the Conference should be countered by following the recently revised memorandum with personalized letters and an awareness-raising campaign.

The slow but inexorable drop in the number of reports and comments received from governments should be reversed by adopting a more personalized approach to countries failing to submit.

What is more worrying is that a very low number – less than 25 per cent – of reports arrive before the deadline. This prompts us to say two things.

First, the fall in the number of submission reports and the number of late reports should not be accepted as something that is inevitable. One reason of this is that, in the space of a year, the number of comments from the social partners has almost doubled thanks to continued work by union organizations and ACTRAV. The comments from employers' and workers' organizations increased from 297 to 533 within the space of a single year.

This increasing number would lead us to request that the comments of the social partners be fully examined and used by the Committee of Experts. They supplement the more legal comments made by the experts and should be used to a greater extent. This would also help the discussion of individual cases in the Committee, without excluding the possibility of more up-to-date contributions.

The comments of the social partners not only provide an insight of what is happening in the field, but also provide us with a picture of what has happened more recently. The late submission of reports has widened the gap between facts, the reports and the consideration of the facts by our Committee. This is something that we have observed once again this year.

A number of events or legislative developments referred to in the reports are overtaken by social, economic or political events when it comes for us to discuss them. This enables a number of governments to boast during the Conference that they have made positive progress while the Committee is unable to check progress at this late stage in the procedure. If governments informed us earlier of such changes and left enough time for them to be checked, then they could be credited with these positive changes. This brings me to the cases of progress.

Cases of progress have had a higher profile this year as we, ourselves regulated. What we would like to know is on what basis the experts "expressed their satisfaction" on certain measures, while others they "note with interest". What we would like to see more clearly in the reporting process are the different kinds of progress made in the areas of the core Conventions and other Conventions. Perhaps the experts could each year dedicate a separate chapter to cases of progress, while paying particular attention to one Convention, or a group of Conventions, and provide broader coverage of "outstanding" or "model" progress. The work of the Committee on the Application of Standards would certainly benefit from this guidance and discussion of good practices.

Nevertheless, using the words "guidance" and "good practices" should not lead us to forget that standard-setting activities are at the heart of the ILO and need to recover their dynamism. Indeed, these words would only have true meaning in the context of standards-setting activities.

As was stated already during our Committee's deliberations, enhancing the effectiveness of standards would establish the authority and pre-eminence of the ILO, which was mentioned by the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization. Standards which are formulated, ratified, and then implemented at the national level and monitored by our Committee facilitate the protection of workers against the deregulation entailed by globalization.

However, since the idea of the integrated approach was introduced, the adoption of new Conventions or Recommendations has ground to a halt.

We are gravely concerned by the concept of an integrated approach, in spite of what was said by the representative of the Secretary-General.

This is owing to our character; we are immediately somewhat suspicious when buzz words such as "integrated" or "global" appear in a context that, until then, had seemed sufficiently clear and unambiguous.

After three years of working with this concept, we remain unsure of the benefits of this approach. On the one hand, we are still waiting for the first results and, on the other hand, we are noting a reduction in the number of new Conventions.

We have noted with satisfaction the reassuring words according to which the integrated approach should serve to consolidate the classical approach. However, we have yet to understand why, for this reason, the classical approach is no longer used and why there are no new Conventions, with the exception of the maritime sector.

We want to work with the department to strengthen confidence in a modernized and coherent supervisory mechanism.

We want to work with the department to make standard setting more effective and visible.

We agree with the department on the advantages of using economic arguments to support our standard-setting activities, but our approach is essentially and above all based on the full respect for social standards.

Economic considerations must not become a condition *since qua non*.

The Workers' group, which has officially reaffirmed the importance of international labour standards, requests once again that the department and the experts be provided with adequate human and financial resources to defend and promote the ILO's standard-setting activities.

Secondly, we reaffirm the importance of tripartism. The results obtained in our Committee this year, and I will come back to this in the last part of my intervention, are clearly encouraging and enable us to reaffirm the strength of the tripartism that makes the ILO so special. The embedding of our activities in law and practice and tripartism are two guiding principles for work of the Committee on the Application of Standards and for the ILO in general.

This is true on a number of levels. Firstly, at the level of principles, tripartism is democracy in action and, therefore it is an essential condition for the effective functioning of a world economy which is pursuing progress and social justice.

Secondly, as was mentioned by the representative of the Director-General, the workers' organizations, like the WCL or the ICFTU, and employers' organizations breathe life into tripartism on a daily basis through their comments and observations and, in doing so, promote the work of the Committee.

Thirdly, at the heart of the supervisory mechanism, we see a clear synergy between the three constituents, which facilitates the effective implementation of supervision and follow-up in the field.

Fourthly, missions, which are increasingly tripartite in their nature, although we might regret, at the level of technical assistance, governments' failure to show commitment to socially sustainable projects fully involving the social partners, which would be a true vision of tripartism in action. So there is work to be done there.

The Committee of Experts plays a central role in this whole system and its excellent, impartial legal work should be recognized once again as one of the central pillars of the work of the Committee on the Application of Standards.

Tripartism is not only what is stated in the Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 144), but it is also the reaffirmation of two key Conventions for democracy and the fundamental rights of workers and employ-

ers: the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98).

Government's respect for tripartism at the national level make our meetings possible.

It is obvious that, when allocating roles within our tripartite Committee, unanimity between workers and employers has a direct influence on the list of cases to be dealt with during a given session of the International Labour Conference.

Those governments that have cast aspersions on the way in which the list is drafted must accept this principle and understand that the ILO is not a Commission on Human Rights where only governments talk.

In our system, action is driven by the concrete and crude reality of social and economic life and this reality puts the partners around the table on an equal footing.

It is thus clear that the objective of our Committee is not to make itself out to be a court, nor to imitate the Commission on Human Rights, nor to provide a substitute for the economic and social committee.

We are here to find solutions based on social justice and economic development, which come under the authority of the social partners and the mistakes of labour, and not under the exclusive authority of foreign ministers or their representatives.

For the Workers' group, when selecting the cases, many criteria come into play but, in contrast to what the Government of Zimbabwe said – and what was unfortunately supported by a number of friendly governments – the criteria are never political.

They are simply based on the will to improve the situation of workers by calling for the respect of the protection established by the ILO's tripartite Conventions.

What is most important for the Workers' group is the seriousness of the reported breaches, and the threats received during the Conference will not change our position.

Finally, I think we have worked well this year. Yes, we have worked well. There is no doubt about that, even though we may have a few regrets. The General Survey was an excellent document and has therefore given rise to a very interesting discussion. We now look forward to the specific follow-up which will come from the Governing Body.

The Workers' group would like to reiterate its wish that an excessively swift review of the Hours of Work (Industry) Convention, 1919 (No. 1), and the Hours of Work (Commerce and Offices) Convention, 1930 (No. 30) be avoided. Instead, we favour the holding of a general discussion that would enable workers, employers and governments to receive more in-depth information on current practices regarding working hours and flexibility in these sectors, including in export processing zones.

As for automatic cases, an initial study was submitted on the reasons why certain member States do not submit a report. It would be wise to revisit this issue in order to gain a deeper, keener understanding of the reasons for this attitude and to think about the best way of countering it in the future.

The Workers' group stresses that those countries which do not honour their obligation to file a report must not, despite their unhelpful attitude, have the feeling that they are being rewarded for their lackadaisical approach. The Workers' group has made

some suggestions on this point. They are set out in the general report of the Committee.

We welcome the speed with which our Committee worked – it was able to begin its consideration of individual cases only on Tuesday, 7 June. Attention must, however, likewise be drawn to the efforts made by the three groups which, with the exception of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, showed themselves willing, every day, to embark on discussions with effectiveness and conviction.

In order to enable the consideration of all of the selected cases, the Workers agreed to make an effort to reduce their speaking time. This is a clear sign of workers' mutual respect and solidarity. It was not always easy, because many workers really wished to convey the emotions aroused by the violation of their fundamental rights. Even so, we nearly failed to achieve our objective because of the tactics adopted by certain governments which, not content to talk at length about things that were irrelevant, also invited friendly governments to do the same. We should, perhaps, reconsider this aspect of procedure, for such an undue taking advantage of the situation could quickly turn into tactics designed to reduce the number of cases examined.

The preparatory work we did on preparing the list of cases led to a balanced list, although admittedly, many of the cases selected related to the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87). That Convention constitutes one of the foundations of democracy and the very existence of trade union organizations depends on compliance with it. That is the explanation for our choice.

The Workers' group welcomes the quality of the conclusions adopted by the Committee. While the latter's seemingly protracted deliberations might in some cases have afforded some governments an opportunity to bring pressure to bear on the Workers, the expectations of the Workers' group were satisfied by the courageous conclusions evidencing a determination to find new, creative and therefore more efficacious approaches to dealing with the acts in questions.

Innovation is a good thing when its purpose is to achieve more tangible results. We must, however, pay attention to the sometimes subtle implications of some of the proposed measures. In order to avoid any malfunctioning of the various kinds of missions which have been decided by our Committee, the Workers' group would like a typology of missions to be established, which would clearly identify the sort of mission we are talking about, its content, the terms of reference of those carrying it out, the authorities it must approach, as well as the time frame.

Lack of precision or a somewhat vaguely worded conclusion should not offer governments a pretext for not carrying out, or incompletely carrying out, our committee's request.

It emerges from the conclusions that 11 cases have given rise to technical assistance and eight to a mission or another form of appropriate technical assistance: in Venezuela high-level technical assistance; in Saudi Arabia a technical assistance mission in respect of the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111); in Swaziland a high-level mission; in Sudan a technical assistance mission with investigative powers; in Zimbabwe a direct contacts mission, which has been turned down by the Government; in Mauritania a fact-finding mission combined with technical

cooperation. Lastly, the conclusion with regard to Colombia was that it should receive a high-level tripartite visit. Heed must be paid to these subtle differences and the substance must be evaluated in the experts' next report. A special paragraph was devoted to Belarus which, it was decided, would receive a assistance mission, while Burma (Myanmar) formed the subject of a special paragraph of our Committee's report. Moreover, the Committee devoted a special sitting to examine developments concerning the observance by Myanmar/Burma of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29).

The Workers' group welcomes the cooperation it obtained from the Employers' group. The Workers' group is therefore satisfied with this year's session of the Committee, with the exception of the attitude displayed by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Let us begin here. Why does the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina openly refuse to take part in the tripartite procedure by not being present when its case is considered, although the selfsame Government supported the position expressed by the European Union on a good number of cases? There is no justification for this ambiguous conduct.

With regard to Japan and the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), which was not on our list, the Workers' group regrets that the Government has failed to respond to the offer made to give a signal at this session, which would make it possible to hold an informal tripartite meeting of all interested parties under the aegis of the ILO. The Workers' group regrets the official refusal of the Employers' group to support this approach. This morning the Japanese Government confirmed orally that it did not feel that it was useful to hold a tripartite meeting on this question because it was not part of traditional Committee procedure and that it therefore abided by the statement made to our Committee on 1 June.

We have concluded our work for 2005. We still have a lot of work to do. The 25 cases which have been considered are only the tip of a vast iceberg. The Workers' group would have liked to discuss all the cases because we believe that all of the comments refer to matters of application. Some comments note considerable progress and we would wish to endorse them, because these cases in which progress has been made might prompt others to pursue the dialogue and to believe in the real possibility of change.

The fact that we have to make choices has led us to focus first on cases of flagrant violations. We reject here and now any effort to brand us as inquisitors or to label us as biased. Our action must be seen first and foremost as forming part of all the ILO's missions and as supplementing in a coherent manner the work of other departments, such as technical cooperation or promotion initiatives.

It is in this positive context of encouragement to improve *de jure* and *de facto* the working and living conditions of our workers that the union movement will rally to the cause of more social justice at the national and international level.

I therefore recommend the adoption of the report from the Committee on the Application of Standards.

Original Portuguese: Mr. PAIXÃO PARDO (Government, Brazil; Chairperson of the Committee on the Application of Standards)

It is an honour for Brazil to chair the Committee on the Application of Standards during this Conference. I do not wish to repeat the comments made by previous speakers, instead, I shall limit myself to making a few remarks concerning the methods of work employed during the Committee's meetings. After many years, we have, I believe, made progress in terms of transparency and in the preparation of the conclusions. The list of individual cases now appears in published form even more quickly than before.

We hope to continue to perform in an increasingly efficient fashion.

I also believe that there are improvements to be made regarding our work. This year we decided that we would no longer speak of "automatic cases", instead we opted for the term "cases of serious failure by member States to respect their reporting and other standards-related obligations". We need to continue to improve our ability to sum up and we should only refer to the essential points concerning cases in our discussions and conclusions. A similar approach should be employed when examining individual cases in the future.

I should like to thank the two Vice-Chairpersons, Mr. Luc Cortebeeck (Worker, Belgium), Mr. Edward Potter (Employer, United States) and our Reporter, Ms. Carine Parra (Government, France), who assisted me greatly in the work of the Committee.

I should also like to thank Ms. Cleopatra Doumbia-Henry and all the team for their dedication.

I should also like to thank the delegates who will examine this report and recommend that it be adopted, as it faithfully reflects the result of the work that has been carried out over the last three weeks.

We think this report represents a significant step forward in the dynamic world of work.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

The general discussion of the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards is now open.

Mr. MACPHEE (Government, Canada; speaking on behalf of the IMEC group)

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 35 member countries of the Industrialised Market Economy Countries (IMEC).

IMEC continues to support the working methods of the Committee on the Application of Standards with regard to the selection of cases and the formulation of conclusions. In three years of ongoing review, no major problems have come to light.

We consider, however, that it is appropriate to seek further improvements to the Committee's effective time management.

IMEC notes that the discussion of the cases has highlighted the importance of ILO assistance in promoting full implementation of ratified Conventions in law and practice.

IMEC renews its call, made in the Committee on the Application of Standards, for the Director-General to ensure that ILO standards and the work of the Standards Department are among his highest priorities. Indeed, the effectiveness of the Office in supporting the ILO's supervisory system has a direct bearing on the credibility of the Organization as a whole.

Original Spanish: Mr. DORADO CANO (Government, Venezuela)

I had not planned to speak, but the spokesperson for the Employers' group has made false claims about my country, and I would therefore like to take this opportunity to make a statement.

The Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is concerned by the Committee's invitation to, and I quote, "lift immediately the restrictions on the freedom of movement imposed on the leaders of FEDECAMARAS, Mr. Carlos Fernández and Ms. Albuis Muñoz". My Government has already stated its reservations about this part of the conclusion, but I would like to add the following observations:

Firstly, the persons mentioned in the conclusion are still under investigation, with no discrimination against them, along with 300 other people, in connection with their suspected involvement in the 2002 coup d'état. The first act of Pedro Carmona's de facto Government, a former acting president of FEDECAMARAS, was to usurp the power of President Chávez, dissolve the National Assembly, dismiss the Supreme Court judges, the Ombudsman, the Public Prosecutor and the directors of the Electoral Council. This coup d'état was condemned immediately by the Organization of American States (OAS) and by the international community.

The Committee is wrong to state that there is an arrest order for the President of FEDECAMARAS, she is free to travel around the country and would only need to obtain the authorization of the investigating legal body in order to leave the country, in accordance with the law. However, as this investigation has not yet finished and in accordance with the principle of the presumption of innocence, the Government accredited Ms. Muñoz, the President of FEDECAMARAS, as the representative of Venezuelan employers at this 93rd Session of the Conference; her name appears in the attendance register and she was with us here in Geneva until a few days ago.

I must also highlight the fact that in its report, the Committee never mentions Ms. Muñoz, which is why her inclusion in the Committee's conclusions is so surprising, particularly as my country is unable to defend itself.

The Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela considers that the Committee's invitation violates international law, particularly article 8 of the ILO Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87).

The Committee is setting a dangerous precedent by suggesting that we should not investigate actions against democracy, which are punished in all countries around the world, and that measures arising from these legal investigations, including restrictions of movement, should not be enforced, when these measures are perfectly legal, justified and proportionate.

The activities related to a coup d'état are not trade union activities, therefore they are not protected by Convention No. 87. This type of conclusion, criticizing our Government, therefore violates Article 8 of the Convention and is an attack on the principles of democracy and lawfulness.

In the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, as we all know, there is a democratic regime, characterized by the separation of powers. The executive, legislative, judicial, electoral and civic powers, which all

function normally, are independent and autonomous. Therefore, the Government cannot influence the investigations of the Public Prosecutor's Office or the actions of the courts, which are following due process.

Lastly, the Government considers that the Committee's invitation is inconsistent with the rest of the Committee's conclusions, which recognize the separation of public powers, singling out the Government as opposed to the National Assembly or the National Electoral Council.

For all these reasons, it is evident that the recommendation made by the Committee is, in our opinion, contrary to the facts and impossible to comply with.

On behalf of my Government, I would like to request that this statement be included in the final report.

Mr. SHEIN (*Government, Myanmar*)

I wish to make some brief comments on the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards in so far as it relates to the special sitting on Myanmar held on 4 June 2005.

My delegation deeply regrets that the conclusion of the special sitting recommended to reactivate measures and actions called for under the resolution of 2000 in addition to reviewing the foreign direct investment that member countries have with Myanmar, as well as to submit a report to the Economic and Social Council in 2006.

We feel that this decision is unbalanced, unjust and unfair to Myanmar. Since the year 2000 until now, we have all along cooperated, both in law and in practice with the ILO on the issue of the eradication of forced labour. We have achieved significant progress towards this end. Yet rather than encouraging us to enhance our cooperation, the conclusions have done just the opposite.

Indeed, at the special sitting a good number of Government delegations encouraged Myanmar and the ILO to pursue this constructive dialogue. In fact, the *raison d'être* for giving Myanmar more time to resolve the issue in cooperation with the ILO is evident from the achievement and progress made during the past five years. We are very much disappointed at the decision taken by the Committee and its subsequent submission to the plenary.

My delegation reserves its right to further pronounce its position on this matter at the appropriate time and through appropriate channels.

Original French: Mr. OULD MOHAMED LEMINE (Government, Mauritania)

The Government of Mauritania took a favourable view of its inclusion on the list of individual cases to be considered by the Committee on the Application of Standards, because we expected there to be a constructive dialogue that would result in some positive and constructive conclusions, given the many specific activities undertaken by the Government of Mauritania. We would encourage other governments to submit to this supervisory mechanism. We complied with all of the recommendations made by the Committee of Experts and took into account further suggestions made by the direct contact mission that visited my country in May 2004.

Nonetheless, the discussion within the Committee on the Application of Standards virtually ignored the very existence of that direct contact mission and

the conclusions it reached. Those conclusions are, however, important when you look at the central issue (which should be of concern to all parties in this discussion) that is to say, whether or not there is forced labour in Mauritania.

Looking at the five trade union confederations in our country, only one of them claims that forced labour exists and when the direct contact mission requested NGOs active in this field to provide evidence of specific cases, they could do so in fewer than ten cases. The Government later found that those allegations were groundless.

The direct contact mission report notes this paradox whereby certain observers have referred to several thousand cases that have come to light, whereas an international mission, duly set up and received by the most active trade unions and associations in this field, found evidence of fewer than ten alleged cases.

Twenty-three years ago, when we received a mission of the United Nations Sub-committee on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, they reached the same conclusion. Anyone truly familiar with the situation in Mauritania will agree with these conclusions, because, despite the pressure exercised on the Committee through certain interventions, Mauritania is not hermetically sealed. It is an open, transparent society. In fact, researchers, journalists of all kinds, foreign NGOs and many international missions from all the UN agencies and programmes observe daily life in my country.

All of this goes to show that the allegations repeatedly made against Mauritania are groundless. No serious body could possibly lend credence to such allegations, which resemble something out of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*.

The direct contact mission set out the facts in its report less than a year ago. This report did not come out of nowhere, it is the result of a mission that was requested in 2003 by the Committee on the Application of Standards and which was carried out in May 2004.

Mauritania is not requesting special treatment. We merely wish to be judged based on objective facts and in a spirit of constructive criticism. Thus, we wish to bring this august Conference's attention to the increasingly contradictory nature of the ILO. On the one hand, we have a supervisory body that takes a contentious approach to issues, especially with regard to developing countries that are held to be weak, and which sometimes oversteps the legal boundary. On the other hand, we have the positive approach taken by the Office which takes due account of progress made and is based on cooperation and technical assistance.

However, confrontation and blacklists have never been the best ways of consolidating labour standards. For its part, the Government of Mauritania remains utterly dedicated to fundamental principles and rights at work and will fully respect its legal commitments, whilst remaining open to dialogue and cooperation within the framework of established standards and practices. My Government will implement all of the Committee's recommendations and has already done so with regard to all the recommendations of the Committee of Experts.

Based on the core Conventions, Mauritania, working with the ILO, has elaborated an action programme to promote the Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. All the unions have

associated themselves fully with this action programme.

With the support of the United States, Mauritania has implemented an awareness campaign concerning international labour standards and even forced labour. It is preparing to launch a national plan for the promotion and protection of human rights that was elaborated with the help of the United Nations High Commissioner of Human Rights. Mauritania will clearly and precisely meet all of its obligations under the Conventions to which it is party. My country shall unceasingly pursue the implementation of its strategy to combat poverty that has been cited as a reference by international financial institutions and development partners. Mauritania will reinforce the social dialogue and the partnership existing with civil society.

Mr. CHIPAZIWA (*Government, Zimbabwe*)

Zimbabwe takes the floor at the plenary again this year to raise concern over how its matter is being handled by the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards it is as a result of the working methods of that Committee.

It is well known that the report of the Committee of Experts forms the basis of members who appear before the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards.

Governments are asked to report on those observations once they are listed to appear before the Committee.

It is those specified observations only which governments are aware of and for which they are able to prepare responses. It is not supposed to be a game of hide-and-seek, where other matters are introduced through the back door by various interest groups.

Since 2002, Zimbabwe has been appearing in respect of the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98). It was over provisions of its Labour Act which were deemed to be non-compliant with this Convention.

Zimbabwe has dutifully amended its laws and it is visibly and currently working on those laws with the guidance of the Committee of Experts.

At this session, even the Employers' group endorsed that position in assuring the Committee and the Government of Zimbabwe that "the case had not been selected on the basis of any political consideration ..." and that "this was rather a case involving tangible progress which was one of the criteria for the selection provided for under the Committee's methods of work".

There was, therefore, no issue concerning Zimbabwe. The view was echoed by all seven Government members who addressed the Committee, including the Zimbabwe Worker delegate and the Zimbabwe Employer delegate.

Despite that, irregular and irrelevant remarks about political developments in Zimbabwe were allowed into the hearing. These had absolutely nothing to do with Convention No. 98 and least of all the practice in Zimbabwe had not been questioned at all by the Committee of Experts. Nor has it ever been in the past. The protagonists are well-known political opponents of the Zimbabwe Government.

For all the Members who appeared, the Committee of Experts was very clear whether its observations centred on the practice or law. The Committee of Experts received no report on Zimbabwe concerning breaches in practice of Convention No. 98.

And the Committee of Experts does not dream up its observations.

To introduce those alleged breaches at the Committee hearing, as occurred, and to draw adverse conclusions based on them, is akin to changing goalposts – and quite irregular, unfair and unacceptable to us.

It is detrimental and prejudicial to Government. Worker members should not be treated like a substitute Committee of Experts. That is what the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards did in respect of Zimbabwe at this Conference.

The conclusions it reached are inconsistent with the observations of the Committee of Experts, the Employers' group and all the Government members who voiced their concern at Zimbabwe's listing. That Committee invariably tends to use the functions of the Committee on Freedom of Association when it pertains to Zimbabwe.

The Committee relied on unsubstantiated, biased, secretively concocted and malicious political disinformation on Zimbabwe. The Committee should remain focused and objective and not be swayed by predetermined and emotional outbursts by one social partner.

This attitude is reflected in the Worker spokesperson's closing remarks during the adoption of the Committee's work. Other than making scathing attacks on the Zimbabwe Government to which we had no opportunity of reply, he was discourteous enough to attack the integrity of the African governments of Malawi, Kenya, South Africa, Nigeria and Namibia, which rose in their numbers to approve and recognize Zimbabwe's legislative reform. The integrity of these distinguished States will never depend on the sordid judgmentalism of paid malcontents from afar.

One can perceive personal, if not racial, hate underlying all this. There should be no room for zealotry. The ILO is fast losing credibility. We must all contribute to a positive reform of our attitude and work ethics. In this regard we take exception to the attitude of the Worker spokesperson and we hope that his desire to muzzle governments in this chamber will never succeed.

Is it that African governments cannot stand on their own? That they cannot sustain credible contrary views on issues?

Should it therefore be surprising why Zimbabwe declined a direct contacts mission? There is no basis at all in law or in fact for the Committee to request the Government of Zimbabwe to consider the possibility of accepting a direct contacts mission. The recommendation is an ill-founded misdirection and it arises from irregularities in the Committee on the Application of Standards. No wonder the same Worker's spokesperson summarily called for Zimbabwe to be included in a special paragraph when Zimbabwe declined the inappropriate direct contacts mission. We feel we are at the mercy of a conceited and bigoted clique. Zimbabwe needs the protection of this Conference.

Instead of Members being applauded for upholding the virtues of the International Labour Organization, those such as we are being derided.

Finally, Zimbabwe also calls for a further review of the working methods of this Committee. Not to act to redress this unfortunate decline in the integrity of this Committee would be to deliver a mortal wound to it. The Conference should not be complacent in such dereliction of duty.

Mr. NKHAMBULE (*Government, Swaziland*)

May I take the opportunity to make a correction? I do not represent the Workers, I represent the Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland.

My delegation would like to commend the Committee on the Application of Standards for producing one of the most magnificent reports so far, and placing it before this august assembly.

For my delegation, the report is clear, humanely accurate and contains a very rich debate of the issues that actually took place in the Committee on the Application of Standards.

For its part, the Committee on the Applications of Conventions and Recommendations continues to be innovative on the format of its report, thus making it easy to read among other things.

My delegation took note that during the debate of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations' report, the working methods featured repeatedly. I understand that this was the case in the year 2003 and I know this was also the case during the 92nd Session in 2004.

Of particular concern on this subject is the listing of countries for discussion and I want to tell you that my delegation is of the view that this still calls for further review to achieve, inter alia, justice in this area.

It is now common knowledge that Swaziland was listed, and we think better things could have been done, especially given the progress that Swaziland has made so far in its application of Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87) and the record speaks for itself.

Swaziland is committed to the ideals of this Organization, and continues, and will continue, to cooperate with the ILO as an Office, and also as an Organization. I hope that this year we have actually been listed for the very, very last time. I see no reason why we should be listed next year.

Original Chinese: Ms. LU (Government, China)

We have listened with great attention to the report submitted by the Committee on the Application of Standards. Regarding the application of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), by Myanmar, I wish to state the following.

We should note that, since 2000, the Myanmar Government has fully cooperated with the ILO.

The Chinese Government is of the view that encouragement should be offered to the Government of Myanmar, so that it will continue constructive dialogue and cooperation with the Office. We believe that continued constructive dialogue and engagement in effective cooperation are the only solution to the problem.

Original Russian: Mr. STAROVOYTOV (Government, Belarus)

Having heard the comments of Government delegations from other countries about the report of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards, we wish to express our viewpoint too.

The Republic of Belarus is a proponent of constructive dialogue and achieving positive results through mutually beneficial cooperation. That is the position that has been taken by many of the countries whose cases have been considered by the Committee, and that would include also the Government delegation of Belarus.

To some extent, the same is also true of the situation of the Government of Myanmar. Taking into

account the conclusions adopted by the Committee following its special sitting to examine developments concerning the question of the observance by the Government of Myanmar of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), the delegation of the Republic of Belarus would like once again to reaffirm its position, and its conviction, that exceptionally harsh measures and punitive measures, particularly those that are of an economic nature, first and foremost affect the workers.

The delegation of the Republic of Belarus considers it necessary to bear in mind the positive trends that have been noted with regard to the development of the situation in Myanmar, and to continue the constructive dialogue between the ILO and the Government of Myanmar in order to fully eradicate problems relating to the application of forced labour in that country.

As for the matter of the case relating to Belarus, the implementation of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), our delegation would like once again to emphasize that it is open to cooperation with the ILO. We will be doing our utmost to implement the Recommendations prepared by the Commission of Inquiry, which was sent to our country last year.

The Republic of Belarus has repeatedly expressed its interest in receiving technical assistance from the ILO, in particular, to implement those Recommendations.

In that connection, our delegation was somewhat surprised when the Committee took a decision, which in fact, meant that there was a binding requirement to have a kind of support mission for Belarus to develop and improve its legislation. On the basis of the wording in the conclusions of the Committee, the impression is given that the Committee is insisting on this mission, when, in fact, technical assistance is something that was requested by the Government itself. That being so, we would like changes to be made to the wording used to say that the Government of Belarus has to accept a mission so that the wording sounds more positive.

Mr. CHIBEBE (*Worker, Zimbabwe*)

I take this opportunity to thank the Committee for discussions on Zimbabwe and the outcome therefrom. The process was not easy and at times became acrimonious. Whereas the Government of Zimbabwe felt victimized, whereas they felt that they have tried their best to address the workers' concerns, their best is not good enough. It is unfortunate that the Government of Zimbabwe has once again refused to accept a direct contacts mission. Assuming there was nothing to hide, one would have thought that the Zimbabwean Government would have accepted the proposal. In spite of the denials by the Government regarding violations of the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), their actions at this Conference and, among others, intimidation tactics and their tone, exposed them. It is therefore humbly submitted that this Conference should seriously take note of the situation of violations of human and trade union rights in Zimbabwe, particularly the situation of the informal economy workers who have been reduced to homeless people in a space of three weeks.

The Government of Zimbabwe must therefore be urged to respect the ILO Conventions both in law

and in practice in order that they are not listed again. Nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. NDOYE (Government, Gambia)

I wish to thank the Committee of Experts and to make the following observations. The Government, after taking cognizance of the information contained in the Report of the Committee of Experts, wishes to reaffirm before this august body our commitment and obligation to report on Conventions and Recommendations. Our Government wishes to state its deep regret that we have been unable to fulfil these obligations since 2002. However, every effort will be made to ensure that the current situation is normalized and to that effect, we think it will be necessary to seek technical assistance from the ILO.

Notwithstanding, it is of paramount importance to inform this house of recent developments in my country regarding the review of our labour legislation. This document is in its final stage of revision of revision and will soon be put before the National Assembly for enactment. The Labour Code, among others, has adequately covered the core Conventions that the Gambia had ratified. This goes to show our commitment to the principles and ideals of the ILO and we have given priority to these core Conventions. This is why they are embodied in our Labour Code.

Once more, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Committee for its observations and also to promise that these observations will make sure that at least we address some of the shortcomings experienced in my country.

Ms. BRIGHI (*Worker, Italy*)

The work of the Committee has been hard but fruitful, with positive cooperation with the Employers' group and with most of the Governments. The Committee has fully respected its mandate, the working method has been positive and balance, transparency and independence in the selection of cases has been fully respected.

Unfortunately, from both the report and today's discussion, it is clear that even now there are a great number of problems in the implementation of the fundamental ILO Conventions, particularly the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87). This Convention represents the very heart of the ILO standards and the only possibility to consistently promote and respect other Conventions, particularly the technical ones.

This issue must be raised here, particularly with those governments which, with unacceptable justification, hide themselves behind excuses of conspiracy against some countries or behind misconceptions, in order to seek impunity for their violation of core labour standards, in many cases threatening the lives of workers' representatives or unionists, or dismissing or arresting them, or even, in some cases, murdering them. The same group of governments try to undermine the supervisory mechanism and continuously attack the quality and the working methods of the Committee and, most regrettably, the independence of the Committee of Experts, accusing the Committee of political or ideological preconceptions in the selection and discussion, and in the conclusions of cases. This is the case with what we have just heard, from the Governments of Zimbabwe, Mauritania and other States.

We, the Workers' group, cannot accept such accusations by any means. Governments have agreed to be Members of this Organization and have to fully respect its rules, its legal obligations and its mandate. We note with regret that once again in the Committee, the call underlined in the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization to fill the gaps in coherence, democracy and consistency, remains unheard by some governments as we have just heard. The results of the work of this year are particularly successful and we have underlined some positive cases that demonstrate that the work achieved through promotional standards and technical assistance can be fully successful if willingness is shown by the governments concerned.

In this regard, it is of great concern that adequate means be available for the implementation of the commitment taken by the Committee in terms of technical assistance and missions. It is therefore of crucial importance that the most important faction of the ILO be protected, granted and adequately financed, particularly through the regular budget, but also through voluntary contributions, particularly by the IMEC countries, which have declared today that they will fully support and strengthen the supervisory mechanism.

Particular importance in this regard has to be given to the implementation of the decisions concerning a series of technical fact-finding missions which are a positive supportive instrument to help governments to fulfil their obligations. In particular, Zimbabwe, Swaziland, Malawi and Colombia or Sudan could contribute to the solution of long-standing, serious violations of fundamental Conventions. In this regard, it is not acceptable that some governments today put into question legitimate decisions assumed by governments on the application of standards and in particular their follow-up.

We have just heard the Governments of Belarus, Zimbabwe and Burma. These Governments ignore ongoing recommendations, beginning with those of the Commission of Enquiry, and further recommendations by the Committee on the Application of Standards, and the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29). Forced labour unfortunately remains one of the key means for the military junta to wield terror and power. We continue to ask the junta to fulfil their commitments. It is unacceptable to us that excuses such as being a country in continuous transformation give such countries the possibility to continuously violate fundamental human and workers' rights.

I wish to recall, therefore, the need for the full implementation of the recommendations of the special sitting on Convention No. 29. It is of outstanding importance that the ILO liaison office is strengthened and that its work can be implemented in the most free way. I urge the constituents therefore to fully respect and promote the decisions of that sitting, particularly as far as the decisions that constituents should activate and intensify the review of their relations with Burma and urgently take the appropriate actions including as regards foreign direct investments in all its various forms.

We have noted that all the political sanctions applied up until now, by the ILO and by other international organizations, did not bring successful results. It is now the time to implement such resolution. The Workers' group supports the final remarks by the Employers' group, in order not to weaken the

already difficult work of the liaison officer on Convention No. 29, as far as the case of Burma relating to Convention No. 87 is concerned. If the task of the liaison officer has also to include support for the Government of Burma for the implementation of Convention No. 87, the liaison office should be appropriately reinforced to that effect and adequate resources and means should be provided. In this regard I would reiterate my request to governments to fully support and finance these requests.

In conclusion, one further improvement in the work of our Committee may be discussed. We consider the result of this year of work as very positive. The so-called "cold war" proposal from the Employers is not suitable to seek solutions to cases of violations of fundamental Conventions which are affecting the real fundamental role in activities, as constituents cannot wait endless years for them to be discussed.

Original Spanish: Mr. RODRIGUEZ DIAZ (Worker, Colombia)

The Colombian trade union movement would like to take this opportunity to express once again our satisfaction with the conclusions adopted by the Committee on the Application of Standards as regards Colombia, which we think will help reactivate social dialogue.

From this forum and on behalf of tripartism, which is democracy in action, we would like to hold out the hand of friendship to the Government and Colombian employers and invite them to work alongside us to develop the postulates of the ILO. In this way, we can show a real commitment to the defence of democracy, which implies a respect for the Constitution, for the law, for international Conventions, and for freedom of association, which would thus make it possible to make of collective bargaining a dynamic process.

The Colombian trade union movement is growing weary of the violence, of the painfully slow steps being made towards dialogue and collective bargaining. It is for this reason that we would like to repeat, without any ambiguity, a fervent wish to intensify our contribution to finding a political solution to the armed conflict and to give impetus, without preconceived ideas and with realism to social dialogue.

The tripartite high-level mission which will come to our country at the beginning of October this year reflects the concern of the international community for the case of Colombia and clearly shows the influence of the ILO. In short, Colombia will gain and tripartism will be strengthened. But, above all, justice will triumph and this will generate confidence and require workers, employers and the Government to enter into effective social dialogue which will be reflected in good labour relations.

As well as our enthusiasm for the conclusions of the Committee on the Application of Standards as regards Colombia, we would like to record our satisfaction at seeing our brother, Mr. Julio Roberto Gomez, General-Secretary of the General Confederation of Labour (CGT) in the Governing Body of the ILO and the continued presence in the third list of our brother, Mr. Apecides Alvis, President of the Confederation of Workers of Colombia. These two leaders have enormous abilities that they will put to the service of tripartism; they will certainly make a valuable contribution.

Let us stress again our intention to be able to make positive progress within the mandate con-

ferred on us by the ILO to renew social dialogue immediately. Furthermore, we would like to thank all those who have made this important agreement possible, an agreement which began with a trade union mission to Europe under the auspices of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the World Confederation of Labour (WCL) and welcomed by the European trade union movement, allowing Colombia's problems to be examined in a tripartite manner.

Apart from Mr. Luc Cortebееck (Worker Vice-Chairperson of the Committee on the Application of Standards) and Mr. Edward Potter (Employer Vice-Chairperson of the Committee on the Application of Standards), we would also like to thank Mr. Sérgio Paixão Pardo, who was Chairperson of the Committee on the Application of Standards. We also welcome the Committee on Freedom of Association's decision regarding the legality of the Ecopetrol strike.

Finally, fraternal greetings from the Colombian trade union movement, which would like to express its gratitude concerning the ILO decision, which will help to make another Colombia possible.

Mr. AHMED (Worker, Pakistan)

We have spent two weeks in this Committee of Governments, Workers and Employers, on occasions violating the international labour standards by working on Saturday and up to 10 p.m. on some days. We have brought this report before this house, where Government and Employers' representatives contributed to our discussion. Our discussion concerns the report of the Committee of Experts, which is composed of experts from all the continents, from developed and developing countries. This Committee provides a forum for dialogue between Governments and the other constituents frankly and fairly, with full opportunity afforded to all the parties. That is the reason for the impression that is being given of discrimination between the developed and developing countries. In the Committee's report there are cases concerning alleged violations by the United States of the Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 144), and alleged violations by Australia of the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98). Discussions have been taking place and these Governments have been called upon to amend their laws and practice to meet their international obligations. Had they been developing countries, they might have been treated differently. Secondly, I would submit that we live in the international community and we have love and affection for all parts of the world, including Africa, Asia, the Americas and Europe.

That is why I must say here in this house, that the ILO, which is considered to be the social conscience of the world and the "world parliament of labour", has always fought for social justice and for an end to all forms of discrimination.

I well remember those days when the South African racist regime was expelled from the ILO and all Members, governments, as well as social partners, demonstrated full solidarity until the liberation of South Africa had been achieved. This shows that we stand for full respect for all people, and particularly those who have been struggling. This Committee is not subjective; it is impartial and independent, and offers technical assistance to member States ratifying Conventions, so that they can fulfil their obliga-

tions. We hope, therefore, in view of the reservations made by some Members, that they will fully take into account the technical cooperation and amend their laws and practices, which would help them to fulfil their responsibilities. We fully support, on behalf of the Workers' group, the adoption of this report, and commend the work of the distinguished Employer and Worker spokespersons and the Chairperson of the Committee. We also wish to thank the representative of the Secretary-General and all those members of the secretariat who have worked long hours. We fully support the adoption of this report.

Mr. SALIMIAN (*Worker, Islamic Republic of Iran*)

I endorse the views of the Workers' spokesperson of the Committee. Regarding the Committee and its working method, I think firstly that the conclusions drawn on the cases were quite lengthy, mostly containing and repeating the text of the report of the Committee of Experts. Sometimes these conclusions were even lengthier than the deliberations of the spokespersons of the groups. Secondly, before the conclusion for a case was drafted and announced, there was an interval in the proceedings of the Committee. In past years, the practice was that the conclusions were drawn right after the discussion of the case, and only in rare cases, where there was no consensus, was there an interval for consultation with the two spokespersons.

Thirdly, due to a shortage of time, limits were introduced in the second week for the speakers, which limited the number of speakers for each case, whereas, in the first six cases discussed, a large number of speakers participated in the debate. Consequently, justice was not done to the cases discussed in the second week due to the time constraints. Fourthly, as these constraints did not apply to the Government representatives, they therefore abused this right and spoke at length about the cases or in support of other governments. Fifthly, regarding the list of cases itself, I think it was not reasonably balanced. I hope that next year we will be able to see more EU countries on the list.

Coming to my country's case regarding the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949 (No. 95), unfortunately, despite the amendment that I made to *Provisional Record* No. 10, it has not been fully covered in the report. Therefore, I am compelled to make my statement now, so that it can be put on record.

The situation prevailing throughout the country regarding non-payment of wages is drastic and disastrous. I myself am from the textile industry. I came from the Dorakhshan Yazd Spinning and Weaving Company. My late father also used to work in this factory. I am a member of the Islamic Labour Council of this textile unit.

For the last three years, our wages have always been late. Even now workers' wages are about six months behind schedule. Last year, when our workers blocked the road, the law enforcement agencies intervened. When they came to know that we had not received wages for several months, they said that if my salary was delayed for two months, I would end up behind bars because my creditors would lodge a complaint and that would be my fate.

The non-payment of wages has played havoc with the life of the workers. You just imagine a worker who is already living hand-to-mouth: if he does not receive wages for a few months, he will be in a fix.

We can quote hundreds of incidents with the names of workers and workplaces. A worker was not able to pay back his house loan, until ultimately the bank auctioned his house to gain back the money it had lent. In another instance, the foundations of workers' homes were shaken. There have been cases where workers' wives have asked for divorce because they could not cope with the delay of day-to-day living expenses. There have been numerous incidences of workers committing suicide. Three workers of the Saadat Nassajan committed suicide during a period of one year. Fortunately, a fourth was rescued. As one of our labour leaders once said, the workers do not have money to buy rope to hang themselves. Where is the public prosecution with an awakened conscience, that these incidents pass unnoticed?

In almost all the cases where units have cash-flow problems, all the provincial authorities, including the Ministry of Labour, did everything within their power in cooperating to solve the employers' problems. For example, Mahdi Chini was helped to receive a loan, but, instead of paying the wages of its workers, first paid the debts of its own shareholders.

Although the Government has made efforts to resolve this matter, and the Ministry of Labour has created a Workers' Support Fund, the resources allocated are far from sufficient. It is like a drop in the ocean. Besides that, we think that the Government's attitude towards this sensitive matter should really change. The Ministry of Labour, the administrations in the provinces, the labour inspectors – all must have positive and favourable attitudes toward the workers.

Islamic teaching pays tribute to the work and workers and considers work as a prayer. According to a saying of the Prophet Mohammed – peace be upon him – a worker's wages should be paid before his sweat dries up. It was with this mentality that I once suggested in a newspaper article that the officials of my country must either strike the name of Islamic from the name of the State or else, change their attitude and outlook towards workers. The former they cannot do, because the Iranian people, in national referendum, gave this mandate of Islamic Republic.

One of the provisions of the Convention calls for means to redress injury caused, including not only the full repayment of amount due, but also fair compensation of losses incurred on account of delayed payment. I hope that our officials are aware of the fact that in Turkey, our next-door neighbour, according to legislation, if wages arrears exceed a period of three months, the normal rate of interest has to be added to the amount of wages in arrears to compensate for the delayed payment. Therefore, we demand that similar legislation should be enacted, in line with Convention No. 95.

Finally, I hope that the recommendations I made in the Committee, which have been reflected in the report, will be fully implemented by the Government. I also call on the distinguished delegates of this Conference to adopt the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards.

Mr. SANKAR SAHA (*Worker, India*)

Whilst I welcome the report of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards, I would like, on behalf of Indian workers, to make a few observations that are felt imperative.

It is the experience of the working class community the world over, that in the era of exploitative globalization, the worst-affected victims are the workers, no matter which country they belong to. Core Conventions and fundamental standards are being violated everywhere, but few of these violations are reported and even fewer come under the scrutiny of the ILO supervisory mechanism.

We admit that the Committee has done stupendous work. The general discussion that was held on the Director-General's Report, *A global alliance against forced labour* revealed that forced labour is a shameful crime that exists in all countries of the globe, whether some admit it or not. Any attempt to eradicate or rehabilitate forced labour shall prove abortive if we do not change the exploitative system that has given birth to this uncivilized phenomenon and formalize informal industrial relations.

Incidentally, I cannot but question before this august house how long civilized mankind will tolerate the present Iraqi regime, which manages to bring forced labour to Iraq from Iran through Turkey. Many of the forced labourers die like animals under the pressure of exploitation, and the rest are killed when they try to escape.

Let us look at the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182). The use of children in begging, in extremely hazardous work in mines and quarries, and in the sale and trafficking of children for the purposes of economic and sexual exploitation, is witnessed by civilization everywhere every day. The remedy can be found only in giving gainful employment to the parents, and free and compulsory education to the children, but under the exploitative system, such education and employment opportunities remain a dream.

Let us move to another fact of life, that of drastically dismantling or reducing the existing social security system. Workers of many countries have been compelled to take strike action in order to foil attempts to reduce, or altogether dismantle, their social security benefits. The so-called welfare states are shirking their responsibility of providing social security to the working community, that is the creator of wealth. Many member States are asking employees to buy their own pension and health care, while in many countries the social security system is privatized and the public and private systems co-exist, leaving the worker's life hanging in the balance. In developing countries like ours, 90 per cent of the working people have been pushed into the informal sector and no social security system is available to them. Without formalizing the informal sector, no benefit can reach them. The working class community has to seriously ponder this issue.

According to one estimate, with the revolution in technological development that has already occurred in the world, in a system free from the greed of capitalism, if all the employable population was given work for two to four hours a day, sufficient wealth could be produced to cater for the needs of the entire human race, such as food, shelter, pure drinking water, sanitation, health care, old age protection, etc.

Against this background, various governments and employers are insisting on flexibility of working hours and on revising the Hours of Work (Industry) Convention, 1919 (No. 1), which was achieved through many struggles and sacrifices in the first session of the International Labour Conference in Washington in the year 1919. The purpose,

it appears, is to disarm the working community of its right to fixed working hours and make it work for more than eight hours a day. The Workers at the International Labour Conference have already recorded their dissent to the proposal.

In conclusion, you will kindly appreciate that the community of workers is now in the process of protecting their existing rights, given to them under various noble Conventions of the ILO, but they are under severe attack from capitalism and their tolerance is at breaking point.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

As there are no further speakers, we all now proceed to the adoption of the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards.

If there are no objections may I consider that the Conference has adopted the report of the Committee as a whole, that is, the first, second and third parts?

(The report, as a whole, is approved.)

Before we conclude the debate on this point I would like to congratulate the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons of the Committee on the Application of Standards, and all those persons who have participated in the work of that Committee, for the excellent work they have been doing. I also thank all the members of the secretariat who have contributed to the excellent results that have been obtained.

CLOSING SPEECHES

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

It is my pleasure to invite you to listen to the closing speeches of this 93rd Session of the International Labour Conference.

Mr. FINLAY (*Employer, Canada; Employer Vice-President of the Conference*)

Out of courtesy for the staff and our interpreters that have been hanging in here all afternoon, I am going to disregard my notes and I am going to reduce my speech to three very brief points.

First of all, thank you to the Employers' group for giving me the honour of appointing me to this position.

Second point, I would like to compliment the staff that run this Conference. Being a Vice-President you get to see a little bit more about what they do, and they do an incredible job – they make a huge effort, from the interpreters to the support staff, but I would also especially like to mention the professionalism and the care demonstrated by Mr. Damien on his last Conference.

Finally, what I would have liked to talk about a little bit – but I am going to defer to a Governing Body discussion – is how we can make the plenary more meaningful in dynamics. I am looking forward to that discussion taking place in the Governing Body, and on that note I will stop.

Original Spanish: Ms. ANDERSON (*Worker, Mexico; Worker Vice-President of the Conference*)

First of all I would like to say that it has been an honour for my organization, and for me personally, to be worker Vice-Chairperson at this 93rd International Labour Conference.

I would also like to thank the worker delegates for the confidence which they have placed in me by electing me to such an important position.

I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the President of the Conference, the Minister of

Labour of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Mr. Basim Khalil Alsalam for the wise guidance and direction which he has given us during the meetings. I would also like to thank to my colleagues, Vice-Chairpersons, Mr. Andrew Finlay, the Employers' delegate of Canada, and the Minister of Labour and Employment of Ecuador, Mr. Galo Chiriboga Zambrano who represented the Governments. I thank them for their generosity, for the spirit of teamwork which we have enjoyed and I would like to say that we have worked alongside the Officers of this Conference in an atmosphere of co-operation and we have shared responsibilities throughout.

Of course, I would like to repeat my congratulations to the Director-General of the ILO, Mr. Somavia, for the excellent work which he has carried out and I would also like to congratulate the technical committees for their work. Thanks to them we have been able to achieve positive results over the last two days of plenary.

I would also like to point out the fact that the consensus on the basis of which we achieved the results in relation to the various items on the agenda would not have been possible without the firm commitment of the social partners in our tripartite dialogue.

It is clear that through their work, the Committees have provided us with concrete indications as to how to make progress regarding the various aspects of the world of work today.

The report entitled *A global alliance against forced labour* provides scandalous figures concerning the number of persons being exploited in the area of forced labour and the number of victims of human trafficking, a majority of whom are women and children. Forced sexual labour for financial gain is unacceptable and intolerable. Here, the urgent need to eradicate forced labour springs to mind and I would like to say that we must redouble our efforts to combat this phenomenon.

The work of the Committee on the Application of Standards has been of fundamental importance and this has been said on a number of occasions. Standards are the backbone of the ILO. The standard-setting system is the backbone of this institution and therefore I think we have to call for greater attention to be given to violations of freedom of association and the need for respect for collective bargaining.

The Workers' group has recognized and very much appreciates the progress which has been made in the case of Colombia through the appointment of a high-level mission led by the Chairperson of the Committee on the Freedom of Association. We hope that the recommendations made by the Committee for each of the 25 cases examined will lead to real progress in the implementation of international labour standards in those countries.

The issue of hours of work, the parameters of which have been drastically affected by the impact of globalization, was the subject of fierce debate and is still a very important issue for the Workers' group.

The Committee on Youth Employment is important for millions of young people for whom a decent job is a distant dream. Unemployment is high. Employment, when it exists, is precarious and does not always provide sufficient income in order to meet basic needs. The conclusions of the discussion on youth employment recognize the diversity and the magnitude of the problems faced by young people across the world. We support the decisions which

have been taken concerning the employment of youth. There should be a large-scale campaign organized by the ILO in order to ensure that there can be decent work for young people.

The Committee on Safety and Health discussed a number of conclusions with a view to adopting an instrument to establish a framework for promotion within the field of occupational safety and health. Regrettably, the content of the document is very weak. This new instrument should promote the ratification and implementation of certain key ILO Conventions which are very important in the area of occupational safety and health. The instrument also needs to create a link with the workplace workers and establish the basic principles governing health and safety at work. We very much hope that next year we shall see a strengthening of the content of the Convention and the Recommendation in order that the situation as regards occupational safety and health may be improved.

As regards the important work which has been carried out by the Committee on the Fishing Sector, we are happy to see the progress which has been made on the behalf of one of the most exploited groups of workers in the world. This process was a very important one since this instrument is one which has been elaborated on the basis of existing Conventions. The instrument establishes a balance between the need to maintain certain existing standards and flexibility for vessels of a smaller size. The adoption of the consolidated maritime Convention completes, or will complete, the nexus between seafarers and fishers. The provisions on social security and repatriation are of particular importance to this group. In conclusion, the consolidated Convention is something which has to be worked towards. We, the workers feel that it is regrettable that, because of a single vote, the Convention was not adopted.

I have to congratulate my colleagues, who represent the new Governing Body. We are very happy about the democratic and fair results which have been achieved.

We note with some sadness that the total number of women participating in this Conference this year has dropped, as compared with earlier years. We make up a mere 22.4 per cent of delegates. We would like to make an appeal to the Conference as a whole. We have, all of us, to make a serious effort in order to improve this level of participation.

At the 91st session of the International Labour Conference, in 2003, a whole day was spent analysing and promoting equality between men and women at work, as well as trying to promote greater participation in the activities of the ILO.

Mr. Juan Somavia chaired that very important discussion.

At that time, we suggested that, at the next session of the Conference, delegations should comprise at least 30 per cent women, and that was the case. At the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference in 2004, we saw the largest number of women present. The then President of the Conference, Mr. Ray Guevara, commented on this in plenary, with great satisfaction.

That same year, there was also an important resolution on equality between men and women as regards equal pay.

But now, in the year 2005, at this Conference, this 93rd Session of the Conference, the number of women present far from increasing has dropped. For

example, in the discussion of the reports of the Governing Body and the Director-General of the ILO, there were 285 speakers, of whom only 39 were women. Once again, I would like to appeal to all the Members to ensure that, at the next session of the Conference, this 30 per cent participation by women be respected so that we can contribute to making progress for equality in the world of work.

I would also like to call upon all women who are involved in tripartism to participate more actively and to defend the right to equality, which we have struggled to obtain, here in this esteemed institution of the ILO. After all, we women are an integral part of that Organization.

Original Spanish: The SECRETARY-GENERAL of the CONFERENCE

My dear friends, Mr. President Chiriboga, I would like to thank you for having brought this great session of the Conference to a conclusion. My gratitude also goes to the Minister of Labour for Jordan, Mr. Alsalim, who was here with us until yesterday, as well as Ms. Hilda Anderson and Mr. Finlay. Thank you very much for all your work.

I would also like to thank the Chairpersons of the Committees, the members of the corresponding bureaux, and the representatives of the different groups. I think a tremendous job has been accomplished; we have addressed forced labour, youth employment, health and safety in the workplace, and the fishing sector.

I only wish to make three short comments. Firstly, any session of the Conference has its own complexities, as became clear this morning in connection with the Report of the Committee on the Application of Standards.

It is important to remember that this is an essential part of our work and that, while we are always glad to hear positive comments on progress, we must remember the limitations. It is useful to listen to everyone here, including Governments concerned and those who wish to support the Report, because here at the International Labour Conference, freedom of expression is guaranteed to all representatives. This is of crucial importance, as it is the basis for the strength of our Organization: here, we have freedom of speech.

At the same time, we respect majorities; we respect the will of the majority and, that is why we have just approved the report of the Committee on the Application of Standards.

The second issue I wish to highlight concerns the draft Convention for the fishing sector. Here, we have seen tripartism in action. As I mentioned earlier, we do respect majorities, albeit through a vote, but it was respected. But tripartism immediately identifies the true issue at stake: it was not a matter of not adopting that standard, but rather of facilitating a discussion on its contents. Let us agree here and now that this debate will continue and take an immediate decision to take this issue up again in 2007, on the basis of the Report. This to me is an extraordinary example of flexibility and an ability to understand quickly that this issue can not be resolved by way of a simple vote.

Finally, one of the things that impressed me and gave much hope for the future is the degree of convergence and consensus present in the plenary discussions. For the purpose of presenting a response to the end of the session, which has been distributed, I had to review all the speeches given, since

my other duties did not allow me to be present at all times. I sincerely welcome the degree of consensus that has been achieved on our Decent Work Agenda and, in particular, on the need to make this a global objective; on the need for the ILO to integrate into its activities the promotion of a fair globalization; on the need to examine the issues of growth, investment and employment; and on the need to face up to the problems resulting from high unemployment levels worldwide. All these issues have been addressed, as well as the link between employment and poverty eradication. I think we have come out of this session energized by this great consensus, which is also reflected in the adoption of the ILO's programme of work for 2006-07. This is a matter of great satisfaction for me, as I believe that it leads us on logically to the next step, that is to say, national decent work programmes.

I would like to invite all of you, therefore, to make use of tripartism on a national level. International tripartism has agreed that the ILO should move in a certain direction. I reiterated this at this session of the Conference and I included it in the programme and budget 2006-07. Now we have to return home. We have to demonstrate the strength of this tripartism, that it is alive and able to have an impact on the solution of conflicts and on policy-making. I would like to invite you to return home with that task, the task that we have agreed to here, with our own way of working and the ability to carve out our own direction in response to today's problems, which is also seen in practice, in the tasks that you will carry out on your return home. The ILO will always be prepared to support its constituents, those who have problems with the Committee on the Application of Standards or those who want to incorporate the Decent Work Agenda into their national programmes. The International Labour Office is available to serve you all, to move forward and to solve problems.

Original Spanish: The PRESIDENT

For my country, Ecuador, it has been an honour to chair this final sitting of the 93rd Session of the International Labour Conference, and I must take this opportunity to comment very briefly on certain of the significant experiences which we have had over the last three weeks.

The ILO is like a great international watch; although it is not Swiss, it works as well as Swiss watches do, in spite of its complex problems. I am not going to repeat the objectives which the ILO has, because I think we have had enough debate on that, particularly in our discussion of the Reports of the Director-General and the Chairperson of the Governing Body, *Consolidating progress and moving ahead* and *A global alliance against forced labour*. However, I believe that the ILO, as a tripartite organization based on social dialogue, should become what I may call an instrument of war – yes, I said war: war against unemployment, against marginalization, against failure to respect international standards, human rights, and fundamental labour rights; a war promoting, defending, and protecting the right to life, generating more investment, better technological development, and better research, since this is what human beings normally do when at war.

This Conference has reaffirmed that tripartism is the key to achieving a state of well-being, as long as we turn our words into action. As has been said so

very often here, policies which are not converted into action are unsustainable.

It has seemed to me very important over these last three weeks to discuss unemployment, and the social and economic impacts thereof; however, I believe that the discussion should go further and should examine how to enhance the entrepreneurial capacity of young people, so that they can create mechanisms which will generate employment for their own contemporaries, with the support of employers, unions and governments.

The main commitment of States is to improve conditions so that productive investment can occur, guaranteeing legal security for workers and employers, and better infrastructures, so that business can prosper. One of the instruments of such infrastructure is to provide for decent wages, which will enable the virtuous circle of development to operate effectively. Support for the mutual supervision of employers and workers is fundamental, and therefore we must support collective bargaining and limit the intervention of the State to guaranteeing that whatever obligations are undertaken shall be fulfilled.

I hope, and this is an obligation of States, that the public services which are supplied by States are of good quality, competitive and geared towards the users, who are the citizens. Governments must also see to it that public service unions are able to defend their rights, but above all promote the right of citizens to be well treated and to receive better service. Governments should be fully committed to working towards such objectives.

I do not want to continue further and will just conclude by expressing my thanks and congratulations to all those who have participated in this session of the International Labour Conference, to the President of the Conference, Mr. Alsalim, for his splendid work, and to Vice-Presidents Anderson and Finlay for their generous contributions. They have advanced the work of this assembly. Lastly, I thank all the administrative and technical support staff, the security staff, and the translation staff for their cooperation.

(The Conference adjourned sine die at 2.50 p.m.)



**Vote final par appel nominal sur l'adoption de la Convention sur le travail
dans la pêche, 2005**

**Final record vote on the adoption of the Work in Fishing Convention,
2005**

**Votación nominal final sobre la adopción del Convenio sobre el trabajo
en el sector pesquero, 2005**

Pour/For/En Pro: 288
Contre/Against/En contra: 8
Abstentions/Abstentions/Abstenciones: 139
Quorum: 297

Pour/For/En Pro: 288

Afrique du Sud/South Africa/Sudáfrica

NDEBELE, Mr. (G)
LUSENGA, Ms. (G)
RANTSOLASE, Ms.(T/W)

Algérie/Algeria/Argelia

SEDKI, M. (G)
ABDELMOUMENE, M. (G)
SIDI SAID, M.(T/W)

Allemagne/Germany/Alemania

SCHLEEGER, Mrs. (G)
HOFFMANN, Mrs. (G)
ADAMY, Mr.(T/W)

Angola

N'GOVE LUSSOKE, M. (G)
FERNANDA CARVALHO FRANCISCO,
Mme(T/W)

*Arabie saoudite/Saudi Arabia/Arabia
Saudita*

ALYAHYA, Mr. (G)
AL-ZAMIL, Mr. (G)
DAHLAN, Mr. (E)
RADHWAN, Mr.(T/W)

Argentine/Argentina

ROSALES, Sr. (G)
VARELA, Sr. (G)
MARTÍNEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Australie/Australia

BURROW, Ms.(T/W)

Autriche/Austria

DEMBSHER, Ms. (G)
HÄCKEL-BUCHER, Ms. (G)
BOEGNER, Ms.(T/W)

Bahamas

SYMONETTE, Mr. (G)
BROWN, Mr. (G)

Bahreïn/Bahrain/Bahrein

AL-QASSIMI, Mr. (G)
AMIN MOHAMED, Mr. (G)
AL-MAHFOODH, Mr.(T/W)

Barbade/Barbados

BURNETT, Mr. (G)
EASTMOND, Mr. (G)
TROTMAN, Mr.(T/W)

Bélarus/Belarus/Belarús

MOLCHAN, Mr. (G)

Belgique/Belgium/Bélgica

DE VADDER, M. (G)
VANDAMME, M. (G)
GRUSELIN, M.(T/W)

Bénin/Benin

ONI, M. (G)
GAZARD, Mme (G)
AZOUA, M.(T/W)

*Bosnie-Herzégovine/Bosnia and
Herzegovina/Bosnia y Herzegovina*

KALMETA, Ms. (G)

Botswana

MATLHO, Mrs. (G)
SEEMULE, Ms. (G)
BAIPIDI, Mr.(T/W)

Brésil/Brazil/Brasil

PAIXÃO PARDO, Mr. (G)
SALDANHA, Mr. (G)
FERREIRA DO PRADO, Mr.(T/W)

Bulgarie/Bulgaria

TZANTCHEV, Mr. (G)
TCHOLASHKA, Mrs. (G)

Canada/Canadá

ROBINSON, Ms. (G)
MACPHEE, Mr. (G)
LAMBERT, Mr.(T/W)

Chili/Chile

MARTABIT SCAFF, Sr. (G)
PASCAL CHEETHAM, Sr. (G)
AGUILAR TORRES, Sra.(T/W)

Chine/China

XU, Mr.(T/W)

Chypre/Cyprus/Chipre

PAPADOPOULOS, Mr. (G)

Colombie/Colombia

GOMEZ ESGUERRA, Sr.(T/W)

Congo

MIERE, M. (G)

*République de Corée/Republic of
Korea/República de Corea*

KANG, Mr.(T/W)

Costa Rica

CLARAMUNT, Sra. (G)
SEGURA, Srta. (G)
CABEZAS BADILLA, Sr.(T/W)

Côte d'Ivoire

BOULLOU BI DJEHIFFE, M. (G)
N'GUESSAN, M. (G)
GAHE MAHAN, M.(T/W)

Croatie/Croatia/Croacia

MARKOTIC, Mr. (G)
SOCANAC, Mr. (G)
TOTH MUCCIACCIARO, Mrs.(T/W)

Cuba

HERNÁNDEZ OLIVA, Sra. (G)
LAU VALDÉS, Sra. (G)
GONZÁLEZ GONZÁLEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Danemark/Denmark/Dinamarca

HARHOFF, Ms. (G)
PEDERSEN, Mr. (G)

République dominicaine/Dominican

Republic/República Dominicana
HERNÁNDEZ SÁNCHEZ, Sr. (G)
REYES UREÑA, Sr. (G)

Egypte/Egypt/Egipto

ABDO, Mr. (E)
ABD EL HADY, Mrs.(T/W)

El Salvador

ÁVILA DE PEÑA, Sra. (G)
RODRÍGUEZ SALAZAR, Sr. (G)

Emirats arabes unis/United Arab

Emirates/Emiratos Arabes Unidos
ALZAABI, Mr. (G)
ABDUL GHANI, Mr. (G)
ALMARZOOQI, Mr.(T/W)

Equateur/Ecuador

ARCINIEGA, Sr.(T/W)

Espagne/Spain/España

ARNAU NAVARRO, Sr. (G)
FRADES, Sr.(T/W)

Estonie/Estonia

KAADU, Mr. (G)
LEHT, Ms. (G)
TAMMELEHT, Mrs.(T/W)

Etats-Unis/United States/Estados

Unidos
ZELLHOEFER, Mr.(T/W)

Ethiopie/Ethiopia/Etiopía

SIAMREGN, Mr. (G)
ALEMAYEHU, Mr.(T/W)

Fidji/Fiji

KURUDUADUA, Mr. (G)
SINGH, Mr.(T/W)

Finlande/Finland/Finlandia

SALMENPERÄ, Mr. (G)
MODEEN, Ms. (G)
VALKONEN, Ms.(T/W)

France/Francia

AUER, Mme (G)
THIERRY, M. (G)
BLONDEL, M.(T/W)

Gabon/Gabón

MOULOMBA NZIENGUI, M. (G)
BIVEGHE NDOUTOUME, M. (G)

Ghana

DORKENOO, Mr.(T/W)

Grèce/Greece/Grecia

LAIYOU-SPANOPOULOU, Mme (G)
CAMBITSIS, M. (G)
DASSIS, M.(T/W)

Guatemala

NICHOLS LÓPEZ, Sr. (G)
PIRA, Sr. (G)
LUCAS GÓMEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Guinée/Guinea

KEIRA, M. (G)
DIALLO, Mme(T/W)

Haïti/Haiti/Haití

PIERRE, M. (G)
JOSEPH, M. (G)
PIERRE FRANCOIS, M. (E)
NUMAS, M.(T/W)

Honduras

IBARRA, Sra.(T/W)

Hongrie/Hungary/Hungria

HÉTHY, Mr. (G)
TÓTH, Mr. (G)
TÓTH, Mr.(T/W)

Inde/India

SANJEEVA REDDY, Mr.(T/W)

Indonésie/Indonesia

AKSAM, Mr.(T/W)

République islamique d'Iran/Islamic
Republic of Iran/República Islámica
del Irán

SALIMIAN, Mr.(T/W)

Iraq

HAMD, Mr.(T/W)

Irlande/Ireland/Irlanda

MC DONNELL, Mr. (G)
PENDER, Mr. (G)
LYNCH, Ms.(T/W)

Islande/Iceland/Islandia

DAVIDSDOTTIR, Ms. (G)
KRISTINSSON, Mr. (G)
GUNNARSSON, Mr.(T/W)

Italie/Italy/Italia

TRIA, M. (G)
SIMONETTI, M. (G)
BRIGHI, Mme(T/W)

Japon/Japan/Japón

NAKAJIMA, Mr.(T/W)

Jordanie/Jordan/Jordania

AL-MA'AYTA, Mr.(T/W)

Kenya

KAVULUDI, Mr. (G)
KUBAI, Mr.(T/W)

Lesotho

MATSOSO, Mrs. (G)
KHETSI, Mr. (G)

Lettonie/Latvia/Letonia

KALNINS, Mr. (G)
KARKLINS, Mr. (G)

Liban/Lebanon/Líbano

GHOSN, M.(T/W)

Jamahiriya arabe libyenne/Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya/Jamahiriya Arabe
Libia

IDRIS AZARUG, Mr. (G)

Lituanie/Lithuania/Lituania

JAKUCIONYTE, Ms. (G)
ZANANAVICIUS, Mr. (G)
VAICAITYTE, Ms.(T/W)

Luxembourg/Luxemburgo

FISCH, Mme (G)
WELTER, Mme (G)
PIZZAFERRI, M.(T/W)

Madagascar

RASOLONJATOVO, M. (G)
RASOLOFONIAINARISON, M. (G)

Malaisie/Malaysia/Malasia

SYED SHAHIR, Mr.(T/W)

Malawi

KAMBUTO, Mr. (G)
KALIMANJIRA, Mr.(T/W)

Malte/Malta
PULLICINO, Mr. (G)
AZZOPARDI, Mr. (G)
MICALLEF, Mr.(T/W)

Maroc/Morocco/Marruecos
FARHANE, M. (G)
ADDOUN, M. (G)

Mauritanie/Mauritania
OULD MOHAMED LEMINE, M. (G)
OULD CHEIKHNA, M. (G)

Mexique/Mexico/México
ANDERSON, Sra.(T/W)

République de Moldova/Republic of Moldova/República de Moldova
CROITOR, Mr. (G)
REVENCO, Mr. (G)

Mozambique
DENGO, M. (G)
CAIFAZ, M. (G)
UINGE, M. (E)
SITOE, M.(T/W)

Namibie/Namibia
HIVELUAH, Ms. (G)
SHINGUADJA, Mr. (G)

Nicaragua
MARTÍNEZ FLORES, Srta. (G)
CRUZ TORUÑO, Sr. (G)
JIMÉNEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Nigéria/Nigeria
KORIPAMO-AGARY, Mrs. (G)
EGHOBAMIEN, Mrs. (G)
ODAH, Mr.(T/W)

Norvège/Norway/Noruega
BRUAAS, Mr. (G)
VIDNES, Mr. (G)
THEODORSEN, Mrs.(T/W)

Nouvelle-Zélande/New Zealand/Nueva Zelandia
ANNAKIN, Mr. (G)
CRENNAN, Ms. (G)
WAGSTAFF, Mr.(T/W)

Ouganda/Uganda
OCHAN, Mr. (G)
DAVID, Mr. (G)
ONGABA, Mr.(T/W)

Pakistan/Pakistán
AHMED, Mr.(T/W)

Panama/Panamá
MENA QUINTANA, Sr.(T/W)

Papouasie-Nouvelle-Guinée/Papua New Guinea/Papua Nueva Guinea
MALABAG, Mr.(T/W)

Paraguay
BARREIRO, Sr. (G)
PARRA GAONA, Sr.(T/W)

Pays-Bas/Netherlands/Países Bajos
KAASJAGER, Mr. (G)
BEETS, Mr. (G)
VRIELING, Ms.(T/W)

Pérou/Peru/Perú
VEGAS, Sr. (G)
BERAÚN, Sra. (G)

Pologne/Poland/Polonia
LEMIESZEWSKA, Ms. (G)
RAPACKI, Mr. (G)
WOJCIK, Mr.(T/W)

Portugal
RIBEIRO LOPES, M. (G)
SOUSA FIALHO, M. (G)
ALVES TRINDADE, M.(T/W)

Qatar
AL-KHULAIIFI, Mr. (G)
AL NAAMA, Mr.(T/W)

République dém. du Congo/Democratic Republic of the Congo/República Democrática del Congo
KABULO MBODYAWASHA, M.(T/W)

Roumanie/Romania/Rumania
STOINEA, Mlle (G)
CONSTANTINESCU, Mme (G)
CORNEA, M.(T/W)

Royaume-Uni/United Kingdom/Reino Unido
RICHARDS, Mr. (G)
NELLTHORP, Ms. (G)
STEYNE, Mr.(T/W)

Fédération de Russie/Russian Federation/Federación de Rusia
LEVITSKAYA, Ms. (G)
BAVYKIN, Mr. (G)
SHMAKOV, Mr.(T/W)

Saint-Marin/San Marino
BIGI, Mme (G)
GASPERONI, M. (G)
BECCARI, M.(T/W)

Saint-Vincent et-les Grenadines/Saint Vincent and the Grenadines/San Vicente y las Granadinas
FRANCIS, Mrs. (G)
WEEKES, Mr. (G)
MANDEVILLE, Ms.(T/W)

Sénégal/Senegal
CAMARA, M. (G)
DIALLO BÂ, Mme (G)
GUIRO, M.(T/W)

Serbie et Monténégro/Serbia and Montenegro/Serbia y Montenegro
BEGOVIĆ, Mr. (G)
BUKUMIRIĆ KATIĆ, Mrs. (G)
CANAK, Mr.(T/W)

Seychelles
ROBINSON, Mr.(T/W)

Slovaquie/Slovakia/Eslovaquia
PETOCZ, Mr. (G)
MACHALÍKOVÁ, Mrs. (G)
BORGULA, Mr. (E)
BRSELOVÁ, Mrs.(T/W)

Slovénie/Slovenia/Eslovenia
KAKER, Mrs. (G)
MARKOV, Mrs. (G)
MIKLIC, Mr.(T/W)

Soudan/Sudan/Sudán
ALSABTY, Mr. (G)
SHENTOUR, Mr. (G)
ELSIDDIG, Mr.(T/W)

Sri Lanka
SIRIWARDANE, Mr.(T/W)

Suède/Sweden/Suecia
MOLIN HELLGREN, Ms. (G)
WIKLUND, Ms. (G)
EDSTRÖM, Mr.(T/W)

Suisse/Switzerland/Suiza
SCHAER BOURBEAU, Mme (G)
ELMIGER, M. (G)
VIGNE, M.(T/W)

Suriname
COURTAR, Mr. (G)
DEFARES, Ms. (G)

République arabe syrienne/Syrian Arab Republic/República Árabe Siria
AL-ABDULLA, Mr. (G)
AL SALIB, Mr. (G)
SHAHEEN, Mr. (E)
HABAB, Mr.(T/W)

République-Unie de Tanzanie/United Republic of Tanzania/República Unida de Tanzania
RAJABU, Mr. (G)
NGULA, Mr.(T/W)

Tchad/Chad
DJEGUEDEM, M. (G)

République tchèque/Czech Republic/República Checa
SAJDA, Mr. (G)
SLABY, Mr. (G)
BAUEROVÁ, Mrs.(T/W)

Thaïlande/Thailand/Tailandia
JAMASEVI, Mr. (G)
CHAVALITNITIKUL, Mr. (G)
CHANPORNONG, Mr. (E)
THAILUAN, Mr.(T/W)

République dém. du Timor-Leste/Democratic Rep. of Timor-Leste/Rep. Democrática de Timor-Leste
DICK, Mr. (G)
PAIXÃO BANO, Mr. (G)
DOS SANTOS, Mr. (E)
CORREIA, Mr.(T/W)

Togo
AKOUEDE, M. (G)
AMOUSOU-KOUEDE, M. (G)
NAKU, M. (E)
HLOMADOR, M.(T/W)

Trinité-et-Tobago/Trinidad and Tobago/Trinidad y Tabago
DEORAJ, Ms. (G)
GEORGE, Mr. (G)

Tunisie/Tunisia/Túnez
LANDOULSI, M. (G)
CHOUBA, Mme (G)
TRABELSI, M.(T/W)

Turquie/Turkey/Turquía
GENC, Mr. (G)
ERCAN, Mr. (G)

Ukraine/Ucrania
KYRYLENKO, Mr. (G)
BELASHOV, Mr. (G)
SHYLOV, Mr.(T/W)

Uruguay
PAYSSE, Sra. (G)
BONOMI, Sr. (G)
FERNANDEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Venezuela
DORADO CANO, Sr. (G)
CARRERO CUBEROS, Sr. (G)
DÍAZ, Sr.(T/W)

Yémen/Yemen
OBAD, Mr. (G)
AL-ARYANI, Mr. (G)
TABET ASAQAF, Mr. (E)
AL-KUHLANI, Mr.(T/W)

Zambie/Zambia
SIASIMUNA, Mr. (G)
TEMBO, Mr.(T/W)

Zimbabwe
DZVITI, Mr. (G)
MUSEKA, Mr. (G)
RUZIVE, Mr.(T/W)

Contre/Against/En contra: 8

Bénin/Benin
ZANO, M. (E)

Egypte/Egypt/Egipto
GABR, Mrs. (G)
MELEIKA, Mr. (G)

Estonie/Estonia
NIINEMÄE, Mr. (E)

Myanmar
SHEIN, Mr. (G)
NYUNT, Mr. (G)

Niger/Niger
MAÏNA, M. (G)

Seychelles
RAGUIN, Mr. (G)

Abstentions/Abstentions/ Abstenciones: 139

Afghanistan/Afganistán
BASHIRI, M. (G)

Afrique du Sud/South Africa/Sudáfrica
VAN VUUREN, Mr. (E)

Algérie/Algeria/Argelia
YOUSFI, M. (E)

Allemagne/Germany/Alemania
GERSTEIN, Mrs. (E)

Angola
GOMES, M. (E)

Argentine/Argentina
SPAGHI, Sr. (E)

Arménie/Armenia
AYVAZYAN, Ms. (G)
MNATSAKANIAN, Mr. (G)

Australie/Australia
LIPP, Ms. (G)
EVANS, Mr. (G)
ANDERSON, Mr. (E)

Autriche/Austria
TOMEK, Mr. (E)

Bahreïn/Bahrain/Bahrein
AL KHOOR, Mr. (E)

Bangladesh
RAHMAN, Mr. (E)

Belgique/Belgium/Bélgica
DA COSTA, M. (E)

Bolivie/Bolivia
POGGI BORDA, Sr. (G)
ESPAÑA SMITH, Sr. (E)

Botswana
MOLEELE, Mr. (E)

Brésil/Brazil/Brasil
DUQUE, Ms. (E)

Bulgarie/Bulgaria
PAVLOVA, Mrs. (E)

Burkina Faso
NACOLMA, M. (E)
LILIOU, M.(T/W)

Canada/Canadá
FINLAY, Mr. (E)

Cap-Vert/Cape Verde/Cabo Verde
CORADO, Mme (E)

Chili/Chile
HUMERES NOGUER, Sr. (E)

Chine/China
ZHANG, Ms. (G)
SHA, Mr. (G)
CHEN, Mr. (E)

Colombie/Colombia
QUINTERO CUBIDES, Sr. (G)

République de Corée/Republic of Korea/República de Corea

KWON, Mr. (G)

LEE, Mr. (G)

HWANG, Ms. (E)

Croatie/Croatia/Croacia

KATIC, Ms. (E)

Cuba

PARRA ROJAS, Sr. (E)

El Salvador

TOMASINO HURTADO, Sr. (E)

SORIANO, Sr.(T/W)

Emirats arabes unis/United Arab Emirates/Emiratos Arabes Unidos

KHAMMAS, Mr. (E)

Equateur/Ecuador

THULLEN, Sr. (G)

Espagne/Spain/España

FERRER DUFOL, Sr. (E)

Etats-Unis/United States/Estados Unidos

HAGEN, Mr. (G)

NEWTON, Ms. (G)

POTTER, Mr. (E)

Ethiopie/Ethiopia/Etiopía

ZAWDE, Mr. (E)

Fidji/Fiji

PROBERT, Mr. (E)

Finlande/Finland/Finlandia

ETU-SEPPÄLÄ, Ms. (E)

France/Francia

BOISSON, M. (E)

Gabon/Gabón

AWASSI ATSIMADJA, Mme (E)

Ghana

ARYEE, Ms. (E)

Grèce/Greece/Grecia

CHARAKAS, M. (E)

Honduras

BU FIGUEROA, Sra. (G)

URTECHO, Sr. (E)

Hongrie/Hungary/Hungria

SZIRMAI, Mr. (E)

Inde/India

SAHNI, Mr. (G)

SINGH, Mr. (G)

ANAND, Mr. (E)

Indonésie/Indonesia

TAMBUSAI, Mr. (G)

SULISTYANINGSIH, Mrs. (G)

RACHMAN, Mr. (E)

République islamique d'Iran/Islamic Republic of Iran/República Islámica del Irán

TASDIGHI, Mrs. (G)

HEFDAHTAN, Mr. (G)

OTAREDIAN, Mr. (E)

Irlande/Ireland/Irlanda

CRONIN, Ms. (E)

Israël/Israel

BARAK, Mr. (E)

Italie/Italy/Italia

SASSO MAZZUFFERI, Mme (E)

Jamaïque/Jamaica

LLOYD, Mrs. (E)

Japon/Japan/Japón

FUJISAKI, Mr. (G)

TSUNEKAWA, Mr. (G)

SUZUKI, Mr. (E)

Kenya

KONDITI, Mr. (E)

Koweït/Kuwait

RAZZOOQI, Mr. (G)

AL-SABAH, Mr. (G)

AL-HAROON, Mr. (E)

Lesotho

MAKEKA, Mr. (E)

Lettonie/Latvia/Letonia

PANKOVA, Ms. (E)

Liban/Lebanon/Líbano

SAAB, Mme (G)

RAZZOUK, M. (G)

BALBOUL, M. (E)

Lituanie/Lithuania/Lituania

GUZAVICIUS, Mr. (E)

Luxembourg/Luxemburgo

SCHMIT, M. (E)

Malaisie/Malaysia/Malasia

WAN ZULKFLI, Mr. (G)

ABU BAKAR, Mr. (G)

SHAMSUDDIN, Mr. (E)

Malawi

SINJANI, Mr. (E)

Mali/Mali

MAHAMANE, M. (G)

TRAORE, M. (E)

DIAKITE, M.(T/W)

Malte/Malta

FARRUGIA, Mr. (E)

Maurice/Mauritius/Mauricio

JEETUN, Mr. (E)

Mexique/Mexico/México

ROVIROSA, Sra. (G)

ROSAS, Sr. (G)

GUTIÉRREZ, Sr. (E)

Namibie/Namibia

PARKHOUSE, Mr. (E)

Népal/Nepal

ACHARYA, Mr. (G)

Nicaragua

SEGURA ESPINOZA, Sr. (E)

Nigéria/Nigeria

OSHINOWO, Mr. (E)

Norvège/Norway/Noruega

RIDDERVOLD, Mrs. (E)

Nouvelle-Zélande/New Zealand/Nueva Zelandia

CLEARY, Mr. (E)

Ouganda/Uganda

SENABULYA, Ms. (E)

Pakistan/Pakistan

JANJUA, Ms. (G)

KHAN, Mr. (G)

TABANI, Mr. (E)

Panama/Panamá

CASTILLERO, Sr. (G)

AGUILAR, Sr. (G)

AIZPURÚA, Sr. (E)

Papouasie-Nouvelle-Guinée/Papua New Guinea/Papua Nueva Guinea

TIBU, Mr. (G)

Pays-Bas/Netherlands/Paises Bajos

VAN DER ZWAN, Mr. (E)

Philippines/Filipinas

BITONIO, Mr. (G)

SORIANO, Mr. (E)

BALAIS, Mr.(T/W)

Portugal

ABRANTES, M. (E)

*République dém. du
Congo/Democratic Republic of the
Congo/República Democrática del
Congo*

ELEMBO YANGOTIKALA, M. (G)
MULUMBA KIFOTO, M. (G)
NTAMBWE KITENGE, M. (E)

Roumanie/Romania/Rumania
NICOLESCU, M. (E)

*Royaume-Uni/United Kingdom/Reino
Unido*
LAMBERT, Mr. (E)

*Fédération de Russie/Russian
Federation/Federación de Rusia*
EREMEEV, Mr. (E)

Saint-Marin/San Marino
UGOLINI, M. (E)

*Saint-Vincent et-les Grenadines/Saint
Vincent and the Grenadines/San
Vicente y las Granadinas*
PROVIDENCE, Mr. (E)

Sénégal/Senegal
DIOP, M. (E)

*Serbie et Monténégro/Serbia and
Montenegro/Serbia y Montenegro*
NINKOVIC, Mr. (E)

Seychelles
SULTAN-BEAUDOUIN, Mr. (E)

Singapour/Singapore/Singapur
LIM, Mr. (G)
NG, Mr. (G)

Slovénie/Slovenia/Eslovenia
JEREB , Mrs. (E)

Soudan/Sudan/Sudán
ELGORASHI, Mr. (E)

Sri Lanka
MADIHAHEWA, Mr. (G)
ATHUKORALA, Mr. (G)
DASANAYAKE, Mr. (E)

Suède/Sweden/Suecia
TROGEN, Mr. (E)

Suisse/Switzerland/Suiza
BARDE, M. (E)

Swaziland/Swazilandia
MAPHANGA, Mrs. (E)

*République-Unie de Tanzanie/United
Republic of Tanzania/República
Unida de Tanzania*
MBWANJI, Mr. (E)

*République tchèque/Czech
Republic/República Checa*
DRBALOVÁ, Mrs. (E)

*Trinité-et-Tobago/Trinidad and
Tobago/Trinidad y Tabago*
HILTON-CLARKE, Mr. (E)

Tunisie/Tunisia/Túnez
M'KAISSI, M. (E)

Ukraine/Ucrania
GRYSHCHENKO, Mr. (E)

Viet Nam
NGUYEN, Mr. (G)
VU, Mr. (G)
NGUYEN, Mr. (E)



Vote final par appel nominal sur l'adoption de la Recommandation sur le travail dans la pêche, 2005

Final record vote on the adoption of the Work in Fishing Recommendation, 2005

Votación nominal final sobre la adopción de la Recomendación sobre el trabajo en el sector pesquero, 2005

Pour/For/En Pro: 292

Contre/Against/En contra: 8

Abstentions/Abstentions/Abstenciones: 135

Quorum: 297

Pour/For/En Pro: 292

Afrique du Sud/South Africa/Sudáfrica

NDEBELE, Mr. (G)
LUSENGA, Ms. (G)
RANTSOLASE, Ms.(T/W)

Algérie/Algeria/Argelia

SEDKI, M. (G)
ABDELMOUMENE, M. (G)
SIDI SAID, M.(T/W)

Allemagne/Germany/Alemania

SCHLEEGER, Mrs. (G)
HOFFMANN, Mrs. (G)
ADAMY, Mr.(T/W)

Angola

N'GOVE LUSSOKE, M. (G)
FERNANDA CARVALHO FRANCISCO, Mme(T/W)

Arabie saoudite/Saudi Arabia/Arabia Saudita

ALYAHYA, Mr. (G)
AL-ZAMIL, Mr. (G)
DAHLAN, Mr. (E)
RADHWAN, Mr.(T/W)

Argentine/Argentina

ROSALES, Sr. (G)
VARELA, Sr. (G)
MARTÍNEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Australie/Australia

BURROW, Ms.(T/W)

Autriche/Austria

DEMBSHER, Ms. (G)
HÄCKEL-BUCHER, Ms. (G)
BOEGNER, Ms.(T/W)

Bahamas

SYMONETTE, Mr. (G)
BROWN, Mr. (G)

Bahreïn/Bahrain/Bahrein

AL-QASSIMI, Mr. (G)
AMIN MOHAMED, Mr. (G)
AL-MAHFOODH, Mr.(T/W)

Barbade/Barbados

BURNETT, Mr. (G)
EASTMOND, Mr. (G)
TROTMAN, Mr.(T/W)

Bélarus/Belarus/Belarús

MOLCHAN, Mr. (G)

Belgique/Belgium/Bélgica

DE VADDER, M. (G)
VANDAMME, M. (G)
GRUSELIN, M.(T/W)

Bénin/Benin

ONI, M. (G)
GAZARD, Mme (G)
AZOUA, M.(T/W)

Bosnie-Herzégovine/Bosnia and Herzegovina/Bosnia y Herzegovina

KALMETA, Ms. (G)

Botswana

MATLHO, Mrs. (G)
SEEMULE, Ms. (G)
BAIPIDI, Mr.(T/W)

Brésil/Brazil/Brasil

PAIXÃO PARDO, Mr. (G)
SALDANHA, Mr. (G)
FERREIRA DO PRADO, Mr.(T/W)

Bulgarie/Bulgaria

TZANTCHEV, Mr. (G)
TCHOLASHKA, Mrs. (G)

Canada/Canadá

ROBINSON, Ms. (G)
MACPHEE, Mr. (G)
LAMBERT, Mr.(T/W)

Chili/Chile

MARTABIT SCAFF, Sr. (G)
PASCAL CHEETHAM, Sr. (G)
AGUILAR TORRES, Sra.(T/W)

Chine/China

ZHANG, Ms. (G)
SHA, Mr. (G)
XU, Mr.(T/W)

Chypre/Cyprus/Chipre

PAPADOPOULOS, Mr. (G)

Colombie/Colombia

GOMEZ ESGUERRA, Sr.(T/W)

Congo

MIERE, M. (G)

République de Corée/Republic of Korea/República de Corea
KANG, Mr.(T/W)

Costa Rica
CLARAMUNT, Sra. (G)
SEGURA, Srta. (G)
CABEZAS BADILLA, Sr.(T/W)

Côte d'Ivoire
BOULLOU BI DJEHIFFE, M. (G)
N'GUESSAN, M. (G)
GAHE MAHAN, M.(T/W)

Croatie/Croatia/Croacia
MARKOTIC, Mr. (G)
SOCANAC, Mr. (G)
TOTH MUCCIACCIARO, Mrs.(T/W)

Cuba
HERNÁNDEZ OLIVA, Sra. (G)
LAU VALDÉS, Sra. (G)
GONZÁLEZ GONZÁLEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Danemark/Denmark/Dinamarca
HARHOFF, Ms. (G)
PEDERSEN, Mr. (G)

République dominicaine/Dominican Republic/República Dominicana
HERNÁNDEZ SÁNCHEZ, Sr. (G)
REYES UREÑA, Sr. (G)

Egypte/Egypt/Egipto
ABDO, Mr. (E)
ABD EL HADY, Mrs.(T/W)

El Salvador
ÁVILA DE PEÑA, Sra. (G)
RODRÍGUEZ SALAZAR, Sr. (G)

Emirats arabes unis/United Arab Emirates/Emiratos Arabes Unidos
ALZAABI, Mr. (G)
ABDUL GHANI, Mr. (G)
ALMARZOOQI, Mr.(T/W)

Equateur/Ecuador
ARCINIEGA, Sr.(T/W)

Espagne/Spain/España
ARNAU NAVARRO, Sr. (G)
FRADES, Sr.(T/W)

Estonie/Estonia
KAADU, Mr. (G)
LEHT, Ms. (G)
TAMMELEHT, Mrs.(T/W)

Etats-Unis/United States/Estados Unidos
ZELLHOEFER, Mr.(T/W)

Ethiopie/Ethiopia/Etiopía
SIAMREGN, Mr. (G)
ALEMAYEHU, Mr.(T/W)

Fidji/Fiji
KURUDUADUA, Mr. (G)
SINGH, Mr.(T/W)

Finlande/Finland/Finlandia
SALMENPERÄ, Mr. (G)
MODEEN, Ms. (G)
VALKONEN, Ms.(T/W)

France/Francia
AUER, Mme (G)
THIERRY, M. (G)
BLONDEL, M.(T/W)

Gabon/Gabón
MOULOMBA NZIENGUI, M. (G)
BIVEGHE NDOUTOUME, M. (G)

Ghana
DORKENOO, Mr.(T/W)

Grèce/Greece/Grecia
LAIYOU-SPANOPOULOU, Mme (G)
CAMBITSIS, M. (G)
DASSIS, M.(T/W)

Guatemala
NICHOLS LÓPEZ, Sr. (G)
PIRA, Sr. (G)
LUCAS GÓMEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Guinée/Guinea
KEIRA, M. (G)
DIALLO, Mme(T/W)

Haïti/Haiti/Haití
PIERRE, M. (G)
JOSEPH, M. (G)
PIERRE FRANCOIS, M. (E)
NUMAS, M.(T/W)

Honduras
IBARRA, Sra.(T/W)

Hongrie/Hungary/Hungría
HÉTHY, Mr. (G)
TÓTH, Mr. (G)
TÓTH, Mr.(T/W)

Inde/India
SANJEEVA REDDY, Mr.(T/W)

Indonésie/Indonesia
AKSAM, Mr.(T/W)

République islamique d'Iran/Islamic Republic of Iran/República Islámica del Irán
SALIMIAN, Mr.(T/W)

Iraq
HAMD, Mr.(T/W)

Irlande/Ireland/Irlanda
MC DONNELL, Mr. (G)
PENDER, Mr. (G)
LYNCH, Ms.(T/W)

Islande/Iceland/Islandia
DAVIDSDOTTIR, Ms. (G)
KRISTINSSON, Mr. (G)
GUNNARSSON, Mr.(T/W)

Italie/Italy/Italia
TRIA, M. (G)
SIMONETTI, M. (G)
BRIGHI, Mme(T/W)

Japon/Japan/Japón
NAKAJIMA, Mr.(T/W)

Jordanie/Jordan/Jordania
AL-MA'AYTA, Mr.(T/W)

Kenya
KAVULUDI, Mr. (G)
KUBAI, Mr.(T/W)

Lesotho
MATSOSO, Mrs. (G)
KHETSI, Mr. (G)

Lettonie/Latvia/Letonia
KALNINS, Mr. (G)
KARKLINS, Mr. (G)

Liban/Lebanon/Líbano
GHOSN, M.(T/W)

Jamahiriya arabe libyenne/Libyan Arab Jamahiriya/Jamahiriya Arabe Libia
IDRIS AZARUG, Mr. (G)

Lituanie/Lithuania/Lituania
JAKUCIONYTE, Ms. (G)
ZANANAVICIUS, Mr. (G)
VAICAITYTE, Ms.(T/W)

Luxembourg/Luxemburgo
FISCH, Mme (G)
WELTER, Mme (G)
PIZZAFERRI, M.(T/W)

Madagascar
RASOLONJATOVO, M. (G)
RASOLOFONIAINARISON, M. (G)

Malaisie/Malaysia/Malasia
SYED SHAHIR, Mr.(T/W)

Malawi
KAMBUTO, Mr. (G)
KALIMANJIRA, Mr.(T/W)

Malte/Malta
PULLICINO, Mr. (G)
AZZOPARDI, Mr. (G)
MICALLEF, Mr.(T/W)

Maroc/Morocco/Marruecos
FARHANE, M. (G)
ADDOUM, M. (G)

Mauritanie/Mauritania
OULD MOHAMED LEMINE, M. (G)
OULD CHEIKHNA, M. (G)

Mexique/Mexico/México
ANDERSON, Sra.(T/W)

République de Moldova/Republic of Moldova/República de Moldova
CROITOR, Mr. (G)
REVENCO, Mr. (G)

Mozambique
DENGO, M. (G)
CAIFAZ, M. (G)
UINGE, M. (E)
SITOE, M.(T/W)

Namibie/Namibia
HIVELUAH, Ms. (G)
SHINGUADJA, Mr. (G)

Nicaragua
MARTÍNEZ FLORES, Srta. (G)
CRUZ TORUÑO, Sr. (G)
JIMÉNEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Nigéria/Nigeria
KORIPAMO-AGARY, Mrs. (G)
EGHOBAMIEN, Mrs. (G)
ODAH, Mr.(T/W)

Norvège/Norway/Noruega
BRUAAS, Mr. (G)
VIDNES, Mr. (G)
THEODORSEN, Mrs.(T/W)

Nouvelle-Zélande/New Zealand/Nueva Zelandia
ANNAKIN, Mr. (G)
CRENNAN, Ms. (G)
WAGSTAFF, Mr.(T/W)

Ouganda/Uganda
OCHAN, Mr. (G)
DAVID, Mr. (G)
ONGABA, Mr.(T/W)

Pakistan/Pakistán
AHMED, Mr.(T/W)

Panama/Panamá
MENA QUINTANA, Sr.(T/W)

Papouasie-Nouvelle-Guinée/Papua New Guinea/Papua Nueva Guinea
MALABAG, Mr.(T/W)

Paraguay
BARREIRO, Sr. (G)
PARRA GAONA, Sr.(T/W)

Pays-Bas/Netherlands/Paises Bajos
KAASJAGER, Mr. (G)
BEETS, Mr. (G)
VRIELING, Ms.(T/W)

Pérou/Peru/Perú
VEGAS, Sr. (G)
BERAÚN, Sra. (G)

Philippines/Filipinas
BITONIO, Mr. (G)
BALAIS , Mr.(T/W)

Pologne/Poland/Polonia
LEMIESZEWSKA, Ms. (G)
RAPACKI, Mr. (G)
WOJCIK, Mr.(T/W)

Portugal
RIBEIRO LOPES, M. (G)
SOUSA FIALHO, M. (G)
ALVES TRINDADE, M.(T/W)

Qatar
AL-KHULAIIFI, Mr. (G)
AL NAAMA, Mr.(T/W)

République dém. du Congo/Democratic Republic of the Congo/República Democrática del Congo
KABULO MBODYAWASHA, M.(T/W)

Roumanie/Romania/Rumania
STOINEA, Mlle (G)
CONSTANTINESCU, Mme (G)
CORNEA, M.(T/W)

Royaume-Uni/United Kingdom/Reino Unido
RICHARDS, Mr. (G)
NELLTHORP, Ms. (G)
STEYNE, Mr.(T/W)

Fédération de Russie/Russian Federation/Federación de Rusia
LEVITSKAYA, Ms. (G)
BAVYKIN, Mr. (G)
SHMAKOV, Mr.(T/W)

Saint-Marin/San Marino
BIGI, Mme (G)
GASPERONI, M. (G)
BECCARI, M.(T/W)

Saint-Vincent et-les Grenadines/Saint Vincent and the Grenadines/San Vicente y las Granadinas
FRANCIS, Mrs. (G)
WEEKES, Mr. (G)
MANDEVILLE, Ms.(T/W)

Sénégal/Senegal
CAMARA, M. (G)
DIALLO BÂ, Mme (G)
GUIRO, M.(T/W)

Serbie et Monténégro/Serbia and Montenegro/Serbia y Montenegro
BEGOVIĆ, Mr. (G)
BUKUMIRIC KATIC, Mrs. (G)
CANAK, Mr.(T/W)

Seychelles
ROBINSON, Mr.(T/W)

Slovaquie/Slovakia/Eslovaquia
PETOCZ, Mr. (G)
MACHALÍKOVÁ, Mrs. (G)
BORGULA, Mr. (E)
BRSELOVÁ, Mrs.(T/W)

Slovénie/Slovenia/Eslovenia
KAKER, Mrs. (G)
MARKOV , Mrs. (G)
MIKLIC, Mr.(T/W)

Soudan/Sudan/Sudán
ALSABTY, Mr. (G)
SHENTOUR, Mr. (G)
ELSIDDIG, Mr.(T/W)

Sri Lanka
SIRIWARDANE, Mr.(T/W)

Suède/Sweden/Suecia
MOLIN HELLGREN, Ms. (G)
WIKLUND, Ms. (G)
EDSTRÖM, Mr.(T/W)

Suisse/Switzerland/Suiza
SCHAER BOURBEAU, Mme (G)
ELMIGER, M. (G)
VIGNE, M.(T/W)

Suriname

COURTAR, Mr. (G)
DEFARES, Ms. (G)

République arabe syrienne/Syrian Arab Republic/República Árabe Siria

AL-ABDULLA, Mr. (G)
AL SALIB, Mr. (G)
SHAHEEN, Mr. (E)
HABAB, Mr.(T/W)

République-Unie de Tanzanie/United Republic of Tanzania/República Unida de Tanzania

RAJABU, Mr. (G)
NGULA, Mr.(T/W)

Tchad/Chad

DJEGUEDEM, M. (G)

République tchèque/Czech Republic/República Checa

SAJDA, Mr. (G)
SLABY, Mr. (G)
BAUEROVÁ, Mrs.(T/W)

Thaïlande/Thailand/Tailandia

JAMASEVI, Mr. (G)
CHAVALITNITIKUL, Mr. (G)
CHANPORNONG, Mr. (E)
THAILUAN, Mr.(T/W)

République dém. du Timor-Leste/Democratic Rep. of Timor-Leste/Rep. Democrática de Timor-Leste

DICK, Mr. (G)
PAIXÃO BANO, Mr. (G)
DOS SANTOS, Mr. (E)
CORREIA, Mr.(T/W)

Togo

AKOUEDE, M. (G)
AMOUSOU-KOUEDE, M. (G)
NAKU, M. (E)
HLOMADOR, M.(T/W)

Trinité-et-Tobago/Trinidad and Tobago/Trinidad y Tabago

DEORAJ, Ms. (G)
GEORGE, Mr. (G)

Tunisie/Tunisia/Túnez

LANDOULSI, M. (G)
CHOUBA, Mme (G)
TRABELSI, M.(T/W)

Turquie/Turkey/Turquia

GENC, Mr. (G)
ERCAN, Mr. (G)

Ukraine/Ucrania

KYRYLENKO, Mr. (G)
BELASHOV, Mr. (G)
SHYLOV, Mr.(T/W)

Uruguay

PAYSSE, Sra. (G)
BONOMI, Sr. (G)
FERNANDEZ, Sr.(T/W)

Venezuela

DORADO CANO, Sr. (G)
CARRERO CUBEROS, Sr. (G)
DÍAZ, Sr.(T/W)

Yémen/Yemen

OBAD, Mr. (G)
AL-ARYANI, Mr. (G)
TABET ASAQAF, Mr. (E)
AL-KUHLANI, Mr.(T/W)

Zambie/Zambia

SIASIMUNA, Mr. (G)
TEMBO, Mr.(T/W)

Zimbabwe

DZVITI, Mr. (G)
MUSEKA, Mr. (G)
RUZIVE, Mr.(T/W)

Contre/Against/En contra: 8

Bénin/Benin

ZANOU, M. (E)

Egypte/Egypt/Egipto

GABR, Mrs. (G)
MELEIKA, Mr. (G)

Estonie/Estonia

NIINEMÄE, Mr. (E)

Myanmar

SHEIN, Mr. (G)
NYUNT, Mr. (G)

Niger/Niger

MAÏNA, M. (G)

Seychelles

RAGUIN, Mr. (G)

Abstentions/Abstentions/ Abstenciones: 135

Afghanistan/Afganistán

BASHIRI, M. (G)

Afrique du Sud/South Africa/Sudáfrica

VAN VUUREN, Mr. (E)

Algérie/Algeria/Argelia

YOUSFI, M. (E)

Allemagne/Germany/Alemania

GERSTEIN, Mrs. (E)

Angola

GOMES, M. (E)

Argentine/Argentina

SPAGHI, Sr. (E)

Arménie/Armenia

AYVAZYAN, Ms. (G)
MNATSAKANIAN, Mr. (G)

Australie/Australia

LIPP, Ms. (G)
EVANS, Mr. (G)
ANDERSON, Mr. (E)

Autriche/Austria

TOMEK, Mr. (E)

Bahreïn/Bahrain/Bahrein

AL KHOOR, Mr. (E)

Bangladesh

RAHMAN, Mr. (E)

Belgique/Belgium/Bélgica

DA COSTA, M. (E)

Bolivie/Bolivia

POGGI BORDA, Sr. (G)
ESPAÑA SMITH, Sr. (E)

Botswana

MOLEELE, Mr. (E)

Brésil/Brazil/Brasil

DUQUE, Ms. (E)

Bulgarie/Bulgaria

PAVLOVA, Mrs. (E)

Burkina Faso

NACOUUMA, M. (E)
LILIOU, M.(T/W)

Canada/Canadá

FINLAY, Mr. (E)

Cap-Vert/Cape Verde/Cabo Verde

CORADO, Mme (E)

Chili/Chile
HUMERES NOGUER, Sr. (E)

Chine/China
CHEN, Mr. (E)

Colombie/Colombia
QUINTERO CUBIDES, Sr. (G)

République de Corée/Republic of Korea/República de Corea
KWON, Mr. (G)
LEE, Mr. (G)
HWANG, Ms. (E)

Croatie/Croatia/Croacia
KATIC, Ms. (E)

Cuba
PARRA ROJAS, Sr. (E)

El Salvador
TOMASINO HURTADO, Sr. (E)
SORIANO, Sr.(T/W)

Emirats arabes unis/United Arab Emirates/Emiratos Arabes Unidos
KHAMMAS, Mr. (E)

Equateur/Ecuador
THULLEN, Sr. (G)

Espagne/Spain/España
FERRER DUFOL, Sr. (E)

Etats-Unis/United States/Estados Unidos
HAGEN, Mr. (G)
NEWTON, Ms. (G)
POTTER, Mr. (E)

Ethiopie/Ethiopia/Etiopía
ZAWDE, Mr. (E)

Fidji/Fiji
PROBERT, Mr. (E)

Finlande/Finland/Finlandia
ETU-SEPPÄLÄ, Ms. (E)

France/Francia
BOISSON, M. (E)

Gabon/Gabón
AWASSI ATSIMADJA, Mme (E)

Ghana
ARYEE, Ms. (E)

Grèce/Greece/Grecia
CHARAKAS, M. (E)

Honduras
BU FIGUEROA, Sra. (G)
URTECHO, Sr. (E)

Hongrie/Hungary/Hungria
SZIRMAI, Mr. (E)

Inde/India
SAHNI, Mr. (G)
SINGH, Mr. (G)
ANAND, Mr. (E)

Indonésie/Indonesia
TAMBUSAI, Mr. (G)
SULISTYANINGSIH, Mrs. (G)
RACHMAN, Mr. (E)

République islamique d'Iran/Islamic Republic of Iran/República Islámica del Irán
TASDIGHI, Mrs. (G)
HEFDAHTAN, Mr. (G)
OTAREDIAN, Mr. (E)

Irlande/Ireland/Irlanda
CRONIN, Ms. (E)

Israël/Israel
BARAK, Mr. (E)

Italie/Italy/Italia
SASSO MAZZUFFERI, Mme (E)

Jamaïque/Jamaica
LLOYD, Mrs. (E)

Japon/Japan/Japón
FUJISAKI, Mr. (G)
TSUNEKAWA , Mr. (G)
SUZUKI, Mr. (E)

Kenya
KONDITI, Mr. (E)

Koweït/Kuwait
RAZZOOQI, Mr. (G)
AL-SABAH, Mr. (G)
AL-HAROUN, Mr. (E)

Lesotho
MAKEKA, Mr. (E)

Lettonie/Latvia/Letonia
PANKOVA, Ms. (E)

Liban/Lebanon/Libano
SAAB, Mme (G)
RAZZOUK, M. (G)
BALBOUL, M. (E)

Lituanie/Lithuania/Lituania
GUZAVICIUS, Mr. (E)

Luxembourg/Luxemburgo
SCHMIT, M. (E)

Malaisie/Malaysia/Malasia
WAN ZULKFLI, Mr. (G)
ABU BAKAR, Mr. (G)
SHAMSUDDIN, Mr. (E)

Malawi
SINJANI, Mr. (E)

Mali/Mali
MAHAMANE, M. (G)
TRAORE, M. (E)
DIAKITE, M.(T/W)

Malte/Malta
FARRUGIA, Mr. (E)

Maurice/Mauritius/Mauricio
JEETUN, Mr. (E)

Mexique/Mexico/México
ROVIROSA, Sra. (G)
ROSAS, Sr. (G)
GUTIÉRREZ, Sr. (E)

Namibie/Namibia
PARKHOUSE, Mr. (E)

Népal/Nepal
ACHARYA, Mr. (G)

Nicaragua
SEGURA ESPINOZA, Sr. (E)

Nigéria/Nigeria
OSHINOWO, Mr. (E)

Norvège/Norway/Noruega
RIDDERVOLD, Mrs. (E)

Nouvelle-Zélande/New Zealand/Nueva Zelandia
CLEARY, Mr. (E)

Ouganda/Uganda
SSENABULYA, Ms. (E)

Pakistan/Pakistán
JANJUA, Ms. (G)
KHAN, Mr. (G)
TABANI, Mr. (E)

Panama/Panamá
CASTILLERO, Sr. (G)
AGUILAR, Sr. (G)
AIZPURÚA, Sr. (E)

Papouasie-Nouvelle-Guinée/Papua New Guinea/Papua Nueva Guinea
TIBU, Mr. (G)

Pays-Bas/Netherlands/Países Bajos
VAN DER ZWAN, Mr. (E)

Philippines/Filipinas
SORIANO, Mr. (E)

Portugal
ABRANTES, M. (E)

*République dém. du
Congo/Democratic Republic of the
Congo/República Democrática del
Congo*
ELEMBO YANGOTIKALA, M. (G)
MULUMBA KIFOTO, M. (G)
NTAMBWE KITENGE, M. (E)

Roumanie/Romania/Rumania
NICOLESCU, M. (E)

*Royaume-Uni/United Kingdom/Reino
Unido*
LAMBERT, Mr. (E)

*Fédération de Russie/Russian
Federation/Federación de Rusia*
EREMEEV, Mr. (E)

Saint-Marin/San Marino
UGOLINI, M. (E)

*Saint-Vincent et-les Grenadines/Saint
Vincent and the Grenadines/San
Vicente y las Granadinas*
PROVIDENCE, Mr. (E)

Sénégal/Senegal
DIOP, M. (E)

*Serbie et Monténégro/Serbia and
Montenegro/Serbia y Montenegro*
NINKOVIC, Mr. (E)

Seychelles
SULTAN-BEAUDOUIN, Mr. (E)

Singapour/Singapore/Singapur
LIM, Mr. (G)
NG, Mr. (G)

Slovénie/Slovenia/Eslovenia
JEREB , Mrs. (E)

Soudan/Sudan/Sudán
ELGORASHI, Mr. (E)

Sri Lanka
MADIHAHEWA, Mr. (G)
ATHUKORALA, Mr. (G)
DASANAYAKE, Mr. (E)

Suède/Sweden/Suecia
TROGEN, Mr. (E)

Suisse/Switzerland/Suiza
BARDE, M. (E)

Swaziland/Swazilandia
MAPHANGA, Mrs. (E)

*République-Unie de Tanzanie/United
Republic of Tanzania/República
Unida de Tanzania*
MBWANJI, Mr. (E)

*République tchèque/Czech
Republic/República Checa*
DRBALOVÁ, Mrs. (E)

*Trinité-et-Tobago/Trinidad and
Tobago/Trinidad y Tabago*
HILTON-CLARKE, Mr. (E)

Tunisie/Tunisia/Túnez
M'KAISSI, M. (E)

Ukraine/Ucrania
GRYSHCHENKO, Mr. (E)

Viet Nam
NGUYEN, Mr. (G)
VU, Mr. (G)
NGUYEN, Mr. (E)

CONTENTS

Page

Nineteenth sitting

Second and third reports of the Credentials Committee: Submission and noting	1
<i>Speakers:</i> Mr. Oni (<i>Chairperson and Reporter</i>), Mr. Chipaziwa, Mr. Jiménez	
Final record vote on the proposed Convention concerning work in the fishing sector: Adoption	3
Final record vote on the proposed Recommendation concerning work in the fishing sector: Adoption	3
<i>Speakers:</i> Mr. Trotman, Mr. Funes de Rioja, Ms. Robinson, Mr. Smefjell, Mr. Thierry, the Legal Adviser	
Report of the Committee on the Application of Standards: Submission, discussion and approval	5
<i>Speakers:</i> Ms. Parra (<i>Reporter</i>), Mr. Potter, Mr. Cortebeeck, Mr. Paixão Pardo (<i>Chairperson</i>), Mr. MacPhee, Mr. Dorado Cano, Mr. Shein, Mr. Ould Mohamed Lemine, Mr. Chipaziwa, Mr. Nkhambule, Ms. Lu, Mr. Starovoytov, Mr. Chibebe, Mr. Ndoeye, Ms. Brighi, Mr. Rodríguez Díaz, Mr. Ahmed, Mr. Salimian, Mr. Sankar Saha	
Closing speeches	20
<i>Speakers:</i> Mr. Finlay, Ms. Anderson, the Secretary-General, the President	
Record vote on the draft Convention concerning work in the fishing sector: Results	25
Record vote on the draft Recommendation concerning work in the fishing sector: Results	31