

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE  
BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DU TRAVAIL  
OFICINA INTERNACIONAL DEL TRABAJO

GB.222/PV (Rev.)  
222nd Session

---

**GOVERNING BODY**  
**CONSEIL D'ADMINISTRATION**  
**CONSEJO DE ADMINISTRACION**

Geneva,  
1-4 March 1983

---

MINUTES OF THE 222ND SESSION

---

TABLE OF CONTENTS BY ORDER OF ITEM ON THE AGENDA

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Title of agenda item</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Approval of the Minutes of the 221st Session .....	I/1
2	Appointment of the Director-General.....	II/1
		III/1
3	Selection of the Members of the Organisation of chief industrial importance .....	X/13
4	Record of the Thirteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva, 18-29 October 1982) .....	I/1
5	Report of the Inter-American Advisory Committee on its Sixth Session (Geneva, 22-24 November 1982) .....	III/3
6	Report of the Committee of Experts on Maintenance of Rights in Social Security (Geneva, 23-30 November 1982) .....	VII/11
7	Report of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Appli- cation of the Recommendation concerning the status of Teachers on its Fourth Session (Geneva, 29 November 7 December 1982).....	I/5
8	Activities of the International Occupational Safety and Health Information Centre (CIS) in 1982	
9	Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association ....	VI/1
	Two hundred and twenty-third report .....	IV/4
	Two hundred and twenty-fourth report .....	IV/5
	Two hundred and twenty-fifth report .....	IV/5
10	Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee:	
	First report .....	IX/1
	Second report: Personnel questions .....	IX/1
	Third report: Programme and budget proposals for 1984-85	IX/2
11	Report of the Allocations Committee .....	X/1
12	Report of the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations .....	IV/1
13	Report of the International Organizations Committee .....	V/1
14	Report of the Committee on Operational Programmes.....	X/4
15	Report of the Committee on Discrimination.....	X/6
16	Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings:	
	First paper .....	IV/2
	Second paper .....	X/11
17	Symposia, seminars and assimilated meetings .....	IV/4

**GOVERNING BODY**  
**CONSEIL D'ADMINISTRATION**  
**CONSEJO DE ADMINISTRACION**

Geneva,  
1-4 March 1983

---

MINUTES OF THE 222ND SESSION

---

The 222nd Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva from Tuesday, 1 March to Friday, 4 March 1983.

The Governing Body was composed as follows;

Chairman: Mrs. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico).

Government group:

<u>Australia:</u>	Mr. WATCHORN
<u>Bahrain:</u>	Mr. AL-SHAKAR
<u>Bangladesh:</u>	Mr. MORSHED
<u>Barbados:</u>	Mr. ROGERS
<u>Brazil:</u>	Mr. TARGINO BOTTO
<u>Bulgaria:</u>	Mr. PETROV
<u>Canada:</u>	Mr. ARMSTRONG
<u>Colombia:</u>	Mr. CHARRY SAMPER
<u>Ecuador:</u>	Mr. ALEMAN SALVADOR
<u>Egypt:</u>	Mr. AHMED
<u>France:</u>	Mr. VENTEJOL
<u>German Democratic Republic:</u>	Mr. NOACK
<u>Germany, Federal Republic of:</u>	Mr. HAASE
<u>India:</u>	Mr. SUBRAHMANYA
<u>Italy:</u>	Mr. FALCHI
<u>Japan:</u>	Mr. MORI
<u>Kenya:</u>	Mr. MBATHI
<u>Mali:</u>	Mr. N'DIAYE
<u>Mexico:</u>	Mr. TELLO
<u>Mozambique:</u>	Mr. SIMBINE
<u>Netherlands:</u>	Mr. ALBEDA
<u>Nigeria:</u>	Mr. WILLIAMS
<u>Philippines:</u>	Mr. NORIEL
<u>Senegal:</u>	Mr. SENE
<u>USSR:</u>	Mr. JOUKOV
<u>United Kingdom:</u>	Mr. ROBINSON
<u>United States:</u>	Mr. SEARBY
<u>Venezuela:</u>	Mr. LOPEZ OLIVER

Employers' group:

Mr. BANNERMAN-MENSON  
Mr. EURNEKIAN  
Mr. FLUNDER  
Mr. GEORGET  
Mr. GHARBAOUI  
Mr. GROVE  
Mr. LINDNER  
Mr. NASR  
Mr. OECHSLIN  
Mr. POLITES  
Mr. TATA  
Mr. VERSCHUEREN  
Mr. VILLALOBOS  
Mr. YOSHINO

Workers' group:

Mr. BROWN  
Mrs. CARR  
Mr. GONZALEZ NAVARRO  
Mr. ISSIFU  
Mr. LLOYD  
Mr. MASHASI  
Mr. MEHTA  
Mr. MENDOZA  
Mr. MUHR  
Mr. PROKHOROV  
Mr. SANCHEZ MADARIAGA  
Mr. SOW  
Mr. SVENNINGSSEN  
Mr. TANAKA

The following regular members were absent:

Government group:

China

Workers' group:

Mr. DOLAN

The following deputy members, or substitute deputy members, were present at all or some of the sittings:

Government group:

<u>Algeria;</u>	Mr. BRIKI
<u>Angola;</u>	Mr. M'POLO
<u>Argentina;</u>	Mr. MARTINEZ
<u>Belgium;</u>	Mr. WALLIN
<u>Burma;</u>	Mr. GYI
<u>Cuba;</u>	Mr. DIAZ URBAY
<u>Denmark;</u>	Mr. ANDERSEN
<u>Ethiopia;</u>	Mr. KEBEDE
<u>Ghana;</u>	Mr. WILSON
<u>Hungary;</u>	Mr. MARTON
<u>Indonesia;</u>	Mr. WIDODO
<u>Madagascar;</u>	Mr. RASOLO
<u>Mongolia;</u>	Mr. BATABYAR
<u>Panama;</u>	Mr. ANDERSON
<u>Portugal;</u>	Mr. NASCIMENTO RODRIGUES
<u>Ukrainian SSR;</u>	Mr. OUDOVENKO
<u>Uruguay;</u>	Mr. MALVASIO LAXAGUE
<u>Zimbabwe;</u>	Mr. MURERWA

Employers' group:

Mr. ARBESSER-RASTBURG  
Mr. DESCHAMPS  
Mr. DIAZ GARAYCOA  
Mr. ESCOBAR PADRON  
Mr. von HOLTEN  
Mr. KHAN  
Mr. LACASA ASO  
Mr. MOUKOKO KINGUE  
Mr. MUNGA-wa-NYASA  
Mr. OWUOR  
Mr. PERIQUET  
Mr. SAID  
Mr. SUMBWE  
Mr. YLLANES RAMOS

Workers' group:

Mr. ABONDO  
Mr. AHMED  
Mr. BARNABO  
Mr. BLONDEL  
Mr. BRIKI  
Mr. CUEVAS  
Mr. DAVID  
Mr. MAIER  
Mr. SUDONO  
Mr. TIMMER  
Mr. VANNI  
Mr. WALCOTT  
Mr. ZIMBA

The following deputy members were absent:

Employers' group:

Mr. AL-JASSEM  
Mr. CHAMBERS  
Mrs. SASSO-MAZZUFFERI

Workers' group:

Mr. BEN-ISRAEL

The following representatives of States Members of the Organisation were present:

<u>Austria:</u>	Mr. KOEFFLER
<u>Benin:</u>	Mr. BIAOU
<u>Byelorussian SSR:</u>	Mr. GREKOV
<u>Chile:</u>	Mr. BUSTOS
<u>Czechoslovakia:</u>	Mrs. SLAMOVA
<u>Democratic Yemen:</u>	Mr. FARES
<u>Finland:</u>	Ms. RIIKONEN
<u>Gabon:</u>	Mrs. NGOUYOU
<u>Greece:</u>	Mr. IVRAKIS
<u>Ireland:</u>	Mr. HAYES
<u>Israel:</u>	Mr. SOFFER
<u>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya:</u>	Mr. BURUIN
<u>Luxembourg:</u>	Mr. WOLZFELD
<u>Malaysia:</u>	Mr. KIRUBANATHAN
<u>Marocco:</u>	Mr. HALFAOUI
<u>Nicaragua:</u>	Mr. VARGAS
<u>Norway:</u>	Mr. HEDLAL
<u>Peru:</u>	Mr. SALMON de la JARA
<u>Romania:</u>	Mr. TUDOR
<u>Spain:</u>	Mr. GRACIA TEJADOR
<u>Sweden:</u>	Mr. ISACSSON
<u>Switzerland:</u>	Mr. ZENGER
<u>Tunisia:</u>	Mr. BEL HADJ HASSINE
<u>Turkey:</u>	Mr. INAN
<u>Yugoslavia:</u>	Miss ILIC
<u>Zaire:</u>	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

certain problems remained, especially the legislative aspects and the fact that 193 organisations, representing 15 per cent, of the entire trade union movement in Argentina, were still under supervision. He hoped that it would be possible to open a constructive dialogue between the Government and the Organisation.

Mr. Martinez (Government, Argentina), in replay to Mr. Maier, pointed out that there were more than 2,000 trade unions in Argentina.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 35 of the report.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 65 of the report.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT

Mr. Joukov (Government, USSR) observed that it was the first anniversary of the Governing Body's discussion of the so-called Polish question. Thus, for a year now the Organisation, contrary to the principles and standards of international cooperation, had been interfering in the internal affairs of a member State. It had shown itself in a particularly unfavourable light in that it had become the tool of an illegal political campaign designed to exert pressure on the Polish people in respect of questions which were a purely internal matter.

As could be seen from the report, the enemies of Poland were changing their tactics but not in the right direction. It was clear that the procedure being followed by the ILO was anti-democratic and biased. His Government had always urged the ILO to concern itself with matters outside its competence, more particularly the case of Poland. Unfortunately that appeal had not been heeded. At the Governing Body's last session the Polish delegation had withdrawn in protest against the anti-Polish campaign being waged in the Organisation and the Government, quite understandably, had sent no delegation to the present session.

What did the instigators of the report's recommendations hope to achieve by issuing an ultimatum to a sovereign member State? They appeared to overlook the fact that Polish history was not determined in Geneva or anywhere else but in Poland itself, through the minds and hands of its workers. Far from promoting the stabilization process, the report's recommendations would only disrupt it. The course on which the Organisation had embarked would inevitably lead to a crisis of confidence among its member States. The writing on the wall could already be seen at the last Conference, but unfortunately the proper conclusions had not been drawn.

The recommendations were completely unacceptable and the Polish case should be considered by the ILO. He urged the Governing Body not to allow itself once again to be deflected from the path of reason, and requested that paragraph 63 of the report be put to the vote.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) recalled that on 19 November 1982 the Polish delegation had withdrawn in protest against the Governing Body's decision. Its withdrawal had been motivated by recommendations - generally considered to be moderate - on questions that fell within the ILO's competence.

After release of Lech Walesa, it had become plain, as the so-called normalization process continued, that many of the undertakings given by the Government had not been honoured. For example, a number of trade unionists whose release had been announced were still in custody: Edmund Baluka was still detained and had been forced to start a hunger strike to draw attention to his plight; and charges of violation of the martial law had been brought against Andrzej Gwiazda, Grzegorz Palka and other leaders of Solidarity. Further, the statement made before the Governing Body on 19 November 1982 that "the Government ... had on many occasions given proof of its goodwill and desire to maintain a dialogue with the ILO" was belied by its subsequent assertion that the so-called Polish question should be withdrawn from the agenda of ILO bodies. Lastly, the Government's claim to have decided to restore the trade union movement could not be taken seriously, since it could not simply create a trade union unilaterally. All this justified the setting up of a commission of inquiry.

It was the practice of the Polish Government to charge the West with distorting the facts and with lack of understanding of the problem. But why was it

so difficult to obtain information? He himself had repeatedly approached the Polish Embassy in Paris for news of various Polish trade unionists, but without success. It now appeared that Edmund Baluka would soon be tried and that Anna Walentinowicz would appear in court on 9 March for violation of martial law. Why had the authorities not supplied the Committee with that information? In spite of their silence, the Committee allowed the authorities until 15 April 1983 to elucidate the aspects of the case that remained outstanding. Failing that, the appropriate what was at stake was trade union freedom, without which there could be no democracy.

Mr. Martinez (Government, Argentina) reiterated the view that it was the duty ions to co-operate with governments in tackling their trade union and human rights problems. He believed that the Polish Government was sincere in its desire for a dialogue and was therefore glad that the Committee had decided to postpone setting up a commission of inquiry. At the same time he appealed to the Polish authorities to keep the dialogue open. The solution of economic and social crises took time and both the Organisation and the Government should allow each other the necessary respite for settling once and for all the problems at issue.

Mr. Brown (Worker, United States) expressed appreciation of the work of the Committee. Although there was room for improvement, it continued to play a vital and indeed unique role in the defence of the rights of workers and their organisations as embodied in international labour Conventions.

Once again the Polish question was before the Governing Body and would need to remain so as long as the repressive measures against the Polish trade union movement continued. The suspension of martial law had not basically changed the situation, since repression continued and many of martial law's worst features had now been institutionalised in civil law. Workers were subjected to military discipline and denied the right to leave their jobs, while cases involving public order and security were now tried by military courts. Under the new trade union legislation, Solidarity had been outlawed, the right to strike denied and so-called unions set up by the Government not to represent the workers but as instruments for carrying out official policies. Those unions had been boycotted by the vast majority of the Polish workers who maintained their allegiance to Solidarity and were now forced to continue the struggle underground. Workers could now be dismissed for union activities or for refusing to sign a loyalty pledge and were subject to compulsory labour. Under the new Polish penal code the possession of certain documents was punishable by five years' imprisonment. The employment situation of Lech Walesa and the other released detainees also gave cause for concern and should perhaps be taken up at a future stage through the ILO's discrimination machinery. Thousands of political prisoners were still in gaol and the trial and imprisonment of Solidarity activists continued. In such a situation how could one speak of normalisation and stabilisation?

Nor, as was evident from the lack of progress so far, would Poland's serious economic problems be overcome without the re-establishment of a genuinely free and independent trade union movement. Under the leadership of Lech Walesa, Solidarity had demonstrated its ability to function in a peaceful way, within the framework of between it and the Government. Today, these agreements would not only have guaranteed the workers the right to be represented but would also have given the country the possibility of rebuilding its economy.

He hoped the Governing Body would adopt the Committee's recommendations, which were moderate. He also hoped, although without much optimism, that the Government would comply with the Committee's requests. However, whether or not the case was eventually referred to a commission of inquiry, there could be no letting-up in the ILO's support of the Polish workers' struggle for freedom. That support needed to be reinforced by the international free trade union organisations which should keep the issue alive in every possible international forum.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) regretted that, once again, the Governing Body had before it a report of the Committee on Freedom of Association, showing that attempts to interfere in Poland's internal affairs were continuing in violation of international law. His Government's position on the question, which he had stated at length at previous sessions, remained unchanged, and he rejected all attempts to make use of the ILO in the campaign being waged against Poland. In that connection he fully associated himself with the remarks of the representative of the Government of the USSR. His Government considered that



the complaint should be dropped and therefore did not accept paragraphs 4 and 63 of the report. The discussion should now be closed, and, as proposed by the representative of the Government of the USSR, the Governing Body should proceed to the vote.

Mr. Yumjav (Government, Mongolia) observed that the ILC was again being used, in breach of its Constitution, to interfere in Poland's internal affairs. As he had previously stated, his Government condemned such interference. It was clear from the positive developments which had occurred that the Polish Government was quite capable of solving its country's problems. He rejected the Committee's report and conclusions and requested that the Polish question be withdrawn from the agenda of all ILO bodies.

Mr. Timmer (Worker, Hungary) declared that his position on the subject of Poland remained unchanged. He had recently visited the country and had thus been able to ascertain at first hand the fundamental changes that had taken place. Martial law had been lifted, detainees had been released and no-one was imprisoned because of his trade union activities. No action had been taken against the leaders of Solidarity who had voluntarily reported to the authorities. New trade unions were being established and economic and social reforms were under way. Unfortunately the report did not do justice to those positive developments. It was the ILO's duty to promote the favourable evolution that was taking place and he could support no procedure that would impede it.

Mr. Ventejol (Government, France) recalled that on 5 March 1982 the French Government had written to the Director-General reserving the right to file a complaint under article 26 of the ILO Constitution if the situation in Poland did not improve. Since then, the Workers' delegates of France and Norway to the 68th (1982) Session of the Conference had filed such a complaint, which he had supported, and on 2 December 1982 he had written to the Director-General expressing the hope that at its present session the Governing Body would set up a commission of inquiry which would be able to submit its report before the next session of the Conference. Needless to say he agreed with the recommendations in the Committee's report, which should be fully implemented.

Should the Polish Government not indicate by 15 April 1983 its willingness to accept a further on-the-spot visit by a representative of the Director-General, the Officers of the Governing Body should from then on take all the necessary measures to enable the Governing Body at its next session to set in motion the proper procedure.

While reserving his remarks on substance until the report of the Committee's May meeting was before the Governing Body, he expressed surprise at the allegations of interference, since the ILO's procedures applied equally to all member States. All countries had an obligation to comply with the rules, first and foremost among which was of course respect for trade union liberties.

Mr. M'Polo (Government, Angola) thought that the Committee should have allowed the Polish Government more time, bearing in mind the evolution of the situation and the Government's demonstrated willingness to co-operate with the IIC in seeking a solution, as well as the fact that problems of internal peace and order were also involved. In any case, the Committee's recommendations went beyond the competence of the ILO and constituted interference in the internal affairs of a member State.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-chairman) considered the Committee's conclusions to be both correct and indispensable. With reference to the charge by the representative of the Government of the USSR that the enemies of Poland were once again using the ILO to interfere in Poland's internal affairs, he recalled that at its meeting in November 1982 the Governing Body had followed the somewhat unusual procedure of voting on the Committee's recommendations concerning Poland, and 47 members of the Governing Body had voted in favour. The inference that the Governing Body contained 47 enemies of Poland was quite untenable. Those who examined the application of ILO principles and standards in a particular country and found it wanting were far from being its enemies. He himself intended to vote in favour of the report but categorically rejected any implication that he was an enemy of Poland.

Nor could the operation of the freedom of association procedure be considered as interference. On the contrary, its purpose was to ensure the application of the

principles of the Organisation. The Committee's recommendations were not an ultimatum but an offer to engage in a genuine, constructive dialogue with the Polish authorities. He could only agree with the representative of the Government of the OSSB that it was the Polish workers who should decide how they wished to live and work. Solidarity, which rapidly acquired a membership of 10 million Polish workers, had given them the opportunity of doing so. The Polish Workers' delegate to the 67th (1981) Session of the Conference had eloquently described the path the Polish workers wished to follow in determining for themselves their way of life and conditions of work. It was precisely because the will of the Polish workers had now been stifled and they were not free to decide for themselves that the case had come before the Governing Body.

Mr. Wallin (Government, Belgium) believed that the ILO Constitution provided adequate guarantees concerning respect for member States' national sovereignty and dignity, and that the vast majority fully upheld that principle. Any member of the Governing Body which attempted to interfere in another country's internal affairs would permanently tarnish its own dignity as a sovereign State. He rejected the allegations that the Committee's procedure was antidemocratic. The Committee had been established in complete conformity with the Organisation's rules and its procedure gave States the opportunity of replying to allegations brought against them. The Polish Government had so replied on a number of occasions, and its representative had appeared before the Committee last November. The exchanges there had been frank and encouraging. The ILO was now being told that the Polish question should be withdrawn from the agenda of all ILO bodies. But the procedure had now been set in motion before the Committee on Freedom of Association and as long as the Government had not replied fully to the allegations the Governing Body had no authority to stop it. Nor could it intervene in respect of the pending examination of the new trade union legislation by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations and the possible subsequent consideration of the matter by the corresponding Conference Committee.

He supported the Committee's recommendations, in particular the proposed visit by a representative of the Director-General, and appealed to the Polish Government to show its willingness to carry on the dialogue with the Organisation by accepting it.

Mr. Petrov (Government, Bulgaria) reiterated his Government's view that the Polish question was outside the Organisation's competence. The Polish people should be left alone to resolve their problems and any interference in the country's internal affairs would only aggravate the situation. The Governing Body should follow the advice of the Secretary-General of the United Nations that the United Nations had no reason to concern itself with events in Poland, which were a purely internal matter. He again urged that the procedure be stopped and supported the proposal that the matter now be put to the vote.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) challenged those who were talking about interference to show in what way the treatment of the Polish case differed from the treatment of cases relating to other States, which those who were now alleging interference had in the past accepted without demur and in some cases even with enthusiasm. The Governing Body could not have a double standard: all States had to be treated on an equal footing and no exceptions could be made.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-chairman) entirely agreed. He was concerned at the attempts being made to exempt a certain group of countries from the Organisation's supervisory procedures. Other countries might be censured as the Governing Body thought fit, but a certain privileged region of the world was apparently to enjoy immunity. Such an attitude was unacceptable. The extreme prudence of the language of the Committee's conclusions, for example the reference to a "visit" by a representative of the Director-General, showed that it had been at pains to avoid any impression that it was condemning the Government. But it was necessary to ascertain the facts of the situation and it was difficult to see what Poland would gain by refusing the proposed visit. There was nothing extraordinary in the procedure, which had existed since the early days of the Organisation. Nor was there any question of an ultimatum, since, having regard to the decision taken at the last session of the Governing Body concerning the application of article 26 if the Government failed to comply with the requests made, it would have been logical for the Committee to have decided to initiate the

procedure at the present session. In fact, the Committee was giving the Government further time. While supporting the Committee's recommendations he urged that the Organisation act without delay should an affirmative reply not be received from the Government by 15 April. There was in any case nothing shameful about the article 26 procedure, which was simply a means of ascertaining the facts. There had been no objection to using it in the recent past for Norway, Panama and Sweden, so why should it not also be applied to the countries of Eastern Europe?

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) regarded paragraph 63 as an ultimatum rather than a set of recommendations to the Government. No such ultimatum was to be found in the Committee's recommendations relating to other serious cases. Account should have been taken of the manifest goodwill of the Polish Government, which had supplied detailed information and sent a representative to the last session, and its positive measures to redress the abnormal situation created by the subversive activities of Solidarity, aided and abetted by anti-socialist forces. Poland should be given the necessary time to put its house in order and no useful purpose would be served by trying to put pressure on the Government. He therefore rejected categorically the recommendations in paragraph 63, which could only weaken the chances of a dialogue with the Polish authorities.

Mr. Prokhorov (Worker, USSR) advised those who were trying to attack the socialist countries to listen to reason. In view of the anti-socialist campaign being pursued in the Committee, it could hardly have been expected to produce a report on the Polish question different from that now before the Governing Body. Poland was being attacked because its people refused to serve the ends of those bent on sabotaging the political process and taking the country out of the socialist bloc. By their counter-revolutionary activities they hoped to divert attention from their own serious economic and social problems.

Paragraph 51 referred to long-established ILO principles in the field of freedom of association. As the socialist countries had stated previously, those principles were outdated and should be reviewed in the light of present-day realities. The paragraph also referred to the objective examination of information. But was it objective to condemn without proof and then to demand explanations from the accused? The tendentious approach to the Polish question tore the stamp of external forces that were seeking to betray the Polish people. He was opposed to the recommendations in paragraph 63, which were not an appeal for dialogue but an attempt to threaten the Government. The Governing Body should not be a party to such manoeuvres which could only hinder the normalisation process. Positive developments were taking place in Poland and the Government should be left alone to get on with the job with the assistance of the friendly socialist countries. There was no need for a further visit by a representative of the Director-General and the entire Polish question should be dropped.

Mr. Morton (Government, Hungary) reiterated his Government's opposition to the present procedure. The methods being used by the Organisation would not assist normalisation. For instance, subparagraph 63 (b) referred to the very limited nature of trade union activities in Poland. But it was well known that several Western bodies had called for a boycott of the new trade unions. If the ILO were to assist them, however, no doubt that would help to bring their activities up to the desired level. Unfortunately, the Committee's report was not worded along those lines. Neither was the wording of subparagraph 63 (f) conducive to improving co-operation between the Organisation and the Government, since no sovereign State could accept such conditions. The result of the decision taken at the last session of the Governing Body had been the withdrawal of the Polish delegation and it was not surprising that the Government could no longer co-operate with the Organisation. Once again the Organisation was exceeding its competence and attempting to interfere in Poland's internal affairs. It was curious that the revision of the trade union legislation in a capitalist country was regarded as a democratisation measure, whereas when a socialist country did likewise it was considered to be a restriction on democracy. Such a double standard was not acceptable. The Polish question should be dropped and the Organisation should turn its attention to more constructive pursuits. He supported the proposal that the conclusions be put to the vote.

Mrs. Carr (Worker, Canada) pointed out that Poland was still a Member of the Organisation and consequently was still bound by its Conventions.

Reference had been made to the withdrawal of the Polish delegation at the last session of the Governing Body. But it had not been asked to leave and had done so

of its own free will. It was interesting that the release of Lech Walesa should have conveniently occurred -just before the Polish representative appeared before the Committee, which led one to suspect- that it was arranged to avoid the hearing of the Polish case. The attitude of those who continued to obstruct access to the facts of the situation in Poland was disturbing, as were the charges of interference, since the ILO had an obligation to defend workers' rights and could not remain inactive when they were violated.

In spite of the assurances about the release of detainees and the lifting of martial law in Poland, some 5,000 trade union activists were still detained and 20 had been killed or had died from injuries inflicted by the forces of order. Why did those who were so convinced that the Polish question should be dropped oppose an on-the-spot visit and a commission of inquiry? It was interesting to hear about visits to Poland in recent weeks, because others who had tried to go and see for themselves had been unable to obtain visas.

The plea for more time was a pretext to allow the authorities to pursue their anti-trade union activities undisturbed. Could it really be said that Lech Walesa had been released when his movements were restricted and he was subjected to harassment? Where was the proof that all the activists referred to in the report had been freed and were able to function? Why had Western trade union observers been denied admittance to the trials of Polish trade unionists?

She supported the report's recommendations. The Organisation could not remain on the sidelines when basic human and trade union rights were infringed in any country. While harbouring no feelings of animosity towards the Polish people, the free trade union organisations would continue to keep the Polish question alive in every possible international forum.

Mr. Anderson (Government, Panama) expressed his Government's conviction that the Polish Government, like all other Members, had to abide by the rules of the Organisation.

The report in no way constituted interference in the generally accepted political sense of the term. The ILO's concern with the Polish question was quite legitimate, and the objective of the Committee's report and recommendations was simply that the Government should comply with the principles and standards it had undertaken to observe on joining the Organisation. The report was couched in moderate and objective terms and his Government supported it unreservedly.

Mr. Kebede (Government, Ethiopia) recalled that his Government had previously emphasised the need to give Poland sufficient time to solve its internal problems, and had been opposed to the hasty setting up of a commission of inquiry. The positive developments which had taken place recently in Poland should be encouraged rather than hindered. Unfortunately, the Committee had failed to take those developments into account. He still urged that the Government be given sufficient time and therefore could not agree with the proposed deadline or with the proposal to pursue the matter by means of a commission of inquiry. Such measures would only aggravate an already complicated situation.

Mr. Oudovenko (Government, Ukrainian SSR) restated his Government's opposition to the examination of the Polish question by the Organisation, irrespective of the procedures invoked, and the use of the Governing Body and its committees to spread distorted statements concerning Poland's internal situation and policies. The report under discussion could only propel the Governing Body still further along the path of interference in Poland's internal affairs. Positive developments had taken place and the Government had been ready to enter into a dialogue with the Organisation, but that was not reflected in the report. Allegations of the kind made in the present discussion concerning the oppression of the Polish people would not be tolerated by any sovereign State; but apparently they were considered permissible where Poland was concerned. It was a curious coincidence that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights was also discussing Poland, which pointed to a well orchestrated attempt to make it the focus of world attention as if no other problems existed.

The Polish Government refused to tolerate any external interference in the country's internal affairs. Its delegation had withdrawn at the last session in protest, and the Polish Diet on 1 February 1983 had categorically condemned and rejected all such attempts, stating that the imposing of conditions and demands and the use of sanctions and political pressure violated international law and could only endanger peace.

The anti-Polish campaign being pursued in the Governing Body and its committees underlined the need to democratise its methods of work and composition. He rejected the report in its entirety and supported the proposal that the matter be put to the vote.

Mr. Sene (Government, Senegal) stated that his intention of voting in favour of the Committee's recommendations in no way implied a condemnation of Poland, with which his country enjoyed friendly relations, but was dictated solely by respect for principle and a desire to promote the necessary dialogue and co-operation between the ILO and the Polish Government.

The reason for the exceptionally heated debate on the Polish question was the country's geo-political situation, which was of particular significance for European co-operation, détente and world peace. The ILO should therefore discuss the question, not with any intention of taking sides or interfering, but in order to help Poland resolve its problems and freely decide its destiny in a climate of national reconciliation and respect for democratic and trade union liberties. It was greatly to be hoped that Poland would stay in the ILO and assume all its responsibilities. Having ascertained that the representative of the Government of the USSR maintained his request that paragraph 63 be put to the vote, the Chairman invited the Governing Body to vote by show of hands.

By 46 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions, the Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 63 of the report.

#### SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

#### Report of the Meeting of Experts on Maintenance of Rights in Social Security

(Geneva, 23-30 November 1982)

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-chairman) commented that, while having no observations on the report, the Employers felt that the Office had acted a little hastily in having it printed before the Governing Body had authorised its submission to the Conference. Perhaps in future, when the Governing Body was asked for its opinion on a report, the latter could be presented in a form which would at least give the Governing Body the illusion that it was being asked to do more than merely rubber-stamp it.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-chairman) said that the Workers accepted the report. Although the point raised by Mr. Oechslin was theoretically correct, the Governing Body had never concerned itself with the reports on Conference agenda items, which were prepared by the Office, usually on the basis of questionnaires to governments and the replies received, and submitted direct to the Conference. A similar procedure was now being followed in respect of the conclusions of the Meeting of Experts.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) considered that the Office should rather be congratulated on having had the report printed so quickly in the different languages. The Meeting had been chaired by the expert from his country, who had asked him to thank the Office once again for the Meeting's excellent organisation.

It would facilitate the work of the Committee on Social Security at the next session of the Conference if its members thoroughly familiarised themselves with the report beforehand so as to avoid going over the same ground as the experts. The co-ordination of social security systems was extremely complex, which was why it had been considered desirable to provide countries with guidelines for the application of the Maintenance of Social Security Rights Convention (No. 157), adopted at the last session. The report had been issued very promptly and he hoped that the experts in the various countries would receive it in good time.

Mr. Rogers (Government, Barbados) supported the proposal that the Governing Body take note of the report and authorise the Director-General to submit it to the