concerned parties. Consequently, the Committee requests the Government to accept such a mission.

Case No. 1729

COMPLAINT AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF ECUADOR PRESENTED BY - THE LATIN AMERICAN CENTRAL OF WORKERS (CLAT) AND - THE POSTAL, TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE INTERNATIONAL (PTTI)

742. The complaint in this case is contained in communications of the Latin American Central of Workers (CLAT) dated 17 August 1993, and of the Postal, Telegraph and Telephone International (PTTI), dated 29 August 1993. The Government sent its observations in a communication dated 13 October 1993. The CLAT submitted new allegations in a communication of 15 December 1993.

743. Ecuador has ratified the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98).

A. The complainants' allegations

744. In its communication dated 17 August 1993, the CLAT states that telecommunications workers in Ecuador are subjected to persecution, especially national and provincial leaders affiliated to the National Federation of Workers of Ecuador (FENETEL). The complainant organization alleges that Mr. Raúl Barahona Pasquel, Vice-Chairman of the Latin American Confederation of Telecommunications Workers and General Secretary of FENETEL, was denied trade union leave and accused of having been absent from his post for three consecutive days, for which he was dismissed after 38 years of service in the enterprise.

745. The CLAT states further that in the City of Guayaquil, the SINTIETEL organization (a branch of FENETEL) publicly denounced infringements of the legislation on recruitment and that as a result the State Telecommunications Enterprise (EMTEL) requested that the Treasury Inspector's Office carry out a special audit in the enterprise, immediately granting approval (authorization of dismissal) for the dismissal for 11 trade union leaders, including Messrs. Néstor Pérez Valencia, Secretary-General of the organization, Johny Ramirez, Vicente Ayala and Piedad Loor. Lastly, it points out that the enterprise fails to comply with article 67 of the collective contract in force, concerning the grant of trade union leave to union leaders.

746. In its communication dated 29 August 1993, the Postal, Telegraph and Telephone International (PTTI) points out that there is a central committee of EMETEL employees in Ecuador, known as the single central committee of EMETEL-CONAUTEL employees, grouping together the 11 trade unions organized in the EMETEL enterprise, and that according to the collective agreement the sole purpose of this body is to negotiate and sign collective agreements. The complainant organization points out that after the elections held in January 1993, Ms. Greta Hoyos, the Chairman of CONAUTEL, was replaced by Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada, Chairman of the Samuel Morse organization affiliated to the PTTI. Since then Mr. Logroño has been carrying out the duties of lawful Chairman of CONAUTEL. As a result of negotiations for a collective agreement and of the strong position maintained by CONAUTEL, the EMETEL company subsequently decided unilaterally, in violation of the agreement signed with CONAUTEL, to negotiate and quickly sign the collective agreement with Ms. Hoyos, who is General Secretary of a telephone operators' union of which 143 of the 7,800 EMETEL employees are members. The agreement contained terms which were much less favourable than those demanded by the other organizations which currently have a total of 6,400 members among the employees. It points out that the collective agreement was unlawfully registered by the Ministry of Labour, since it does not meet the requirements laid down by the law, and that members were ordered to pay a contribution of 5,000 sucres, which only the trade union general meetings - which were not held - were competent to decide. This contribution was thus deducted from workers' wages by the enterprise.

747. Lastly, the complainant organization states that this situation gave rise to protests and strikes. As a result of these events, the enterprise arbitrarily dismissed the General Secretaries of FENETEL (Mr. Raúl Barahona Pasquel), FEDETEL (César Jara Pullas) and SINDO-IETEL (Mr. Fernando García), organizations belonging to CONAUTEL, and that Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada had been detained for 24 hours on false accusations made by Ms. Hoyos, who was never willing to confirm them in person to the police, thanks to which Mr. Logroño was released.

748. In its communication of 15 December 1993, the CLAT points out that the contracts of eight trade union leaders of the EMETEL enterprise were terminated, including that of Mr. Leonoardo Torres Sarmiento, General Secretary of the National Federation of Telecommunications Workers of Ecuador (FENETEL). The complainant organization states that the authorities invoked the poor functioning of the telecommunications services as an excuse to justify this measure, but that the real reason was that the dismissed persons denounced the responsible persons in the enterprise for the mismanagement of funds destined towards the acquisition of telephone lines.

B. The Government's reply

749. In its communication dated 13 October 1993, the Government rejects and describes as false and rash the complainants' statements that freedom of association was violated by failure to protect trade union leaders and the free exercise of their functions. Concerning the alleged dismissal of Mr. Raúl Barahona Pasquel, the Government states that this worker was neither removed from his post nor dismissed, but that on 15 April 1993 he handed in his resignation to the enterprise and requested permission to retire after having completed the length of service required by law, which the enterprise granted. Concerning the allegation that the Treasury Inspector's Office had granted approval (authorizations of dismissal) for the dismissal of 11 union leaders of SINTIETEL (City of Guayaquil), including the workers Néstor Pérez Valencia, Johny Ramirez, Vicente Ayala and Piedad Loor, the Government states that EMETEL requested the approval of the labour authorities of the City of Guayaquil in order to terminate the employment relationships with these workers; however, once the waiting period had expired, the authorities established that the enterprise had failed to give evidence of the grounds cited in requesting approval, which was denied as a result. The Government explains that the "approval" procedure [visto bueno] refers to a request submitted by the employer or the worker for the labour authorities to authorize termination of the employment relationship. In order to obtain this approval, the applicant must provide legal proof to the labour inspectorate that the prerequisites laid down in the Labour Code have been met, and that the accused party has exercised his right to defence. The grounds expressly cited in legal provisions refer to discipline, compliance with contractual obligations, aptitude for work and morality. The granting of approval has the effect of dissolving the employment relationship without giving rise to entitlement to any compensation, which is described as warranted dismissal. Unwarranted dismissal is, on the contrary, an illegal and arbitrary act.

750. Regarding the alleged violation by the EMETEL enterprise of the collective agreement in force, by failing to grant trade union leave, it follows from the Government's observations that there have been no complaints in this respect, and that all matters relating to compliance with a collective agreement must be channelled through the joint committees and subcommittees (article 74 of the collective agreement), the next stage being to file a complaint with the labour authorities.

751. Concerning the allegation presented by the Postal, Telegraph and Telephone International (PTTI), the Government states that on 8 December 1992 the single central committee of EMETEL-CONAUTEL employees was set up in accordance with Act No. 133. The workers employed in EMETEL informed the Pichincha labour inspector that this committee had been set up with the backing of 4,600 workers (i.e. the majority, since the total number of workers is 5,942) and that the office of chairman would be held by Ms. Hoyos and that of general

secretary by Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada. In these circumstances, negotiations for the collective agreement were begun with this executive, and in February 1993 the chairman of the committee informed the Ministry of Labour that a general assembly of workers had decided to approve the removal of certain former leaders, including Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada. The enterprise requested the Ministry of Labour to indicate who was the chairman of the committee so that it could continue negotiations, and it was informed that the only executive which was legally registered was that of Ms. Hoyos.

752. The Government states that in February 1993 a group of workers, including Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada, stated that Ms. Hoyos and the other officers of the executive had withdrawn from the committee of their own accord and had therefore been replaced; that they were the representatives of the single central committee and were backed by over 4,000 signatures of workers employed in EMETEL. Faced with a situation where two executives of the single central committee existed side by side, and with an apparent internal struggle for control, the labour inspectorate carried out an investigation and decided to reject the petition of Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada's group as being without factual or legal grounds, having ascertained by consulting handwriting experts that the 4,000 signatures of support presented by these workers were the same that had been presented by the executive headed by Ms. Hoyos. In other words, the complainants had attempted to deceive the labour authorities by presenting documents in support of their petition which in fact belonged to the original executive of 8 December 1992.

753. Lastly, the Government states that the disputes which have arisen are between trade unions, that there is no dispute with the enterprise or with the Government, and that the mutual accusations brought before the authorities by both parties clearly show that they have nothing to do with freedom of association. The Government, in general terms and without referring only to the present case, deplores the fact that disagreements between trade union leaders lead them to adopt belligerent attitudes which ultimately lead to detentions. The Government states further that the EMETEL enterprise comprises 85 trade unions at national level, affilated to 11 national federations, which themselves are affiliated to the four central organizations recognized within the country, and that this complaint reflects the struggle for hegemony among the country's main central organizations of workers.

C. The Committee's conclusions

754. The Committee observes that the allegations presented refer to the dismissal and application to the labour authorities for authorization of dismissals in the EMETEL enterprise; to the enterprise's failure to comply with the collective agreement by denying trade union leave; to the enterprise's recognition of the

executive of the single central committee headed by Ms. Hoyos; and to the 24-hour detention of Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada, who headed the executive opposing that of Ms. Hoyos.

755. As regards the allegation that the EMETEL enterprise negotiated a collective agreement with the body represented by Ms. Hoyos, who, it is stated, does not represent the single central committee as she had been replaced by Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada, the Committee observes that from the information available, the context of this case is that of a conflict between trade unions. The Committee notes that according to the Government, faced with a situation where two executives of the single central committee exist side by side (this committee being the body authorized to negotiate and sign collective agreements on the workers' behalf) and with an apparent internal struggle among trade unions for control, the labour inspectorate carried out an investigation and decided to reject the petition of Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada's group as being without factual or legal grounds, having ascertained by consulting handwriting experts that the signatures of support presented by these workers in February 1993 were the same signatures that had been presented by the executive headed by Ms. Hoyos in December 1992. In this respect, the Committee recalls that it is not competent to make recommendations on internal dissensions within a trade union organization, so long as the Government does not intervene in a manner which might affect the exercise of trade union rights and the normal functioning of an organization [see Digest of decisions and principles of the Freedom of Association Committee, 3rd edition, 1985, para. 666]. In the Committee's view, there is nothing to indicate in this case that the Government has interfered in the conflict among trade unions; on the contrary, when the enterprise requested information as to which was the legal executive with which it should bargain, the labour inspectorate carried out an investigation of the matter. In these circumstances, the Committee considers that this aspect of the case does not call for further examination.

756. As regards the alleged dismissal of trade union leader Mr. Raúl Barahona Pasquel (General Secretary of FENETEL), the Committee notes the Government's observations to the effect that this leader was not dismissed, but on 15 April 1993 handed in his resignation to the enterprise and requested permission to retire, having completed the length of service laid down by the law. In addition, regarding the alleged authorizations of dismissal of 11 trade union leaders of SINTIETEL (City of Guayaquil), the Committee notes the Government's observations to the effect that the dismissals were not authorized and that therefore the workers were not dismissed. Concerning the alleged dismissals of the general secretaries of FEDETEL and SINDO-IETEL, Messrs. César Jara Pullas and Fernando García, as a result of protests and strikes, the Committee observes that the Government has not replied. In these circumstances, the Committee requests the Government to communicate its observations on these alleged dismissals.

757. Concerning the allegation to the effect that the EMETEL enterprise failed to comply with article 67 of the collective

agreement in force, concerning the granting of leave to trade union leaders, the Committee notes that as far as can be seen from the Government's observations no complaints have been made on the matter and that all matters relating to compliance with a collective agreement should be channelled through the joint committees and subcommittees recognized in article 74 of the collective agreement in force, the next stage being to file a complaint with the labour authorities. The Committee observes further that the allegation that trade union leave was denied is too vague, and that the complainant organization has not given any specific information regarding this allegation (persons affected, dates, etc.). The Committee requests the complainant organizations to supply such specific information.

758. Regarding the 24-hour detention of Mr. Abdón Logroño Losada, as a result of accusations brought by Ms. Hoyos, the Committee notes the Government's observations to the effect that both parties brought accusations against each other to the police. The Committee regrets that the Government has not explained the reasons for Mr. Logroño's 24-hour detention and requests it to communicate detailed information on this allegation.

759. Finally, as regards the new allegations presented by the CLAT concerning the dismissal of eight trade union leaders from the EMETEL enterprise, including the General Secretary of the National Federation of Telecommunications Workers of Ecuador (FENETEL), Mr. Leonoardo Torres Sarmiento, the Committee observes that these allegations were transmitted recently. It therefore requests the Government to furnish its observations on these allegations as quickly as possible.

The Committee's recommendations

760. In the light of its foregoing interim conclusions, the Committee invites the Governing Body to approve the following recommendations:

(a) The Committee requests the Government to communicate its observations on the alleged dismissals of the General Secretaries of FEDETEL and SINDO-IETEL, Messrs. César Jara Pullas and Fernando García, as a result of protests and strikes.

(b) Concerning the allegation regarding failure to grant leave to trade union leaders, the Committee requests the complainant organizations to provide specific information in this regard.

(c) The Committee regrets that the Government has not explained the reasons for the 24-hour detention of Mr. Logroño and requests it to communicate detailed information on this allegation.

(d) Observing that the new allegations presented by the CLAT regarding the dismissal of eight trade union leaders from the EMETEL enterprise, including the General Secretary of the National Federation of Telecommunications Workers of Ecuador (FENETEL), Mr. Leonoardo Torres Sarmiento, were transmitted recently, the Committee requests the Government to furnish its observations on these allegations as quickly as possible.

Case No. 1731

COMPLAINT AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF PERU PRESENTED BY THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF WORKERS OF THE NATIONAL PORTS ENTERPRISE (FENTENAPU)

761. The complaint is contained in a communication from the National Federation of Workers of the National Ports Enterprise (FENTENAPU) dated 26 August 1993. FENTENAPU sent additional allegations in a communication dated 4 October 1993. The Government sent its observations on the case in communications dated 15 November 1993 and 24 February 1994.

762. Peru has ratified the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948 (No. 87), as well as the Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98).

A. The complainant's allegations

763. In its communication of 26 August 1993, the National Federation of Workers of the National Ports Enterprise (FENTENAPU) alleges that the current round of collective bargaining for fiscal year 1993 has been seriously affected by legal provisions handed down by the Government which limit the negotiating powers of the state-owned Peruvian National Ports Enterprise (ENAPU PERU) which, in accordance with national legislation, is subject to labour regulations governing the private sector. The position assumed by the enterprise and government authorities is hampering the free and independent development of these negotiations, and is contrary to the principle of good faith which should prevail.

764. In specific terms, the complainant points out that section 23 of the Act on the 1993 Public Sector Budget (Legislative Decree No. 25986) establishes that in the context of collective bargaining, state-owned enterprises covered by Act No. 24948 can only propose and agree to clauses which comply with the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Finance, upon recommendation by the National Development

Corporation (CONADE), the state body responsible for public enterprise policy. These standards and their regulatory provisions require state-owned enterprises, under the personal responsibility of the corresponding authorities, to adhere in negotiations to the positions stipulated by CONADE, with no possibility of modifying them in any way whatsoever.

765. The complainant alleges that collective bargaining for fiscal year 1993, aimed at signing a collective agreement valid for 1993 beginning on 1 January to replace the previous one which expired on 31 December 1992, began with a submission by FENTENAPU of a proposed collective agreement on 30 November 1992, within the deadline prescribed by law. FENTENAPU adds that direct negotiations with the ENAPU PERU enterprise began on 11 February 1993, and that by 23 August 1993 ENAPU PERU had submitted no proposal, leading to an unjustifiable delay of nine months in the collective bargaining process.

766. The complainant points out that ENAPU PERU subsequently submitted a proposal, approved by the Ministry of Finance, which was limited to granting a small wage increase and a non-pensionable bonus, valid as of 1 July 1993, and that these proposals violate national legislation. As regards the date on which authorized increases were to be granted (1 July 1993), the complainant first alleges that the proposed date violates paragraph (d) of section 43 of the Act on Collective Labour Relations (Legislative Decree No. 25593), which provides that collective agreements will enter into force on the day following the expiry of the previous collective agreement. Consequently, with the previous agreement having expired on 31 December 1992, the current agreement should have entered into force on 1 January 1993. The complainant further alleges that were this proposal to be accepted, workers at the enterprise would be deprived of all their benefits for the period between January and June 1993. FENTENAPU adds that owing to the above-mentioned obstacles and delays, and the impending deadline for submitting the proposed collective agreement for 1994, it will be difficult to negotiate the 1994 agreement if the 1993 collective agreement does not come into force.

767. In its communication of 4 October 1993, FENTENAPU further alleges that by means of a Supreme Decree issued on 3 September 1992, the Government declared ENAPU PERU to be an enterprise providing essential services; the implication is that more than 50 per cent of the staff (as designated by trade unions) would have to continue working were a strike to be called. Otherwise, the strike would be declared illegal or else the designated workers who had not remained on the job would be dismissed; this effectively makes it impossible to call a strike in response to delays in concluding collective agreements. The complainant also points out that, in accordance with Legislative Decree No. 25593 (section 67), should there be no agreement through direct negotiation or conciliation concerning essential public services, as would be the case of ENAPU PERU, the dispute must be submitted to compulsory arbitration under a tripartite board composed of three arbitrators, two of whom are appointed by the

Ministry of Labour; this composition would distort the impartiality of such a board.

768. Lastly, FENTENAPU alleges that Legislative Decree No. 25921, published on 3 December 1992, permits employers to suspend or modify work conditions and economic benefits, and to lay off workers temporarily. The complainant adds that section 2(b) of this Decree provides that in case workers refuse to engage in direct negotiation, or fail to arrive at an agreement by this method, the employer may appeal to the Ministry of Labour to rule on the merits of the issue in question within two weeks, after which the request will be considered as approved in the absence of a decision by the labour authority. The complainant further adds that this legal provision conflicts with Legislative Decree No. 25593, inasmuch as it allows employers to avoid negotiation or to delay the signing of collective labour agreements.

C. The Government's reply

769. In its communication of 15 November 1993 the Government points out that within the framework of a global economic stabilization programme, a rigorous plan entailing austerity and the rationalization of public expenditure is being implemented so as to alleviate the economic problems which the country faces. Consequently, section 23 of Act No. 25986, on the 1993 Central Government Budget, establishes that state-owned enterprises referred to in Act No. 24948, on State Entrepreneurial Activity, whose workers are subject to private sector labour legislation can only propose and agree to clauses which comply with the guidelines issued by the National Development Corporation (CONADE), in accordance with directives issued by the Ministry of Finance.

770. The Government points out that the National Ports Enterprise of Peru (ENAPU PERU) is an enterprise whose economic and financial results have not been completely satisfactory, thus contributing along with most state-owned enterprises to the fiscal deficit. The Government has therefore been obliged to implement an austerity plan for all such enterprises within the framework of a policy of equitable and uniform treatment aimed at overall recovery. Accordingly, CONADE's duties include the supervision and evaluation of the financial resources of state-owned enterprises; this is not to be construed as interference in union affairs, but rather an effort by the Government to set general guidelines for the pay policy of these enterprises.

771. The Government explains that the guidelines with which state-owned enterprises must comply in collective bargaining (section 23 of Legislative Decree No. 25986) are not in violation of Convention No. 98, inasmuch as workers' organizations are able to accept or reject an enterprise's proposals, and that national legislation provides for mechanisms so that negotiations will be submitted to arbitration should parties fail to arrive at an agreement. Lastly, the

Government points out that by adopting the Act on Collective Labour Relations (Legislative Decree No. 25593), it has confirmed the fundamental rights of workers such as the right to organize, to bargain collectively and to strike, which are essentially intended to promote resolutions to labour disputes without state interference.

772. As regards the alleged restrictions on the right to strike resulting from the fact that the Government included ENAPU PERU in the category of enterprises providing essential services, the Government mentions that, taking into account the primary role of port activities on the national territory, the National Ports Enterprise S.A. (ENAPU) was included in the list of essential services under Supreme Decree No. 075-92-PCM, in order to ensure transportation and the normal operation of national and international trade activities, which affect the economy of the country. The Government adds that limitations on the right to strike, where it affects services which are essential for life in society are just and reasonable, since this right could not possibly be considered as unrestricted, where its exercise would seriously affect or endanger other goods which enjoy legal protection.

773. As to the allegation concerning Decree Act No. 25921, the Government states that this decree establishes a procedure which employers must observe when they wish to suspend or modify economic benefits or employment conditions, or to suspend the work relationship. It adds that this provision is an incentive for employers in view of the economic situation, in order to achieve higher production and improved productivity, which will have positive effects on the economy of the country and the well-being of the workers.

C. The Committee's conclusions

774. The Committee notes that the allegations in this case refer to limitations in the exercise of collective bargaining and the right to strike by FENTENAPU, arising from various legal provisions (Act. No. 25986, Legislative Decree No. 25921, and Supreme Decree No. 075-92), and from certain measures taken by the National Ports Enterprise of Peru (ENAPU PERU).

775. As regards the requirement for prior approval by the National Development Corporation (CONADE) of the clauses of collective bargaining agreements in state-owned enterprises (Act No. 25986), the Committee notes that within the framework of a global economic stabilization programme, the Government is engaged in a rigorous austerity and rationalization plan with respect to public expenditure, in order to alleviate the difficult economic situation the country is faced with and to reduce the fiscal deficit to which most state-owned enterprises contribute, including ENAPU PERU, whose economic and financial results have not been completely satisfactory. Consequently, section 23 of Act No. 25986 limits proposals by state-owned

enterprises covered by Act No. 24948 (Act on State Entrepreneurial Activity) to those proposed by CONADE in accordance with directives from the Ministry of Finance.

776. Accordingly, the Committee refers to its conclusions in a similar case [287th Report, Case No. 1617 (Ecuador), paras. 63 and 64]:

> The Committee is aware that collective bargaining in the public sector calls for verification of the available resources in the various public bodies or undertakings, that such resources are dependent upon state budgets and that the period of duration of collective agreements in the public sector does not always coincide with the duration of the State Budgetary Law - a situation which can give rise to difficulties ... . The Committee ... refers to the following principle formulated by the Committee of Experts when it examined a similar situation [see Report III (Part 4A), 1989 and 1991, pp. 469 and 465 respectively in the English version]: The Committee considers that in so far as the income of public enterprises and bodies depends on state budgets, it would not be objectionable - after wide discussion and consultation between the concerned employers' and employees' organizations in a system having the confidence of the parties - for wage ceilings to be fixed in state budgetary laws, and that neither would it be a matter for criticism that the Ministry of Finance prepare a report prior to the commencement of collective bargaining with a view to ensuring respect of such ceilings.

777. The Committee notes that section 23 of Legislative Decree No. 25986 allows enterprises covered by Act No. 24948 - including ENAPA PERU - only to propose clauses in collective bargaining agreements which are approved by the National Development Corporation (CONADE) in accordance with standards adopted by the Ministry of Finance. In the view of the Committee, irrespective of any opinion expressed by CONADE, the bargaining parties should be free to reach an agreement of their own choosing; if this is not possible, the Committee considers that any exercise by the public authorities of their prerogatives in financial matters, which hampers the free negotiation of collective agreements, is incompatible with the principle of freedom of collective bargaining.

778. In the light of the above, the Committee urges the Government to provide for a mechanism which ensures that, as regards the collective bargaining process in state-owned enterprises (those covered by Act No. 24948 on State Entrepreneurial Activity), both the trade union organizations and the employers are adequately consulted and may express their points of view to the National Development Corporation (CONADE) (the authority responsible for the wage policy of state-owned enterprises).

779. As regards the allegation concerning the signing of the collective agreement submitted by FENTENAPU for 1993, the Committee regrets that ENAPU PERU waited approximately nine months before submitting a proposal, which, as pointed out by the complainant,

entered into force on 1 July 1993, or six months later than should have been the case according to section 43(b) of the Act on Collective Labour Relations (Legislative Decree No. 25593), which establishes that "the collective agreement shall enter into force on the day following the expiry of the previous agreement," thus depriving workers at the enterprise of the corresponding benefits between January and June 1993. The Committee trusts that in the future suitable measures will be promptly taken to avoid such delays, and that the date of entry into force of the enterprise's proposal will be brought into line with section 43(b) of the above Act.

780. As regards the allegation concerning the limitations on the exercise of the right to strike, which followed from the classification of ENAPU PERU as an enterprise providing essential services, the Government mentions that, taking into account the primary role of port activities on the national territory, the National Ports Enterprise S.A. (ENAPU) was included in the list of essential services under Supreme Decree No. 075-92-PCM, in order to ensure transportation and the normal operation of national and international trade activities, which affect the economy of the country. The Committee notes first that, in accordance with sections 1 and 2 of Supreme Decree No. 075-92, services provided by the National Ports Enterprise (ENAPU) are considered to be essential public services coming under the provisions of section 83(h) of Act No. 25593; secondly, that section 83(h) of this Act defines essential public services as those of a strategic nature as well as those entailing national defence or security.

781. In this connection, the Committee has pointed out that the right to strike can be restricted or even prohibited only in essential services in the strict sense of the term (namely, services whose interruption could endanger the life, personal safety or health of the whole or part of the population). [See Digest of decisions and principles of the Freedom of Association Committee, 3rd edition, 1985, para. 394.] In the opinion of the Committee, while the services provided by the National Ports Enterprise (ENAPU) do not constitute essential services as defined above, they are an important public service in which a minimum service could be requested in case of strike. The Committee therefore considers that legislation should contain more precise provisions as to the conditions in which such minimum service should be maintained.

782. As regards the allegation concerning the submission of ENAPU PERU to compulsory arbitration under a tripartite board comprised of three arbitrators, two of which are appointed by the Ministry of Labour (section 67 of Legislative Decree No. 25593), the Government has not sent its observations. The Committee notes that section 67 of this Decree provides that in the case of public services, if there is no agreement through direct negotiation or conciliation, the dispute will be submitted to compulsory arbitration under a tripartite board composed of one arbitrator appointed by each party and a chairman appointed by the labour authority.

783. In this respect, the Committee has previously pointed out that the imposition of compulsory arbitration in the case of a strike should only be applied to essential services in the strict sense of the term [286th Report, Case No. 1620 (Colombia), para. 384].

784. As regards the allegation concerning Legislative Decree No. 25921 (which authorizes employers to suspend or modify work conditions, allowing them to strengthen their hand to avoid negotiation or to delay the signing of collective labour agreements), the Committee notes that section 1 of Legislative Decree No. 25921, published on 3 December 1992, establishes the procedure that employers should follow in order to modify, suspend or substitute economic benefits and work conditions (paragraph (b)), and to lay off workers temporarily (paragraph (c)). Section 2(b), of this Decree also points out that if workers should reject direct negotiation or refuse to take part in such a procedure, or fail to arrive at an agreement by this method, the employer may appeal to the Ministry of Labour to rule on the merits of the issue in question within two weeks, after which the request will be granted in the absence of a decision by the labour authority.

785. In this respect, the Committee considers that a legal provision which allows the employer to modify unilaterally the content of signed collective agreements, or to require that they be renegotiated, is contrary to the principles of collective bargaining.

The Committee's recommendations

786. In the light of its foregoing interim conclusions, the Committee invites the Governing Body to approve the following recommendations:

(a) The Committee urges the Government to provide for a mechanism which ensures that, as regards the collective bargaining process in state-owned enterprises (covered by Act No. 24948 on State Entrepreneurial Activity), both the trade union organizations and the employers are adequately consulted and may express their points of view to the National Development Corporation (CONADE) (the authority responsible for the wage policy of state-owned enterprises).

(b) As regards ENAPU PERU's nine-month delay in submitting a proposal, the Committee trusts that suitable measures will be taken as soon as possible to avoid such delays, and that the date of entry into force of the enterprise's proposal will be brought into line with the provisions of section 43(b) of Legislative Decree No. 25593.

(c) The Committee requests the Government to take steps to modify legislation concerning essential and minimum services, in particular by defining more clearly how the latter should be maintained and as regards the employers' unilateral decision to change conditions of employment, in order to bring the legislation into line with the principles of freedom of association and collective bargaining.

(d) The Committee refers the legislative aspects of the case to the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

Geneva, 25 March 1994.

Jean-Jacques Oecshlin,
Chairman.

293RD REPORT

MEASURES TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FACT-FINDING AND CONCILIATION COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

A. Introduction

1. The Committee on Freedom of Association, set up by the Governing Body at its 117th Session (November 1951), met at the International Labour Office, Geneva, on 17, 18 and 25 March 1994 under the chairmanship of Mr. Jean-Jacques Oechslin, former Chairman of the Governing Body.

2. A complaint concerning alleged infringements of trade union rights against the Government of South Africa was submitted by the Congress of South Africa Trade Unions (COSATU) to the Governing Body at its 240th Session in May-June 1988. In view of the fact that the Republic of South Africa ceased to be a Member of the International Labour Organization on 11 March 1966 but remained a Member of the United Nations, the matter was referred to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC), in accordance with the procedure established between the ILO and the United Nations in regard to complaints concerning violations of trade union rights against States which are not Members of the ILO but which are Members of the United Nations.

3. Following ECOSOC's request to the Government of the Republic of South Africa to give its consent to the complaint being referred to the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association of the ILO (hereinafter "the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission") and following the Government's consent to the referral of this complaint in February 1991, the Governing Body set up a panel of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission to examine this case at its 250th Session (May-June 1991). The Commission issued a very detailed report [see Prelude to change: Industrial relations reform in South Africa: Report of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association concerning the Republic of South Africa, Official Bulletin, Special Supplement, Vol. LXXV, 1992, Series B.] containing numerous recommendations relating to freedom of association and collective bargaining, which was then submitted to the Governing Body at its 253rd Session (May 1992) for transmission to ECOSOC.

4. At its July 1992 Substantive Session, ECOSOC adopted a resolution (No. 1992/12) on "Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights" in which it requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations: to invite the Government to report on the measures which it had taken to give effect to the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission's recommendations; and to refer the Government's report to

the ILO with the request that the ILO in turn report its advice and comments back to ECOSOC after examining the Government's report.

5. On 8 November 1993, the Government transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations a report constituting its response to the recommendations of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission. On 17 November 1993, the Secretary-General of the United Nations transmitted this report to the Director-General.

6. The Committee has examined the information contained in the Government's report as well as recently enacted legislation and submits for the approval of the Governing Body the conclusions it has reached concerning the measures taken to implement the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission's recommendations.

B. The Government's reply on measures taken to implement the recommendations of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association concerning the Republic of South Africa

7. In its communication of 8 November 1993, the Government first of all refers generally to various factors which characterize and shape the contemporary South African labour market such as the high growth rate of the economically active population; the decrease in the number of employment opportunities in the formal sector since the beginning of the recession in 1989; high levels of unemployment related to a negative economic growth rate; current political developments and the situation of unrest in the country; the low levels of education of the South African population (a 1991 census data indicates that 56.4 per cent of the population may be considered as functionally illiterate), resulting in an excess demand for certain categories of skilled workers on the one hand, and an excess supply of unskilled workers, on the other hand; the low percentage of the overall expenditure of South African companies on the training and retraining of workers; and finally, low wage increases and productivity. The Government also mentions certain steps that have been taken and describes certain structures that have been created to address the various problems affecting the labour market.

8. The Government then describes more specifically, recent developments in labour issues and legislation in South Africa. First of all, it indicates that the National Manpower Commission (NMC) which remains an advisory body on labour policy for the Minister of Manpower has been restructured on a tripartite basis and is representative of employers' and workers' organizations and independent experts as well as the State. The first meeting of the restructured NMC was held on 12 February 1993 and until August 1993 this forum held five meetings. Moreover, the restructured NMC established three working groups and seven subcommitteess (whose names are enumerated by the Government) to further investigate specific issues. The Government indicates that the

NMC is considering the simplification of the Labour Relations Act (LRA) and has published for comment, draft legislation to be considered by Parliament in November 1993. The more important amendments concern the simplification and clarification of procedures relating to the settlement of disputes and the deletion of the provisions regarding the prohibition on the political affiliation by trade unions as well as the prohibition on unions to grant directly or indirectly financial assistance to political parties.

9. Regarding labour legislation for farmworkers, the Government states that the Basic Conditions of Employment Act was extended to the agricultural sector on 1 May 1993. The question of the extension of the LRA to agriculture was referred to a working group in which the South African Agricultural Union (SAAU) and COSATU were represented. On 6 August 1993 SAAU and COSATU reached agreement on the issue concerning a single Act - the Agricultural Labour Act No.147 of 1993 - to be applicable to farmworkers. As far as labour legislation for domestic workers is concerned, a bill to extend the Basic Conditions of Employment Act to domestic workers was passed by Parliament during September 1993. In so far as legislation to regulate labour relations in the public sector is concerned, the Public Service Labour Relations Act came into effect on 2 August 1993.

10. The Government points out that the Department of Manpower has embarked on an investigation into the functioning of the Industrial Court system. A committee, consisting of representatives of the major users of the Court, has also been appointed to assist the Department in addressing certain problems in the functioning of the Court and streamlining its operations. Moreover, the Department has considered the problems arising from access to premises and other organizational rights of trade unions and is of the opinion that these matters should be discussed by the interested parties themselves. There is broad consensus, however, that reasonable rights to access and other reasonable organizational rights of unions should be protected. In the interim, any party involved in a dispute on any of these matters is at liberty to bring the matter to the attention of the Industrial Court.

11. The Government concludes by stating that it is aware of the labour standards as developed by the ILO, especially Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, and due cognizance will be taken thereof in the further development of labour legislation and manpower practices. It would be premature, however, at this stage to comment on how a future government would act with regard to possible readmission to the ILO or further ratification of ILO Conventions. The South African Government would nevertheless welcome ILO technical assistance with specific reference to job creation and training on a tripartite basis inside South Africa.

C. The Committee's conclusions

12. The Committee observes in a general manner that major political changes as well as far-reaching changes to labour relations legislation have taken place in South Africa in the period following the publication of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission's report. It notes that the political changes which have occurred - including the adoption of a new Constitution by Parliament (which recognizes the right to associate, organize, bargain and strike), the establishment of a Transitional Executive Council charged with the facilitation and promotion of the transition to a democratic order in South Africa in conjunction with all legislative and executive structures at all levels of government and the possible reincorporation into the Republic of South Africa of the so-called "national states" and "self-governing" territories - have been the result of negotiations between the major political parties and movements at the Multi-Party Negotiating Forum, whereas changes to labour relations legislation have by and large resulted from negotiations between employers, trade unions and the State in the restructured National Manpower Commission (NMC). However, both these changes are relevant to the recommendations of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission, a number of which have already been given effect to while several matters still require attention.

(a) Restructuring of the National Manpower Commission

13. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission considered that the Government should pursue vigorously the steps that were being taken to reactivate the National Manpower Commission (NMC), with a tripartite structure that was acceptable to all the parties concerned. It also recommended that the NMC's recommendations be given prompt and favourable attention by the Government.

14. The Committee notes with interest that the NMC has been restructured as a tripartite body and consists of representatives of employers' and workers' organizations and the Department of Manpower and of independent experts. It further notes that the NMC which has been functioning on a tripartite basis since February 1993 has, through its various working groups and subcommittees, considered all new labour relations legislation elaborated since that date before it was introduced in Parliament. Moreover, under the terms of article 33 of the new Constitution, the State will in future be bound to submit any proposed legislation concerning industrial relations or employment practices to the NMC for consideration and comments before introducing it in Parliament.

(b) Agricultural workers and domestic workers

15. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission recommended that priority be given to the enactment of legislation extending to agricultural and domestic workers trade union and collective bargaining rights in common with other workers in South Africa.

16. Regarding labour legislation for farmworkers, the Committee notes that the Basic Conditions of Employment Act No. 3 of 1983, which deals with minimum terms and conditions of employment was extended to farmworkers with effect from 1 May 1993. This Act also affords protection against victimization on the grounds of, inter alia, union membership although it does not regulate collective bargaining. The Committee further notes that the Agricultural Labour Act No. 147 of 1993 (ALA) came into force for farmworkers on 17 January 1994. While section 1 of the ALA extends the Labour Relations Act No. 28 of 1956 (LRA) to farmworkers, the ALA also contains a number of provisions which apply exclusively to farmworkers, including provision for the establishment of an agricultural labour court which can act as a court of first instance in unfair labour practice disputes between farmworkers and their employers (section 2(d)).

17. The Committee notes with concern, however, that the ALA, which defines farming activities as "any activity on a farm in connection with agriculture, including stockbreeding, horticulture and forestry" (section 2(a)(iii)), declares such activities to be essential services with the result that strikes and lockouts are prohibited, unless an employer and a trade union on behalf of farmworkers working for such employer agree otherwise (section 2(f)). Failing such an agreement, unresolved disputes between farmworkers and their employers are subject to compulsory arbitration as provided for in section 46(1) of the LRA. The Committee recalls, however, that essential services are those services the interruption of which would endanger the life, personal safety or health of all or part of the population and that agricultural activities do not constitute essential services in the strict sense of the term [see Digest of decisions and principles of the Freedom of Association Committee, 3rd edition, 1985, para. 402]. It therefore considers that the Government should take steps to ensure that section 2(f) of the ALA is repealed so that the prohibition on the right to strike of farmworkers is removed.

18. The Committee further notes that while section 1 of the ALA extends the LRA to farmworkers, it also provides that any amendment to the LRA after 1 September 1993 will not apply to farming activities. The Committee is led to understand from this that in practice two versions of the LRA will apply. The LRA as it reads at present will continue to apply to farmworkers, despite the fact that the Act itself is in the process of amendment and that the amended version applicable to industry ("non-farming activities") would substantially comply with the recommendations of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission if it is passed. Thus, in the Committee's view, the recommendations of

the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on the need to amend certain provisions of the LRA remain valid for the version of the Act which applies to farmworkers. These provisions relate, in particular, to the present system for the registration of trade unions (section 4(3)), the control of the contents of their constitutions (section 4(5)(a)(ii) and (iii), section 8(4)(a)(iv), (6)(c) and (d) and (8)), to interference of public authorities in trade union affairs (section 12(1) and (3)) and collective bargaining agreements (section 48(1), section 51(12), section 51A, section 78(IC)), and to restrictions, both substantive and procedural, on strike action (section 1(1), section 27A, section 35, section 46(1), (2) and (7), section 65(1)(d) and (2)(b), section 65(IA)). In the Committee's view, the Government should take steps to ensure that these provisions of the LRA are amended with respect to farmworkers.

19. As regards labour legislation for domestic workers, the Committee observes that the Basic Conditions of Employment Act No. 3 of 1983 was also extended to domestic workers with effect from 1 January 1994. It deeply regrets to note, however, that no legislation has been tabled to date to extend the provisions of the LRA to them. The Committee has been informed that a subcommittee of the NMC is currently dealing with the matter and in particular with the question of how far the LRA should be extended to domestic workers. In this respect, the Committee firmly believes that the Government should ensure that legislation is enacted as quickly as possible granting trade union and collective bargaining rights to domestic workers in South Africa.

(c) "Self-governing" territories and "national states"

20. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission recommended that the Government should address urgently the serious problems posed by the existence of 11 different sets of labour relations legislation in the various territories into which South Africa was divided with a view to ensuring that workers and employers throughout all of these territories enjoyed the basic rights of freedom of association and collective bargaining.

21. The Committee is aware of the fact that the reincorporation into the Republic of South Africa of the so-called "national states" (Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Ciskei and Venda) and "self-governing" territories (KwaNdebele, Kwazulu, Qua Qua, Lebowa, Gazankulu and Kangwane) is currently being negotiated by the Multi Party Negotiating Forum. However, it regrets to note that the Government has not provided any information on whether any measures are currently under way which envisage either the replacement of the legislation in the individual territories by the legislation applicable in South Africa generally or the harmonization of the labour relations legislation of South Africa and the various territories, in order to address the current serious problems posed by the existence of different sets of

labour relations legislation. The Committee has, however, been informed that this matter is being examined by the Government and that proposals will be submitted to the NMC. In the Committee's view, the Government should be requested to give information on whether any measures are being envisaged along the lines mentioned above and, if so, how the Government proposes to implement such measures so as to assure uniformity of labour legislation and standards throughout the Republic of South Africa, including in the various "self-governing" territories and "national states" into which South Africa is divided with a view to ensuring that workers and employers throughout all of these territories enjoy the basic rights of freedom of association and collective bargaining.

(d) The public sector

22. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission recommended that every effort should be made by all the parties concerned to resolve the outstanding issues in the negotiations concerning new legislation to govern labour relations in the public sector so that this legislation could be enacted as soon as possible. The problems specifically highlighted by the Commission in respect of this sector were the following: the prohibition on the registration of mixed public and private sector unions; the absence of protection against victimization; the absence of a right to strike for public servants not rendering essential services; the absence of adequate machinery for collective bargaining and settlement of disputes in all branches of the public service; and the absence of adequate conciliation and arbitration procedures for public servants rendering essential services.

23. First of all, the Committee notes with interest that the Public Service Labour Relations Act No. 102 of 1993 (the PSLRA), came into operation on 2 August 1993 and applies to all public servants, save for persons employed in terms of the Defence Act, Correctional Services Act (Prisons), Police Act and teachers.

24. The Committee further notes that by virtue of section 4(1) of the PSLRA, all employees except for departmental heads and officers employed by the Commission for Administration whose functions are of a policy-making or managerial nature, have the right to establish and, subject only to the rules of the organizations concerned, to join an "employee organization" of their choice or to refrain from establishing or joining any organization. Section 1(xii) of the PSLRA defines an employee organization as an organization consisting wholly or partly of state employees (emphasis added). In this respect, the Committee observes that amendments to section 2(3)(b) and (d) of the LRA which were introduced in 1991 and which provide for the registration of trade unions with a mixed public service and private sector membership, came into force on 1 September 1993, thereby

removing the prohibition on the registration of mixed public and private sector unions.

25. The issue of the absence of protection against victimization is also addressed by the PSLRA which in its section 4(7) prohibits victimization on account of trade union membership or non-membership or participation in the activities of a trade union.

26. With respect to the right to strike, all employees covered by the PSLRA, save those employed in essential services, have the right to strike by virtue of section 19(1), once prescribed conciliation procedures have been exhausted. Section 20(1) defines essential services as services the interruption of which could cause serious hardship to the whole or a part of the community or could endanger the life, safety or health of the members or some of the members of the community; the Committee considers that by referring to "serious hardship to the whole or a part of the community", this definition differs from its own definition, namely services the interruption of which would endanger the life, personal safety or health of the whole or part of the population. It is therefore of the view that this provision should be amended accordingly. Furthermore, section 21 provides for a system of compulsory arbitration for unresolved disputes of interest arising in essential services and which cannot be resolved through collective bargaining. Disputes of right may be dealt with by the industrial court in terms of its unfair labour practice jurisdiction (section 22(5)).

27. As regards adequate machinery for collective bargaining, the Committee notes that the PSLRA establishes a two-tier structure for collective bargaining, at central (Commission for Administration) and departmental level. Whether a matter falls to be negotiated at the one or the other level depends on whether the Commission or a relevant departmental head is empowered to deal with the matter in question under the terms of section 5. The Committee notes with interest that bargaining is compulsory (section 4(12)) and that a right to information for the purposes of collective bargaining is also established (section 4(11)). Moreover, provision is made for access to the premises and facilities of a state department with the prior approval of the head of the department (section 4(10)). Provision is further made for the registration and recognition of trade unions by virtue of sections 11 and 17, respectively.

28. Finally, the Committee notes that while the PSLRA does not apply to teachers, this category of public servants is either already covered by recently enacted legislation or is to be included under the LRA through proposed amendments to the latter. In this connection, the Committee observes that a distinction was made between persons who teach at universities and technikons, and those who teach at a school, technical college or teachers' training college. Although the former are currently still excluded from the LRA, section 2 of the Labour Relations Amendment Bill extends the ambit of the LRA to include teachers at universities and technikons.

29. Moreover, trade union and collective bargaining rights for teachers in the second category are now provided for in the Education Labour Relations Act No. 146 of 1993 (ELRA) which came into force in October 1993. The Committee notes that section 5(1)(a) of the ELRA grants the right to employees falling within its ambit freely to establish or, subject to the rules of the organization concerned, to join a trade union consisting mainly of such employees or to refrain from doing so. Thus, it would appear that teachers from a school, technical college or teachers' training college may only join trade unions which consist mainly of the same category of workers. However, since there does not appear to be any restriction in the ELRA on these organizations of teachers from freely joining a trade union federation (section 1(vi) defines an employee organization to include a federation of employee organizations), the Committee does not consider this provision to be incompatible with freedom of association principles. In addition, the ELRA establishes the right to bargain (section 5(1)(b)), and provision is made for centralized collective bargaining between sufficiently representative trade unions and employer organizations (section 6 and sections 8-14). Furthermore, the right to strike which was previously denied to this category of workers is now provided for by section 15 of the ELRA.

(e) Amendments to the Labour Relations Act No. 28 of 1956

30. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission recommended that the process of revision and consolidation of the Labour Relations Act (LRA) should be pursued vigorously, with two major objectives: to simplify the LRA and structure it in such a way so as to make it more readily usable and understandable; and to ensure the LRA's conformity with international principles on freedom of association. In order to reach the latter objective, the Commission stressed the need to amend a number of the LRA's provisions which related in particular to: (i) the system for the registration of trade unions; (ii) control of the contents of their constitutions; (iii) interference of public authorities in trade union affairs; (iv) interference of public authorities in collective bargaining agreements; and (v) substantive and procedural restrictions on stike action.

31. The Committee notes the Government's statement that the NMC is considering the simplification of the LRA and has published for comment draft legislation to be considered by Parliament soon. The Committee has been informed since then that a bill has been presented to Parliament in December 1993. Requests have been made for comments on the bill. The bill has not yet been discussed in Parliament. The Committee considers that the Government should be requested to provide information on any progress being made in regard to the process of revision and consolidation of the LRA.

(i) The system for the registration of trade unions

32. The Committee notes that under the LRA a trade union is registered in respect of specific interests and for a specific area. It will be so registered if the Registrar is satisfied that it is "sufficiently representative" of those interests in that area. However, if an existing registered union lodges an objection and the Registrar is satisfied that that union is sufficiently representative of the interests and also in the area applied for, he may, under the so-called "knockout provision" (section 4(3)), refuse to register the applicant union. The Committee recalls the principle that a provision authorizing the refusal of an application for registration if another union, already registered, is sufficiently representative of the interests which the union seeking registration proposes to defend, means that, in certain cases, workers may be denied the right to join the organizations of their choice, contrary to the principles of freedom of association [see Digest, op. cit., para. 231]. The Committee notes that the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (hereinafter LRA bill) does not address section 4(3) of the LRA. The Government should therefore take steps to ensure that this provision is amended to take account of the principle enunciated above.

(ii) Control of the contents of trade union constitutions

33. The Committee notes that section 8(4)(a)(iv) of the LRA envisages that a trade union constitution may provide for "any other matter which in the opinion of the Registrar is suitable to be dealt with in the constitution of a trade union ....." (emphasis added). The Committee considers that this section is too widely expressed and gives the Registrar an unfettered discretion to allow or disallow a particular provision in a trade union constitution. It notes with satisfaction, however, that section 7(a) of the LRA bill deletes the phrase "in the opinion of the Registrar", thereby removing his discretion in regard to the other matters which may be dealt with in a trade union constitution.

34. In addition, section 4(5)(a)(ii) of the LRA disallows registration of a trade union whose constitution contains provisions which "are contrary to the provisions of any law or are calculated to hinder the attainment of the objects of any law or are unreasonable in relation to the members of the public" (emphasis added). The Committee considers that the generality of the section leaves open the risk of administrative interference in the content of a trade union's constitution, and therefore notes with satisfaction that section 6 of the LRA bill deletes the phrase "or are unreasonable in relation to the members of the public".

35. The Committee further notes that section 4(5)(a)(iii) of the LRA prohibits the registration of a trade union affiliated to any political party. Moreover, sections 8(6)(c) and (d) and (8) prohibit

a trade union from affiliating with a political party and from providing funds or carrying on any other activities with the object of assisting a political party or any candidates for election to office in a political party or legislative body. In this respect, the Committee would emphasize that a general prohibition on trade unions from engaging in any political activities would not only be incompatible with the principles of freedom of association but also unrealistic in practice since trade union organizations may wish, for example, to express publicly their opinion regarding the government's economic and social policy [see Digest, op. cit., para. 356]. It therefore notes with satisfaction that section 6 of the LRA bill removes the prohibition on the registration of a trade union affiliated to any political party while section 7 of the LRA bill deletes section 8(6)(c) and (d) and amends section 8(8) of the LRA with the effect that trade unions will be allowed freely to affiliate with a political party, to provide funds or carry on any other activities with the object of assisting a political party or any candidates for election to office in a political party or legislative body.

(iii) Interference of public authorities in trade union affairs

36. The Committee notes that section 12(1) of the LRA empowers the Registrar to investigate a union for the benefit of its members when it has become inactive. Section 12(3) gives him wide-ranging powers to conduct an inquiry into the internal affairs of a trade union if he has reason to believe that any material irregularity has occurred in connection with an election, or that the union or any of its officers or organs has failed to observe the constitution or "has acted unlawfully or has acted in a manner which is unreasonable in relation to the members and which has caused serious dissatisfaction amongst a substantial number of members in good standing". If, following his inquiry, the Registrar is satisfied that an irregularity has occurred, he may recommend to the Minister what action he considers should be taken. The Minister may, after giving the union concerned an opportunity to make representations, order the holding of new elections or any other action recommended by the Registrar. There is no right of appeal against the Minister's decision.

37. The Committee is of the view that sections 12(1) and 12(3) of the LRA leave a considerable degree of discretion to the Registrar to investigate the internal affairs of a union, which could result in undue interference. The Committee would recall that while the principles of freedom of association do not prevent the control of the internal acts of a trade union if those internal acts violate legal provisions or rules, it is important that this control be exercised by the judicial authorities, not only to ensure the right of defence (which normal judicial procedure alone can guarantee), but also to avoid the risk that measures taken by the administrative authorities may appear to be arbitrary [see Digest, op. cit., para. 453]. The Committee notes in this respect that while the LRA bill does not

circumscribe the powers of the Registrar, it creates a right of appeal to the Minister against any instruction by the Registrar in terms of section 12(1) of the LRA as well as a further right of appeal to the Supreme Court against the Minister's decision (section 10 of the LRA bill, amending section 16(1) of the LRA). A right to appeal to the Supreme Court against a decision by the Minister taken in terms of section 12(3) of the LRA is also created (section 10 of the LRA bill, amending section 16(5)(a) of the LRA). The Committee considers that the above provision for a right of appeal to the Minister of Manpower and thereafter to the Supreme Court against any instruction by the Industrial Registrar issued after an inquiry into the affairs of a trade union constitutes an adequate safeguard against possible interference by the administrative authorities in trade union affairs.

(iv) Interference of public authorities in collective agreements

38. The Committee notes that section 48(1) of the LRA gives the Minister a discretion to promulgate or not to promulgate agreements freely concluded in industrial councils. In this respect, the Committee recalls the principle that the right to bargain freely with employers with respect to conditions of work constitutes an essential element in freedom of association, and trade unions should have the right, through collective bargaining or other lawful means, to seek to improve the living and working conditions of those whom the trade unions represent, and the public authorities should refrain from any interference which would restrict this right or impede the lawful exercise thereof [see Digest, op. cit., para. 583]. The Committee regrets to note that the LRA bill does not propose any amendment to section 48(1) of the LRA. It considers that the Government should take steps to ensure that this provision is amended in line with the principle enunciated above.

39. Similarly, the Committee regrets to note that the LRA bill does not propose any amendment to section 51(12) of the LRA which empowers the Minister to exempt or exclude certain areas or classes of work from any industrial council agreement, or parts thereof, nor to section 51A of the LRA which allows him to promulgate proposals on employment conditions coming from the employers' side alone in areas where there is no industrial council operating. In this respect, the Committee recalls the importance of the principle of the autonomy of the parties to the collective bargaining process from which it follows that the public authorities should not, as a rule, intervene in order to modify the contents of collective agreements which have been freely concluded [see Digest, op. cit., para. 593]. Moreover, if employers can impose their choice of conditions of employment in an area where there is no industrial council operating, collective bargaining is jeopardized. The Committee therefore believes that the Government should take steps to ensure that sections 51(12) and 51A of the LRA are amended in conformity with freedom of association principles.

40. With regard to section 78(IC) of the LRA which provides that employers may not enter into stop-order arrangements with unregistered unions without the approval of the Minister, the Committee considers the requirement of ministerial approval to constitute an unwarranted interference in collective bargaining. It notes with interest that section 28(a) of the LRA bill deletes section 78(IC) from the LRA.

(v) Restrictions on strike action

41. First of all, the Committee has been informed in this respect that the Transitional Executive Council has adopted a Bill of Rights which recognizes the right to strike. However, it would be appropriate to examine the relevant provisions of the LRA.

- Procedural restrictions

42. In the Committee's view, the complicated nature of the various pre-strike requirements set out in sections 27A, 35 and 65(2)(b) of the LRA have a negative effect on the exercise of the right to strike. However, it notes that sections 14 and 16 of the LRA bill introduce amendments to sections 27A and 35, respectively, of the LRA which will have the effect of: removing the requirements that a trade union which refers a dispute to an industrial council or conciliation board must submit certain prescribed certificates; allowing unregistered unions to refer disputes to industrial councils and also to assist any individual in doing so; and simplifying the procedural requirements which have to be met for the referral of disputes to industrial councils and conciliation boards. The Committee considers that these amendments could simplify the procedural requirements for a strike to be legal under the LRA. However, it would be appropriate to examine the effectiveness of these amendments once they are implemented.

43. The Committee observes, however, that the LRA bill does not introduce any amendments to section 65(2)(b) of the LRA, which requires an affirmative vote of all union members in an undertaking affected by proposed strike action. In this connection, the Committee recalls the principle that the requirement that an absolute majority of workers should be obtained for the calling of a strike may be difficult, especially in the case of unions which group together a larger number of members. A provision requiring an absolute majority may, therefore, involve the risk of seriously limiting the right to strike [see Digest, op. cit., para. 380]. It considers that steps should be taken by the Government to ensure that section 65(2)(b) of the LRA relating to the question of strike ballots is amended so as to bring procedural requirements to render a strike lawful under the LRA into conformity with freedom of association principles.

- Substantive restrictions

44. Furthermore, the LRA bill does not introduce any amendments to sections 1(1) and 65(1A) of the LRA which limit the right to strike to shop-floor issues. The Committee recalls that the right to strike should not be limited solely to industrial disputes that are likely to be solved by the signing of a collective agreement; workers and their organizations should be able to express in a broader context, if necessary, their dissatisfaction as regards economic and social matters affecting their interests [see Digest, op. cit., para. 388]. The Committee accordingly considers that steps should be taken by the Government to ensure that sections 1(1) and 65(1A) of the LRA are amended so as to safeguard the legality of strikes over social and economic issues affecting workers' and trade union rights.

45. The Committee further notes that certain services contained in section 46 of the LRA where compulsory arbitration is substituted for strike action are not essential in the strict sense of the term. In particular, this is the case for the following: local authorities except when they provide essential services in the strict sense of the term, passenger transportation, the handling of perishable foodstuffs and petrol or other fuels for use by public utilities [see Digest, op. cit., para. 402]. Moreover, the Committee regrets to note that section 19(c) of the LRA bill extends the category of essential service workers to include persons working for an employer providing air traffic and navigation services. Therefore, the Government should take steps to ensure that: section 46 of the LRA is amended so that the prohibition of the right to strike is limited to those services which are essential in the strict sense of the term; and section 19(c) of the LRA bill which extends the category of essential service workers to include persons working for an employer providing air traffic and navigation services is deleted.

46. Finally, the Committee notes that those workers engaged in a lawful strike under the LRA receive immunity against criminal prosecution and civil claims but may nevertheless be dismissed. The Committee observes that the LRA bill does not introduce any amendment in this regard, but is of the view that the unfair labour practice provisions of the LRA should be amended so as to provide appropriate protection against dismissal of strikers engaged in a legal strike and of strikers where the strike, although technically illegal, was in all other respects legitimately called for the promotion and defence of workers' economic and social interests. In this connection, the Committee would emphasize that the use of extremely serious measures, such as dismissal of workers for having participated in a strike and refusal to re-employ them, implies a serious risk of abuse and constitutes a violation of freedom of association [see Digest, op. cit., para. 444].

47. In addition, the Committee notes that criminal sanctions for participation in illegal strikes remain in force. Under section 82(1)(d) of the LRA, such action in breach of the LRA is punishable by a fine of up to Rand 1,000 or one year's imprisonment or both. The

Committee shares the view of the Committee of Experts that such sanctions should be imposed only where there have been violations of strike prohibitions which are themselves in conformity with the principles of freedom of association [see General Survey on Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining, 1983, para. 223]. Since it is clear from the Committee's preceding conclusions that several of the strike prohibitions contained in the LRA are not in conformity with freedom of association principles, the provisions of the LRA imposing criminal sanctions for violations of strike prohibitions which are not in conformity with the principles of freedom of association should be repealed.

(f) Racial restrictions on trade union membership

48. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission recommended that a situation should be achieved as rapidly as possible where no trade union or employers' organization limits its membership by reference to race. It recommended that a special officer should be appointed to facilitate, within a given time, the removal of all provisions whereby membership of such organizations, or the holding of office in them, is confined to persons of a particular race.

49. In the absence of any information from the Government in respect of the above recommendation, the Committee is unable to comment on the position at present. The Government should be invited to indicate: (i) whether any applications for the registration of trade unions which limit their membership on the basis of race have been received since the report of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission and what the results of such applications, if any, have been; and (ii) whether interim measures such as those recommended by the Commission regarding the removal from the constitutions of trade unions of provisions which limit their membership on the basis of race have been implemented.

(g) The right of trade unions to function freely

50. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission recommended that security or other legislation which had been used in the past to restrict the right of trade unions to carry on their activities in full freedom should be reformed. More specifically, the Commission recommended that the Fund Raising Act, the Affected Organizations Act and the Disclosure of Foreign Funding Act should be repealed or amended in such a way that they cannot be used so as to interfere with the right of trade unions to administer their financial affairs without undue interference from the public authorities. It also concluded that the Internal Security Act, Publications Act and Public Safety Act have in the past been used and could still be used to:

prevent trade unions from holding public meetings for trade union purposes; restrict the publication and distribution of news and information of general or special interest to trade unions and their members; and to restrict the legitimate activities of trade unions during a state of emergency. It recommended that these Acts should be reformed.

51. The Committee notes that the following bills have introduced a number of amendments to the above-mentioned Acts:

- the Abolition of Restrictions on Free Political Activity bill, which (i) amends the Publications Act by deleting the provisions referred to in paragraph 288 of the report of the Commission (namely, section 47(2)(c), (d) and (e) of the Publications Act); and (ii) amends the Internal Security Act by restricting the powers of the relevant Minister to declare organizations unlawful. Section 4(1) of the Internal Security Act currently allows the Minister to prohibit organizations which promote violence, rioting, disturbance or disorder and authorizes the detention without trial of persons engaged in such acts. Section 2 of the bill deletes the reference to "disturbance or disorder" with the result that the Minister will only be able to act against organizations or individuals who promote violence or rioting. Section 2 of the bill in any event determines that the Minister may only act on the advice of the Transitional Executive Council. (iii) Section 7 of the bill also proposes the repeal of the Affected Organizations Act and Disclosure of Foreign Funding Act;

- the Regulation of Gatherings bill (section 14(2)) proposes the repeal of sections 46(1) and (2) of the Internal Security Act which impose restrictions on freeom of assembly. The bill acknowledges the right of peaceful assembly and lays down guidelines in that regard;

- both the new Constitution and the Transitional Executive Council Act deal with the declaration of states of emergency. The former lays down the conditions under which a state of emergency may be declared and contains a number of safeguards (article 34). The Transitional Executive Council Act stipulates that the State President may use his powers to declare a state of emergency only after consultation with the TEC, who may also review a declaration and direct the State President to withdraw it (section 2(b)).

52. Thus, the Committee notes with satisfaction that substantial progress has been made in the reform of security and related legislation so as to allow trade unions to administer their financial affairs and to carry out legitimate trade union activities without undue interference from the public authorities.

(h) Attacks on trade unionists and trade union property

53. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission recommended that a suitable means should be found under South African law so that outstanding cases of unresolved violence against trade unions and their members may be reopened. It also considered that it was essential that every effort should be made to bring to justice those responsible for acts of violence against trade unionists or trade union property.

54. The Committee regrets to note that the Government has provided no information on the measures taken in respect of the above recommendation, especially in the light of the fact that the Government itself had acknowledged to the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission that the violence required attention. The Committee is of the same view given that evidence before the Commission indicated that more than 70 attacks on trade unionists and trade union premises occurred between 1986 and 1992. In this regard, the Government should be asked to indicate whether any further attacks have been reported since the publication of the Commission's report and whether any persons have been brought to justice for violence against trade unionists or trade union property.

(i) Government interference in trade union activities

55. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission recommended that every possible step should be taken to prevent the recurrence of spying and other covert activities against trade unionists on the part of any agency of the Government. It further recommended that practical measures to this end, such as the establishment of trade union-police liaison committees and police education on trade union functions and rights should be instituted without delay.

56. The Committee again notes the absence of information from the Government regarding the action taken in respect of the above recommendation. The Government should be requested to provide detailed information on the practical measures that have been taken to ensure that the Government's commitment to refrain from interference in the activities of trade unions and their members is respected by all public agencies.

(j) Employer restrictions on access to premises

57. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission concluded that employer restrictions on access to prmises related specifically to the situation as it affected farmworkers, domestic workers and the mining

industry, i.e. industries where workers both lived and worked on their employers' premises. The Commission recommended that the protection provided under the LRA - under the unfair labour practice jurisdiction - should be extended to farmworkers and domestic workers. In relation to the situation in the mining industry, the Commission recommended that remedies should be found which take into account the special difficulties which had arisen historically over access to mine workers by reason of the mine compound system.

58. The Committee notes the Government's statement that the Department of Manpower is of the opinion that the problems arising from access to premises should be discussed by the interested parties themselves. The Committee observes, however, that while the Agricultural Labour Act (ALA) extends the provisions of the LRA - including the industrial court's unfair labour practice jurisdiction - to farmworkers, no provision has been made in the ALA itself for rights of access. Furthermore, under the terms of the Trespass Act No. 6 of 1959 which still remains applicable, any person entering land without the permission of the owner or lawful occupier, unless it is for a lawful reason, commits a criminal offence. As noted earlier on in the Committee's conclusions, domestic workers are still excluded from the LRA. As regards the mining industry, the Committee notes that workers in this industry are covered by the LRA. It nevertheless notes that evidence presented before the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission indicated that the restrictions on access to premises arose pursuant to agreements entered into by the trade union representing mine workers with mine employers (emphasis added). The restrictions appeared in practice to have been imposed by individual mine managements and had affected a large number of matters relating, among other things, to the recruitment of members, the holding of meetings and the use of mine premises for union business.

59. Thus, in view of the absence of statutory rights of access under the LRA, the provisions of the Trespass Act and the difficulties which have arisen over access to mine workers by reason of the mine compound system, the Committee is of the opinion that access by trade unions to workers who are both employed and housed on their employers' premises remains problematic and is an issue which is not likely to be resolved by the interested parties themselves. In this connection, the Committee recalls the principle that workers' representatives should enjoy such facilities as may be necessary for the proper exercise of their functions, including the right of access to workplaces [see Digest, op. cit., para. 143]. In view of the fact that farmworkers, domestic workers and workers in the mining industry are both employed and housed on their employers' premises and given the absence of statutory rights of access under the LRA, the Committee considers that the Government should take the necessary measures to ensure that access is granted freely to workers in these sectors by trade unions and their officials for the purpose of carrying out normal union activities although on the premises of employers, in conformity with freedom of association principles.

The Committee's recommendations

60. In the light of its foregoing conclusions, the Committee invites the Governing Body to approve the following recommendations:

(a) The Committee notes with interest that the Government has taken measures to give effect to a number of the recommendations of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on the following points:

(i) the National Manpower Commission (NMC) has been restructured as a tripartite body and has been functioning as such since February 1993. Moreover, the State will in future be bound to submit any proposed legislation concerning industrial relations or employment practices to the NMC for consideration and comment before introducing it in Parliament;

(ii) the Basic Conditions of Employment Act No. 3 of 1983 has been extended to farmworkers and domestic workers;

(iii) the Public Service Labour Relations Act No. 102 of 1993 (PSLRA) - which applies to all public servnats except for persons employed in terms of the Defence Act, Correctional Services Act (Prisons), Police Act and teachers - addresses the problems identified by the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission in respect of this sector in that it regulates the right to strike, extends protection against anti-union discrimination, and introduces a system for the negotiation and determination of terms and conditions of employment of employees in the various branches of the public service;

(iv) the Labour Relations Amendment bill extends the ambit of the Labour Relations Act to include teachers at universities and technikons, while the Education Labour Relations Act No. 146 of 1993 now grants trade union and collective bargaining rights to teachers who teach at a school, technical college or teachers' training college;

(v) as regards the provisions of the Labour Relations Act (LRA) on the control of the contents of trade union constitutions, sections 7(a) and 6 of the LRA bill amend sections 8(4)(a)(iv) and 4(5)(a)(ii), respectively, of the LRA, thereby removing the risk of administrative interference in the content of a trade union's constitution; section 6 of the LRA bill amends section 4(5)(a)(iii) of the LRA to remove the prohibition on the registration of a trade union affiliated to any political party; and section 7 of the LRA bill deletes section 8(6)(c) and (d) and amends section 8(8) of the LRA with the effect that trade unions will be allowed freely to affiliate with a political party, to provide funds or carry on any other activities with the object of

assisting a political party or any candidates for election to office in a political party or legislative body;

(vi) as regards the interference of public authorities in trade union affairs, the provision contained in the LRA bill for a right of appeal to the Minister of Manpower and thereafter to the Supreme Court against any instruction by the Industrial Registrar issued after an inquiry into the affairs of a trade union constitutes an adequate safeguard against possible interference by the administrative authorities in trade union affairs;

(vii) the LRA bill deletes section 78(IC) of the LRA, which requires ministerial approval in order for employers to enter into stop-order arrangements with unregistered unions;

(viii) substantial progress has been made in the reform of security and related legislation so as to allow trade unions to administer their financial affairs and to carry out legitimnate trade union activities without undue interference from the public authorities;

(ix) a Bill of Rights recognizing the right to strike has been adopted by the Transitional Executive Council.

(b) However, effect has not been given to a number of the recommendations of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission in the following areas:

(i) the Government should take steps to ensure that section 2(f) of the Agricultural Labour Act No. 147 of 1993 is repealed so that the prohibition on the right to strike of farmworkers is removed. Noting that any amendment to the Labour Relations Act No. 28 of 1956 after 1 September 1993 will not apply to farming activities, the Committee is of the view that the recommendations of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on the need to amend certain provisions of the Labour Relations Act remain valid for the version of the Act which applies to farmworkers. The provisions in question, which are enumerated in paragraph 18 of the Committee's conclusions, should therefore be amended;

(ii) legislation should be enacted as quickly as possible to grant trade union and collective bargaining rights to domestic workers in South Africa;

(iii) section 4(3) of the LRA which entitles the Registrar to refuse to register trade unions which cannot satisfy him that they are "sufficiently representative" should be amended to take account of the principle according to which a provision authorizing the refusal of an application for registration if another union, already registered, is sufficiently representative of the interests which the union

seeking registration proposes to defend, means that, in certain cases, workers may be denied the right to join the organizations of their choice, contrary to the principles of freedom of association;

(iv) as regards interference of public authorities in collective agreements, the Government should take steps to ensure that sections 48(1), 51(12) and 51A of the LRA are amended, in line with freedom of association principles;

(v) the Government should take steps to ensure that section 65(2)(b) of the LRA is amended in order to conform to the principle that the requirement that an absolute majority of workers should be obtained for the calling of a strike may be difficult, especially in the case of unions which group together a larger number of members, and that a provision requiring an absolute majority may therefore involve the risk of seriously limiting the right to strike;

(vi) as regards substantive restrictions on strike action, the Government should take steps to ensure that: (1) sections 1(1) and 65(1A) of the LRA are amended so as to safeguard the legality of strikes over social and economic issues affecting workers' and trade union rights; (2) section 20(1) of the PSLRA is amended to bring it into conformity with the notion of essential services in the strict sense of the term as defined by the Committee; (3) section 46 of the LRA is amended so that the prohibition of the right to strike is limited to those services which are essential in the strict sense of the term; (4) section 19(c) of the LRA bill which extends the category of essential service workers to include persons working for an employer providing air traffic and navigation services is deleted; (5) the unfair labour practice provisions of the LRA are amended to provide appropriate protection against dismissal of strikers engaged in a legal strike and of strikers where the strike, although technically illegal, was in all other respects legitimately called for the promotion and defence of workers' economic and social interests; and (6) the provisions of the LRA imposing criminal sanctions for violations of strike prohibitions which are not in conformity with freedom of association principles are repealed;

(vii) the Government should take the necessary measures to ensure that access is granted freely to farmworkers, domestic workers and workers in the mining industry by trade unions and their officials for the purpose of carrying out normal union activities although on the premises of employers.

(c) The Committee considers that the Government should, moreover, provide information on the following points:

(i) the Government should provide information on whether any measures concerning the replacement or the harmonization of the legislation in the various "self-governing" territories and "national states" are being envisaged and, if so, how the Government proposes to implement them so as to assure uniformity of labour legislation and standards in the various territories into which South Africa is currently divided;

(ii) the Government should provide information on any progress being made in regard to the process of revision and consolidation of the Labour Relations Act (LRA);

(iii) the Government should indicate: (i) whether any applications for the registration of trade unions which limit their membership on the basis of race have been received since the report of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission and what the results of such applications, if any, have been; and (ii) whether interim measures such as those recommended by the Commission regarding the removal from the constitutions of trade unions of provisions which limit their membership on the basis of race have been implemented;

(iv) the Government should indicate whether any further attacks on trade unionists and trade union premises have been reported since the publication of the report of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission, and whether any persons have been brought to justice for violence against trade unionists or trade union property;

(v) the Government should provide detailed information on the practical measures that have been taken - such as the establishment of trade union-police liaison committees and police education on trade union functions and rights - to ensure that the Government's commitment to refrain from interference in the activities of trade unions and their members is respected by all public agencies.

(d) The Committee notes that while measures have been taken to give effect to a number of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission's recommendations, a number of them have not as yet been implemented. It therefore recommends that the Government of South Africa be invited, through the Economic and Social Council as appropriate, to continue submitting reports on the measures taken to give effect to the Commission's recommendations, that ECOSOC transmit such reports to the Director-General of the ILO and that he provide any advice and comments which ECOSOC might wish to have on them.

Geneva, 25 March 1994.

Jean-Jacques Oechslin,
Chairman.

1994 price:
Annual subscription: 140 Swiss francs
Price per number: 30 Swiss francs

ISSN 0378-5882 (Series A)
ISSN 0378-5890 (Series B)

The designations employed in the *Official Bulletin,* which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

ILO publications can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. A catalogue or list of new publications will be sent free of charge from the above address.

Changes of address, orders, renewals and advertising correspondence should be addressed to: ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland.

Changes of address, indicating both the old and the new address, should be sent at least six weeks in advance. If possible kindly enclose a recent mailing label. Claims for undelivered copies must be made immediately on receipt of the following issue.

Printed by the International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland

ISSN 0378-5890

If this address is wrong, please return this sheet to the sender or, at least, the part bearing the address

Pour tout changement d'adresse, prière de renvoyer à l'expéditeur cette feuille ou, du moins, la partie comportant l'adresse

Sírvase indicar el cambio de dirección del destinatario y enviar esta hoja al remitente, o al menos la parte en que esté escrita la dirección

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE
BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DU TRAVAIL
OFICINA INTERNACIONAL DEL TRABAJO
CH-1211 GENÈVE 22

P. P.
1211 GENÈVE 22

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

OFFICIAL BULLETIN

Vol. LXXVII, 1994 — *Series B, No. 2*

294th Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association

CONTENTS

Earlier reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association have been published as follow:

Report	Publication		
	Report of the International Organization to the United Nations (Geneva, ILO)		
1-3	Sixth Report (1952), Appendix V		
4-6	Seventh Report (1953), Appendix V		
7-12	Eighth Report (1954), Appendix II		
	Official Bulletin		
	Volume	Year	Number[1]
13-14	XXXVII	1954	4
15-16	XXXVIII	1955	1
17-18	XXXIX	1956	1
19-24[2]	XXXIX	1956	4
25-26	XL	1957	2
27-28[2]	XLI	1958	3
29-45	XLIII	1960	3
46-57	XLIV	1961	3
58	XLV	1962	1 S
59-60	XLV	1962	2 SI
61-65	XLV	1962	3 SII
66	XLVI	1963	1 S
67-68	XLVI	1963	2 SI
69-71	XLVI	1963	3 SII
72	XLVII	1964	1 S
73-77	XLVII	1964	3 SII
78	XLVIII	1965	1 S
79-81	XLVIII	1965	2 S
82-84	XLVIII	1965	3 SII
85	XLIX	1966	1 S
86-88	XLIX	1966	2 S
89-92	XLIX	1966	3 SII
93	L	1967	1 S
94-95	L	1967	2 S
96-100	L	1967	3 SII
101	LI	1968	1 S
102-103	LI	1968	2 S

Report	Publication		
104-106	LI	1968	4 S
107-108	LII	1969	1 S
109-110	LII	1969	2 S
111-112	LII	1969	4 S
113-116	LIII	1970	2 S
117-119	LIII	1970	4 S
120-122	LIV	1971	2 S
123-125	LIV	1971	4 S
126-133	LV	1972	S
134-138	LVI	1973	S
139-145	LVII	1974	S
146-148	LVIII	1975	Series B, Nos. 1-2
149-152	LVIII	1975	" No. 3
153-155	LIX	1976	" No. 1
156-157	LIX	1976	" No. 2
158-159	LIX	1976	" No. 3
160-163	LX	1977	" No. 1
164-167	LX	1977	" No. 2
168-171	LX	1977	" No. 3
172-176	LXI	1978	" No. 1
177-186	LXI	1978	" No. 2
187-189	LXI	1978	" No. 3
190-193	LXII	1979	" No. 1
194-196	LXII	1979	" No. 2
197-198	LXII	1979	" No. 3
199-201	LXIII	1980	" No. 1
202-203	LXIII	1980	" No. 2
204-206	LXIII	1980	" No. 3
207	LXIV	1981	" No. 1
208-210	LXIV	1981	" No. 2
211-213	LXIV	1981	" No. 3
214-216	LXV	1982	" No. 1
217	LXV	1982	" No. 2
218-221	LXV	1982	" No. 3
222-225	LXVI	1983	" No. 1
226-229	LXVI	1983	" No. 2
230-232	LXVI	1983	" No. 3

Report	Publication		
233	LXVII	1984	Series B, No. 1
234-235	LXVII	1984	" No. 2
236-237	LXVII	1984	" No. 3
238	LXVIII	1985	" No. 1
239-240	LXVIII	1985	" No. 2
241-242	LXVIII	1985	" No. 3
243	LXIX	1986	" No. 1
244-245	LXIX	1986	" No. 2
246-247	LXIX	1986	" No. 3
248-250	LXX	1987	" No. 1
251-252	LXX	1987	" No. 2
253	LXX	1987	" No. 3
254-255	LXXI	1988	" No. 1
256-258	LXXI	1988	" No. 2
259-261	LXXI	1988	" No. 3
262-264	LXXII	1989	" No. 1
259-261	LXXI	1988	" No. 3
262-264	LXXII	1989	" No. 1
265-267	LXXII	1989	" No. 2
268-269	LXXII	1989	" No. 3
270-271	LXXIII	1990	" No. 1
272-274	LXXIII	1990	" No. 2
275-276	LXXIII	1990	" No. 3
277	LXXIV	1991	" No. 1
278	LXXIV	1991	" No. 2
279-280	LXXIV	1991	" No. 3
281-282	LXXV	1992	" No. 1
283	LXXV	1992	" No. 2
284-285	LXXV	1992	" No. 3
286	LXXVI	1993	" No. 1
287-288	LXXVI	1993	" No. 2
289-290	LXXVI	1993	" No. 2
291	LXXVI	1993	" No. 3
292-293	LXXVII	1994	" No. 1

[1] The letter S, followed as appropriate by a roman numeral, indicates a supplement. [2] For communications relating to the 23rd and 27th Reports, see *Official Bulletin*, Vol. XLIII, 1960, No 3.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

OFFICIAL BULLETIN

Vol. LXXVII *1994* *Series B, No. 2*

294th Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association [1]

I. Introduction

1. The Committee on Freedom of Association, set up by the Governing Body at its 117th Session (November 1951), met at the International Labour Office, Geneva, on 2, 3 and 20 June 1994, under the chairmanship of Mr. Jean-Jacques Oechslin, former Chairman of the Governing Body.

2. The member of the Committee of Argentinian nationality was not present during the examination of the case relating to Argentina (Case No. 1745).

* * *

3. The Committee is currently seized of 100 cases, in which complaints have been submitted to the governments concerned for observation. At its present meeting, it examined 28 cases on the merits, reaching definitive conclusions in 20 cases and interim conclusions in eight cases; the remaining cases were adjourned for the reasons set out in the following paragraphs.

NEW CASES

4. The Committee adjourned until its next meeting the cases relating to: Nicaragua (Nos. 1764 and 1776), Bulgaria (No. 1765), Portugal (No. 1766), Ecuador (No. 1767), Iceland (No. 1768), Costa Rica (Nos. 1770, 1780 and 1781), Pakistan (No. 1771), Cameroon (No. 1772), Indonesia (No. 1773), Australia (No. 1774), Belize (No. 1775), Argentina (No. 1777) and Guatemala (No. 1778) and Canada (No. 1779) because it is awaiting information and observations from the governments concerned. All these cases relate to complaints submitted since the last meeting of the Committee.

[1] The 294th Report was examined and approved by the Governing Body at its 261st Session (June 1994).

OBSERVATIONS REQUESTED FROM GOVERNMENTS

5. The Committee is still awaiting observations or information from the governments concerned in the cases relating to: Peru (Nos. 1527, 1541 and 1598), Malaysia (No. 1552), Spain (No. 1561), Venezuela (Nos. 1612 and 1676), Morocco (Nos. 1640 and 1646), Costa Rica (Nos. 1678 and 1695), El Salvador (Nos. 1693, 1754 and 1757), Turkey (Nos. 1727 and 1755), Canada (Nos. 1733, 1743, 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750 and 1758), Guatemala (No. 1740), Argentina (No. 1744), Burundi (No. 1753), the Czech Republic (No. 1762) and Norway (No. 1763). As regards Peru (Cases Nos. 1527, 1541 and 1598), the Government announced that it was going to send its observations soon. Concerning the Russian Federation (Case No. 1769), the Committee is awaiting observations from the Government on the last communication of the complaints.

OBSERVATIONS REQUESTED FROM COMPLAINANTS AND/OR GOVERNMENTS

6. With respect to Cases Nos. 1658 (Dominican Republic) and 1665/1667 (Ecuador), the Committee observes that, in spite of the time which has elapsed since its first request, it has not yet received the observations requested from the complainants. The Committee is therefore compelled to consider these cases as closed. In Case No. 1651 (India), the Committee is awaiting comments and observations from both the complainants and the Government. In Case No. 1736 (Argentina), the Committee is awaiting comments from the complainants. In Case No. 1738 (Canada/Newfoundland), the Committee requests the complainants to submit additional information in support of their complaint. The Committee requests the complainants and the governments concerned to transmit, without delay, the observations and information requested.

PARTIAL INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS

7. In Cases Nos. 1678 and 1695 (Costa Rica) and 1729 (Ecuador) the governments have sent certain information on the allegations made. The Committee requests them to send the remaining information without delay so that it can examine these cases in full knowledge of the facts.

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS

8. The Committee intends to examine the substance of Cases Nos. 1718 (Philippines), 1723 and 1741 (Argentina), 1732 and 1751 (Dominican Republic), 1752 (Myanmar), and 1756 (Indonesia) at its next meeting.

* * *

9. In Cases Nos. 1682, 1711 and 1716 concerning Haiti, the Committee was seized with complaints lodged respectively by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), the World Confederation of Labour (WCL) and the General Independent Organization of Haitian Workers (OGITH). These cases concern allegations

referring mainly to detentions and dismissals of trade unionists and are directed against the military authorities who exercise actual control within the country. The Committee faces a specific procedural problem in these cases since the allegations could only be transmitted to the Haitian Government recognized by the international community, although it cannot be held responsible for the acts which are the subject of the complaints. Although it does not have any reply at its disposal, the Committee envisages examining these cases at its next meeting so as to determine which principles of freedom of association are at stake in these cases.

DIRECT CONTACTS MISSIONS

10. As regards Case No. 1594 (Côte d'Ivoire), concerning a complaint presented under article 26 of the ILO Constitution, the Committee had considered that it would be highly appropriate, in view of the importance of this case and of the seriousness of the issues raised, that a representative of the Director-General undertake a direct contacts mission to the country and report to the Committee. In a communication of 19 May 1994, the Government indicates that it is willing to accept such a mission. The Committee takes note of this information and expresses the hope that this mission will take place shortly.

11. As regards Case No. 1698 concerning New Zealand, the Committee has been informed that the Government has accepted a direct contacts mission and that discussions are under way with a view to determining the specific details of the mission.

URGENT APPEALS

12. As regards Cases Nos. 1512/1539 and 1734 (Guatemala), 1647 (Côte d'Ivoire), 1685 and 1739 (Venezuela) and 1699 (Cameroon), the Committee observes that, despite the time which has elapsed since the presentation of these complaints or since their last examination, it has not received the Governments' observations. The Committee draws the attention of all these Governments to the fact that, in accordance with the procedural rules set out in paragraph 17 of its 127th Report, approved by the Governing Body, it may present a report on the substance of these cases, even if the observations or information requested from the Governments have not been received in due time. The Committee accordingly requests the Governments to transmit their observations or information as a matter of urgency.

ABSENCE OF REPLIES FROM GOVERNMENTS

13. Amongst the cases examined on the merits, the Committee must present a report on the cases concerning Guinea (No. 1703), Morocco (Nos. 1709 and 1724) and Pakistan (No. 1726) without having received the observations of the Government concerned. The Committee deplores this situation which reflects a failure to cooperate on the part of the Governments concerned and emphasizes, in the interests of these Governments, the importance of a prompt, detailed and full reply from Governments

against whom complaints are lodged so that the Committee can take into account the views expressed by all parties concerned.

* * *

14. The Committee draws the legislative aspects of Cases Nos. 1568 (Honduras), 1582 (Turkey), 1648/1650/1731 (Peru), 1726 (Pakistan), 1730 (United Kingdom), 1742 (Hungary) and 1760 (Sweden) to the attention of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

EFFECT GIVEN TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE AND THE GOVERNING BODY

15. As regards Cases Nos. 1434 and 1477 (Colombia), the Committee had requested the Government at its March 1994 meeting [see 292nd Report, paras. 230 to 265] to keep it informed of the developments in all legal proceedings under way concerning the murders, disappearances and attacks involving trade union leaders and trade unionists and to keep it informed of any release or of any indictments of trade unionists who had been detained on 22 November 1992, 30 May and 11 June 1993. The Committee had also requested the Government to keep it informed of the developments in cases filed by members of the trade union of employees of the Bank of Caldas (SINDEBANCALDAS) against this bank in both criminal and labour courts, and of the various allegations concerning the Colgate Palmolive and Croydon enterprises and the Cauca Family Compensation Fund. In a communication of 28 April 1994, the Government states that it has taken the necessary steps to gather information on the legal proceedings under way concerning all acts of violence (and it communicates information on the legal situation with regard to a number of those who have been prejudiced) as well as on the allegations relating to the above-mentioned enterprises. The Committee takes note of this information and trusts that the Government will communicate shortly the information requested.

16. As regards Case No. 1569 (Panama), the Committee had requested the Government at its February 1992 meeting [see 281st Report, paras. 118 to 146] to take new measures with a view to obtaining the reinstatement of the trade union leaders and workers who were dismissed by the Water and Electricity Board (IRHE) and the National Telecommunications Board (INTEL) on account of a strike in December 1990, and to keep it informed of the outcome of the appeals lodged by these workers before the Third Chamber of the Supreme Court. Subsequently, the Government had indicated that the Supreme Court had handed down several decisions stating that the dismissals that took place under Act No. 25 of 1990 were not illegal. In communications of 27 and 29 October 1993 respectively, the Trade Union of Water and Electricity Board Workers (SITIRHE) and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) had criticized these decisions since they affirmed the legality of the dismissals which took place by virtue of this Act, and since several trade unionists were without jobs as a result of these judicial decisions. In a communication of 12 January 1994, the Government had stated that the decisions of the Supreme Court were final, that they were not subject to appeal and that the principle of separation of powers prevailed in the country. In a communication of 14 December 1993, the Latin American Central of Workers (CLAT) had alleged that on 10 November 1993, 134 workers (including a trade union leader)

from the Water Board were suspended then dismissed within the framework of a restructuring process with the approval of the Minister of Labour and in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court had ordered the suspension of this measures following an application for *amparo* (enforcement of constitutional rights). In a communication of March 1994, the Government indicates, with regard to the CLAT's allegations, that the dismissals took place following a staff reduction programme for economic reasons in accordance with the applicable rules. Similarly, the Government specifies that an inquiry was carried out into the economic situation of the IRHE and that trade union organizations were consulted. Finally, the Government adds that the trade union leader who had been suspended had been reinstated and it provides a copy of the reinstatement decision dated December 1993. The Committee takes due note of the fact that this trade union leader was reinstated in his post. It recalls that it can examine allegations concerning economic rationalization programmes — whether or not they imply redundancies — only in so far as they might have given rise to acts of discrimination or interference against trade unions. However, in the present case, the restructuring process appears to be of a general nature and does not seem to have affected only trade unionists (according to the complainants a single trade union leader was suspended) but also several workers. Furthermore, the Committee observes that the complainants do not furnish any proof whereby these redundancies could be categorized as acts of anti-union discrimination. The Committee regrets that the decisions of the Supreme Court stated that the dismissals that took place by virtue of Act No. 25 of 1990 were not illegal. Taking into account its previous recommendations and the new staff reduction programme, the Committee requests the Government to take measures to obtain the reinstatement of the greatest possible number of workers of the IRHE and, in particular, trade union leaders.

17. Regarding Case No. 1572 (Philippines), at its 259th Session (March 1994), the Committee had requested inter alia to be kept informed of developments in the situation of a number of trade union members and leaders. In a communication of 20 May 1994, the Government stated that it could not pursue its investigation without detailed and updated information, particularly as it affects the individuals mentioned in the complaint, and that it has requested such information from the President of the complainant organization. The Committee notes that the Government will provide this information as soon as it is received. It further requests the Government to indicate whether it has opened the inquiries mentioned in its previous recommendations [292nd Report, para. 312(b) and (c)], and to keep it informed of their findings.

18. As regards Case No. 1582 (Turkey), the Committee had requested the Government at its February 1992 meeting [see 281st Report, paras. 223 to 236] to keep it informed of the necessary steps taken to guarantee trade union rights and freedoms for public sector employees, including those employed in the banking sector, as well as the right to strike of workers in the banking sector. In a communication of 21 January 1994, the Government states that since the ratification by Turkey of Conventions Nos. 87 and 151, legislative work aimed at guaranteeing freedom of association for all public sector workers including those employed in the banking sector had started and that the social partners could already comment on a draft Bill on the matter. The Government adds that while the legislative work is at this stage, public sector workers already enjoy in practice the right to establish occupational organizations since the Prime Ministerial Circular No. 1993/15 of 15 June 1993 removed any remaining obstacles in this respect. The