



FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

**Standard-setting policy: Ratification
and promotion of fundamental ILO
Conventions****Contents**

	<i>Page</i>
I. Overview	2
A. Forced or compulsory labour	4
1. Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)	4
2. Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)	5
B. Freedom of association	6
1. Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)	6
2. Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)	7
C. Non-discrimination	8
1. Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)	8
2. Discrimination, Employment and Occupation Convention, 1958 (No. 111)	8
D. Child labour	9
1. Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)	9
2. Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182)	11
II. References to ILO assistance	14
III. Concluding remarks	15

Appendices

1. Ratifications or confirmations of previous commitments since the start of the campaign for the ratification of the fundamental Conventions	17
2. Table of ratifications and information concerning the ILO's fundamental Conventions	21

1. As stated at the last meeting of the LILS Committee,¹ in order to avoid possible conflicts with the procedure of the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up, the progress made in the ratification of the fundamental ILO Conventions and on the future prospects for the ratification of these instruments will in future be examined at the November session of the Governing Body, while the technical assistance provided by the ILO as part of the campaign to promote ratification of the fundamental Conventions will be examined at its March session.
2. It will be recalled that on 25 May 1995 the Director-General launched the campaign to promote the fundamental ILO Conventions with a view to their universal ratification. Each year he submits a report, for information, to the Governing Body on progress made in the ratification of the fundamental ILO Conventions during the previous year and on the future prospects for the ratification of these instruments – based on information communicated by the member States. On 8 August 2000, the Director-General sent a seventh circular letter to governments of countries that had not ratified all the fundamental Conventions, asking them to explain their position with regard to these Conventions and in particular to indicate whether or not their position had changed since their previous communication and whether the information given in that communication was still valid.
3. Part I of this document summarizes prospects for ratification based on replies received to date to the Director-General's seventh circular letter.² As regards the position of member States which did not reply to the Director-General's last circular letter, the members of the Committee are requested to refer to documents GB.277/LILS/5 and GB.277/11/2 (paragraphs 9-16), which summarize the information communicated by these countries by last March.³ As in previous years, information received after 29 September 2000 will be communicated orally to the Committee during the examination of this document. Part II of the document deals with countries that have requested the assistance of the ILO or referred to it, and part III contains concluding remarks.

¹ See footnote No. 1 to document GB.277/LILS/5.

² As at 29 September 2000, 63 ILO member States had replied to the Director-General's letter of 8 August 2000: *Albania, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Mozambique, Myanmar, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Ukraine, United States, Viet Nam.*

³ Information on the ratification prospects for the fundamental Conventions in certain countries, communicated to the Office outside the framework of the current exercise (information obtained under article 19, paragraph 5, of the ILO Constitution; the reading of official gazettes; or information communicated by the permanent missions in Geneva or the ILO multidisciplinary advisory teams; etc.), will be accompanied by an asterisk (*). In addition, at the end of each of the sections of this document, dealing with one of the eight ILO fundamental Conventions, the names of countries that have *never* supplied any information on the ratification prospects of the instrument in question will be recalled.

I. Overview

4. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, 47 new ratifications of Conventions – or confirmations of previous commitments – have been registered, bringing to 230⁴ the number of ratifications since the beginning of the campaign and to 98⁵ the number of member States to have ratified fundamental ILO Conventions since the launch of the campaign in May 1995. These 47 new ratifications are broken down as follows: Convention No. 29 has not received any new ratifications since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body; Convention No. 87 was ratified by *Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis* and the *United Republic of Tanzania*; Convention No. 98 by *Saint Kitts and Nevis*; Convention No. 100 by *Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis* and *South Africa*; Convention No. 105 by *Azerbaijan* and *India*; Convention No. 111 by *Bahrain, Papua New Guinea* and *Saint Kitts and Nevis*; Convention No. 138 by *Austria, Burundi, Central African Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Japan, Madagascar, South Africa, United Kingdom, Yemen* and *Zimbabwe*; Convention No. 182 by *Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo* and *Yemen*. As at 29 September 2000, replies had been received from 63⁶ of the 153 countries⁷ to which the Director-General's last circular letter had been sent. Taking into account the ratifications registered since March 2000, *Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Portugal, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo* and *Yemen* are now among the countries that have ratified all eight fundamental Conventions.
5. One of the objectives of the Director-General's initiative launched in May 1995 is to achieve *universal ratification* of the ILO's fundamental human rights Conventions, the second being to promote the *effective application* of the principles enshrined in these instruments. Of the 175 ratifications needed for each Convention in order to achieve this goal, 153 ratifications have been registered to date for Convention No. 29, 131 for Convention No. 87, 147 for Convention No. 98, 148 for Convention No. 100, 146 for

⁴ The full list of ratifications registered since the beginning of the campaign is annexed.

⁵ *Albania, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Switzerland, Tajikistan, United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.*

⁶ See footnote No. 2 for the list of the countries concerned.

⁷ In accordance with the decisions adopted by the United Nations, the Director-General did not send any communications to the following two countries: *Somalia* and *Yugoslavia* (the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, i.e. the territory comprising Serbia and Montenegro). Naturally no letter was sent to member States that had ratified all the fundamental Conventions as at 8 August 2000.

Convention No. 105,⁸ 144 for Convention No. 111, 100 for Convention No. 138, and 37 for Convention No. 182, making a total of 1,006 ratifications of the fundamental Conventions.⁹

6. To date, of the Organization's 175 member States, 24 countries¹⁰ have ratified the eight fundamental ILO Conventions, 53 countries¹¹ have ratified seven, 40 countries¹² have ratified six and 19 countries¹³ have ratified five. By comparison, 13 countries have ratified only one¹⁴ or two¹⁵ fundamental Conventions and only two – *Gambia* and *Kiribati* – have not ratified any. According to the information available to the Office, it appears that *Gambia* decided to ratify Conventions Nos. 29, 87, 98, 100, 105, 111 and 138 during 1999; the ILO is waiting to receive the related ratification instruments. As regards *Kiribati*, it will be recalled that this country has only been a Member of the Organization since 3 February 2000.

⁸ This total does not take into consideration the ratification – followed by the denunciation – of this Convention by *Malaysia* and *Singapore*.

⁹ At the end of August 2000, the ILO passed the threshold of 1,000 ratifications of the fundamental Conventions. It will be recalled that the objective of the campaign will only be fully achieved when the ILO has registered the 1,400th ratification (i.e. 175 member States x eight fundamental Conventions).

¹⁰ *Belize, Botswana, Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Yemen.*

¹¹ *Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Israel, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Republic of Moldova, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia.*

¹² *Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, Haiti, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Yugoslavia* (this refers to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Pursuant to decisions taken by the ILO Governing Body on the basis of relevant United Nations resolutions, no State has been recognized as the continuation of that Member), *Zimbabwe.*

¹³ *Angola, Canada, Comoros, Djibouti, Estonia, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan.*

¹⁴ *Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Oman, Solomon Islands.*

¹⁵ *Armenia, Bahrain, China, Equatorial Guinea, Myanmar, Namibia, Singapore, United States, Viet Nam.*

A. Forced or compulsory labour**1. Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)**

7. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, no new ratification has been registered for Convention No. 29. The number of ratifications registered for this instrument to date is therefore still 153.
8. According to the latest information available to the ILO,¹⁶ *Bolivia** is re-examining the possibility of ratifying Convention No. 29 and *Gambia** has taken the necessary measures for ratifying Conventions Nos. 29, 87, 98, 100, 105, 111 and 138.

Ratification proposal currently before the competent authorities

9. The Government of *Ethiopia* informed the ILO that a proposal for the ratification of Conventions Nos. 29 and 182 was currently before Parliament. The Government of *Mozambique* indicated that a proposal for the ratification of Conventions Nos. 29, 138 and 182 was put before the Assembly of the Republic in August.

Ratification procedure under way

10. The Government of *Canada* stated that the process for consultation of the constituent entities (states, provinces, territories) intended to obtain their approval with a view to the ratification of Convention No. 29 was still under way and was due to be completed by the end of this year. The Government of the *Philippines* stated that the procedure for the ratification of the Convention was going ahead.

Ratification being considered

11. The Government of *Armenia* stated that Conventions Nos. 29, 98, 105, 138 and 182 were being considered with a view to their possible ratification. The Government of the *United States* confirmed that the ratification of Conventions Nos. 29, 100 and 138 was still being considered. The Government of *Kazakhstan* declared that it was contemplating the possible ratification of Conventions Nos. 29, 98, 100, 105 and 138.

Ratification not being considered

12. The Government of *China* considered that conditions were not yet right for the ratification of Conventions Nos. 29, 87, 98 and 105.
13. To date, the ILO still has no official information on prospects for the ratification of this instrument by *Afghanistan* and *Kiribati*.

¹⁶ See footnote No. 3.

2. **Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)**

14. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, Convention No. 105 has been ratified by *Azerbaijan* and *India*, bringing the total number of ratifications of this instrument to 146.¹⁷
15. The ILO is currently in possession of the instrument of ratification of Convention No. 105 by *Bosnia and Herzegovina* and has asked the Government for some clarification.
16. The position of *Armenia*, *China*, *Gambia** and *Kazakhstan* on the prospects of ratification of the Convention is set out in the section on Convention No. 29.

Ratification approved by the competent authorities

17. The Government of *Ukraine* informed the ILO that the parliamentary committee for social affairs and employment unanimously recommended the ratification of Conventions Nos. 105 and 182 to Parliament.

Ratification being considered

18. The Governments of *Japan* (also concerns Conventions Nos. 111 and 182), *Myanmar* (also concerns Conventions Nos. 98, 100, 111 and 138) and *Oman* (also concerns Conventions Nos. 87, 98, 100, 111, 138 and 182) stated that the ratification of the Convention was still being considered.

Ratification not being considered

19. The Government of *Qatar* stated that, for the ratification of Conventions Nos. 87, 98, 100, 105 and 138, its national legislation had to be brought into line first. The Government of *Singapore* stated that it was taking measures to produce gradual changes in the situation with a view to possible ratification of Conventions Nos. 87, 100, 105, 111 and 138 and explained that it would only ratify them if it felt able to comply without difficulty with the provisions of the Conventions. The Government of *Malaysia* emphasized that the grounds for its country's denunciation of the ratification of the Convention remained.
20. To date, the ILO still has no official information on prospects for the ratification of this instrument by *Kiribati*, *Solomon Islands* and *Yugoslavia*.¹⁸

¹⁷ See footnote No. 8.

¹⁸ This refers to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, i.e. the territory comprising Serbia and Montenegro. It will be recalled that, in accordance with the decisions adopted by the United Nations, the Director-General did not send any communications to the Government of this country on the ratification prospects for the fundamental Conventions which it has not ratified.

B. Freedom of association**1. Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)**

21. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, Convention No. 87 has been ratified by *Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis* and the *United Republic of Tanzania*, bringing the total number of ratifications of this instrument to date to 131.
22. The ILO has been informed that the instrument for ratification of Convention No. 87 by *Kazakhstan* is ready but has not yet received it. The Government of the *Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* has also just sent it a copy of the ratification instruments for Conventions Nos. 87 and 182 and has informed the ILO that the ambassador would hand over the original documents officially to the Director-General during the month of October.
23. The position of *China* and *Gambia** concerning ratification prospects for this instrument is set out in the section on Convention No. 29, and that of *Oman, Qatar* and *Singapore* is reflected in the section on Convention No. 105.

Ratification approved by the competent authorities

24. The Government of *Saint Vincent and the Grenadines* informed the ILO that, since the competent authorities had approved the ratification of Conventions Nos. 87, 100, 111, 138 and 182, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was preparing the related ratification instruments.

Ratification proposal currently before the competent authorities

25. The Governments of *Angola* (also concerns Convention No. 138) and *Armenia* informed the Office that a proposal for the ratification of Convention No. 87 was currently before the National Assembly. The Government of *Fiji* stated that, following the events of 19 May 2000 in the country, the proposal for the ratification of Conventions Nos. 87, 100, 111, 138 and 182 – which had been approved by the previous Government – now had to be submitted to the new Government. The Government of *Guinea-Bissau* stated that, although the People's National Assembly had approved the proposal for the ratification of Convention No. 87 in 1997, it was only recently that the proposal had been brought before the Head of State for ratification.

Legislation being amended

26. The Government of *Thailand* stated that it was bringing the relevant legislation into line with Conventions Nos. 87 and 98 and pointed out that it had just adopted a law on industrial relations within public enterprises and that the general law on industrial relations was being amended to be fully compatible with the provisions of these two instruments.

Ratification being considered

27. The Government of *Saudi Arabia* stated that there had been no change in the situation since last March, i.e. that the ratification of Conventions Nos. 87, 98 and 138 was still being considered. The Government of *Bahrain* said that it was studying the possibility of ratifying Conventions Nos. 87, 98, 100 and 138. The Government of *India* pointed out that it was re-examining the possibility of ratifying Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. The Governments of *Jordan* and *Lebanon* stated that the question of the ratification of this instrument was still under consideration.

Divergences between legislation and the Convention

28. The Government of *El Salvador* informed the ILO that it was not in a position at present to ratify Conventions Nos. 87 and 98 in view of its legislation in this area. The Government of the *United States* explained that the situation had not changed since last March, i.e. that its relevant legislation was not entirely in line with the provisions of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. The Government of *Malaysia* also noted there were differences between its legislation and some of the provisions of Conventions Nos. 87 and 111.
29. To date, the ILO has no official information on prospects for the ratification of this instrument by *Afghanistan, Equatorial Guinea, Kiribati* and *Somalia*.¹⁹

2. **Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)**

30. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, Convention No. 98 has been ratified by *Saint Kitts and Nevis*, bringing to 147 the total number of ratifications of this instrument registered to date.
31. The position of *Armenia, China, Gambia** and *Kazakhstan* concerning ratification prospects for this Convention is set out in the section on Convention No. 29; that of *Bahrain, El Salvador, India, Saudi Arabia, Thailand* and the *United States* is reflected in the section on Convention No. 87; that of *Myanmar, Oman* and *Qatar* is contained in the section on Convention No. 105.

Ratification being considered

32. The Government of *Canada* reiterated its position, i.e. that its legislation was to a great extent in line with the principles contained in Conventions Nos. 98 and 138 but there were certain divergences between the national situation and the specific requirements of these two Conventions. However, as regards Convention No. 98, the Government was re-examining the situation, in the light of the unofficial opinion recently issued by the ILO in response to a question from Canada.

Ratification not being considered

33. The Government of *Kuwait* stated that, after an in-depth examination of Conventions Nos. 98 and 100, it had reached the conclusion that it was not in a position to ratify them. The Government of *Mexico* noted that it was still not in a position to ratify this instrument, in view of the reservation expressed by the Senate of the Republic in relation to Article 1, paragraph 2(b), of Convention No. 98.
34. To date, the ILO has no official information on prospects for the ratification of this instrument by *Afghanistan, Equatorial Guinea, Kiribati* and *Somalia*.²⁰

¹⁹ In accordance with the decisions adopted by the United Nations, the Director-General did not send any communication to the Government of this country concerning the ratification prospects for the fundamental Conventions which it has not ratified.

²⁰ See footnote No. 19.

C. Non-discrimination

1. **Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)**

35. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, this Convention has been ratified by *Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis* and *South Africa*, bringing to 148 the total number of ratifications of this instrument registered to date.
36. The position of *Gambia*,* *Kazakhstan* and the *United States* on the ratification prospects for this Convention is contained in the section on Convention No. 29; that of *Bahrain, Fiji* and *Saint Vincent and the Grenadines* is described in the section on Convention No. 87; that of *Kuwait* is indicated in the section on Convention No. 98; that of *Myanmar, Oman, Qatar* and *Singapore* is contained in the section on Convention No. 105.

Ratification approved by the competent authorities

37. The Government of *El Salvador* stated that the procedure for the ratification of Convention Nos. 100 and 182 had been completed and the ratification of these instruments had appeared in the *Official Gazette*; the ILO is therefore waiting to receive the relevant ratification instruments.

Ratification being considered

38. The Government of *Pakistan* informed the ILO that it had still not adopted its position on the possible ratification of Conventions Nos. 100, 138 and 182.

Ratification not being considered

39. The Government of *Suriname* stated that the ratification of this instrument had not been considered because the legislation in force did not draw any distinction between male and female workers on the question of pay and because there was no specific legislation implementing the principle contained in Convention No. 100.
40. To date, the ILO has no official information on prospects for the ratification of this instrument by *Kiribati, Liberia* and *Somalia*.²¹

2. **Discrimination, Employment and Occupation Convention, 1958 (No. 111)**

41. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, Convention No. 111 has been ratified by *Papua New Guinea* and *Saint Kitts and Nevis*, bringing to 144 the total number of ratifications of this instrument registered to date.
42. The Government of *Bahrain* has just sent the ILO a copy of the decree relating to the ratification of Convention No. 111 by this country, as well as the letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs confirming that Bahrain has ratified the Convention.
43. The position of *Gambia** on the ratification prospects for this Convention is indicated in the section on Convention No. 29; that of *Bahrain, Fiji, Malaysia* and *Saint Vincent and*

²¹ See footnote No. 19.

the Grenadines is contained in the section on Convention No. 87; that of *Japan, Myanmar, Oman* and *Singapore* is set out in the section on Convention No. 105.

Ratification proposal currently before the competent authorities

44. The Government of *Comoros** stated that it had taken the necessary measures for submitting the text of Conventions Nos. 111 and 138 to the next ordinary session of Parliament. The Government of the *United States* declared that the situation had not changed since last March, i.e. that a proposal for the ratification of Convention No. 111 was still before the Senate. The Government of *Luxembourg* informed the Office that in February 2000 it had put a bill before Parliament approving, inter alia, Conventions Nos. 111 and 182. However, before reaching a decision, Parliament had to wait for the opinion of the Council of State, which was expected in September 2000, and this would enable Parliament to examine the bill at its next session (October 2000).

Ratification being considered

45. The Government of *China* stated its intention to ratify this Convention as soon as it was convinced that it would be able to apply effectively all the provisions. The Government of *Thailand* indicated that the ratification of the Convention was being considered since it was possible that certain provisions in its national law and practice were not fully in line with those prescribed by Convention No. 111.

Ratification not being considered

46. The Government of *Suriname* felt that there were a number of difficulties preventing it from ratifying this Convention, such as, for example, the absence of legal provisions relating to the minimum wage or the classification of posts (a system which only exists in the public service and in major enterprises).
47. The ILO still has no official information on prospects for the ratification of this instrument by *Djibouti* and *Kiribati*.

D. Child labour

1. *Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)*

48. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, *Austria, Burundi, Central African Republic, Ecuador, Japan, Madagascar, South Africa, United Kingdom, Yemen* and *Zimbabwe* have ratified this Convention, bringing to 100 the number of ratifications of this instrument registered to date.
49. The ILO has received from Brazil the ratification instrument for Convention No. 138 but has still not registered it. The Office has also received a copy of the instruments for the ratification of Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 by *Panama* and is waiting to receive the original documents. It is also in possession of the instrument for the ratification of Convention No. 138 by *Malawi*.

50. According to the information available to the ILO,²² the National Assembly of *Chad** has examined the proposal for the ratification of Convention No. 138, which was put before it by the Government, but it has not yet reached a decision.
51. The position of *Armenia, Gambia,* Kazakhstan, Mozambique* and the *United States* on the ratification prospects for this Convention is set out in the section on Convention No. 29; that of *Angola, Bahrain, Fiji, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines* and *Saudi Arabia* is contained in the section on Convention No. 87; that of *Canada* is described in the section on Convention No. 98; that of *Pakistan* is set out in the section on Convention No. 100; that of *Myanmar, Oman, Qatar* and *Singapore* is contained in the section on Convention No. 105; that of *Comoros** in the section devoted to Convention No. 111.

Ratification proposal currently before the competent authorities

52. The Government of *Côte d'Ivoire* stated that a proposal for the ratification of Convention No. 138 had been put before the National Assembly but the events of December 1999 resulted in the dissolution of the country's institutions, including the National Assembly. It was probable that, with the imminent return to a normal constitutional life, the instrument would be ratified in the near future. The Government of *Ghana* informed the Office that it had approved the ratification of the Convention and a proposal for ratification would be put before Parliament at its next session. The Government of *Guinea-Bissau* pointed out that a proposal for the ratification of Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 was currently before the National Assembly.

Ratification procedure under way

53. The Government of *Suriname* declared that now it had obtained the views of the social partners on the ratification of Convention No. 138, it was in a position to start the ratification process for this instrument.

Legislation being amended

54. The Government of *Jamaica* stated that it was amending the relevant legislation in order to proceed with the ratification of Convention No. 138. The Government of the *Syrian Arab Republic* stated that bringing its relevant legislation into line with the provisions of Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 was going ahead.

Ratification being considered

55. The Government of *Lebanon* stated that it had finished bringing its legislation into line with the provisions of the Convention.²³ The Government of *Mexico* informed the Office that consultations were currently under way with a view to submitting a proposal for the ratification of Convention No. 138 to the Senate of the Republic. The Government of *Thailand* stated that, before submitting a proposal for the ratification of an international Convention to the Council of Ministers, the national committee responsible for examining the issue had to adopt unanimously a positive resolution. In the case of Convention No. 138, however, the parties concerned had not reached the clear conclusion that Thailand had to ratify this instrument, even if the majority of the members had been in favour of

²² See footnote No. 3.

²³ The ILO replied on 22 May 2000 to the request for clarification submitted by the Government with regard to Convention No. 138 (see paragraph 69 of document GB.277/LILS/5).

ratification. The Government was therefore pursuing the necessary consultations; it hoped that the imminent ratification of Convention No. 182 would speed matters up.

Divergences between legislation and the Convention

56. The Government of *Australia* reiterated its position, namely that it did not think it relevant to lay down in law a minimum age of admission to employment, in view of the fact that national law and practice had so far proved sufficient to prevent children from being exploited or involved in dangerous jobs. The Government of *India* indicated that it would only envisage the ratification of Convention No. 138 when it was sure of being able to apply effectively throughout the country a federal law setting a minimum age of admission to employment.
57. To date, the ILO has no official information on prospects for the ratification of this instrument by *Afghanistan, Djibouti, Guinea, Kiribati, Liberia, Saint Lucia, Solomon Islands, Somalia,*²⁴ and *Swaziland*.

2. **Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182)**

58. Since the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, *Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo* and *Yemen* have ratified this instrument, bringing to 36 the total number of ratifications registered to date. It may be noted that, since its adoption by the International Labour Conference on 17 June 1999, Convention No. 182 has received more ratifications than any other ILO Convention during a same period of time; this proves that the specific campaign launched by the Director-General immediately after the adoption of Convention No. 182 has borne fruit. Finally, it will be recalled that this instrument will enter into force on 19 November 2000.
59. According to the latest information available to the ILO,²⁵ *Bolivia** envisages ratifying Convention No. 182 but, apart from bringing its legislation into line with the Convention, would like to see a programme set up to eliminate child labour; the Government of the *Republic of Korea** had submitted Convention No. 182 to the National Assembly on 7 June 2000 and was apparently starting the procedure for ratification of this instrument; the Government of *Gambia** had initiated the process of ratification of Convention No. 182; the Government of *Niger* had sent the ILO by fax a copy of the ratification instrument for the Convention; the Parliamentary Committee for International Relations of *Slovenia** had examined the Convention; the Government of *Tajikistan** was initiating the procedure for ratification of this instrument; the Government of *Chad** had sent the ILO a copy of the law ratifying Convention No. 182; the Government of the *Czech Republic** had submitted to Parliament a proposal for the ratification of the Convention at the beginning of September 2000; the instruments adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 87th Session (June 1999), including Convention No. 182, had been submitted to the National Assembly of *Turkey**; the Government of *Viet Nam** stated that the bodies consulted had given a favourable opinion and therefore it would be initiating the ratification procedure in the very near future; the Parliament of *Zimbabwe** had unanimously approved the ratification of Convention No. 182 on 14 September 2000.

²⁴ See footnote No. 19.

²⁵ See footnote No. 3.

60. The position of *Armenia*, *Ethiopia* and *Mozambique* on the ratification prospects for this Convention is set out in the section on Convention No. 29; that of *Fiji*, the *Libyan Arab Jamahiriya* and *Saint Vincent and the Grenadines* is described in the section on Convention No. 87; that of *El Salvador* and *Pakistan* is reflected in the part devoted to Convention No. 100; that of *Japan*, *Myanmar*, *Oman* and *Ukraine* appears in the section on Convention No. 105; that of *Luxembourg* is contained in the section on Convention No. 111; that of *Guinea-Bissau*, *Panama* and the *Syrian Arab Republic* is mentioned in the section on Convention No. 138.

Ratification approved by the competent authorities

61. The Governments of *Argentina*, *Belarus* and the *Dominican Republic* stated that the ratification of Convention No. 182 had been approved by the competent authorities and that the Office would be receiving the ratification instruments shortly. The Government of *Singapore* pointed out that the decision to ratify Convention No. 182 had been taken and the ratification instrument would be communicated to the Office in the near future.

Ratification proposal currently before the competent authorities

62. The Government of *Angola* informed the Office that the file on the ratification of Convention No. 182 was currently before the Council of Ministers. The Government of *Costa Rica* stated that a proposal for the ratification of Convention No. 182 was currently before the legislative authority. The Government of *Guatemala* said that a ratification proposal was currently before the Secretariat General of the Presidency of the Republic and this would be transmitted shortly to the Congress of the Republic for approval. The Government of *Guyana* stated that it was awaiting the decision of Parliament, to which a proposal for the ratification of the Convention had been submitted. The Government of *Nicaragua* pointed out that it had sent a proposal for ratification of the Convention to the National Assembly. The Government of the *Philippines* explained that the ratification instrument had been signed by the President of the Republic but it was necessary to await the Senate's approval of this ratification.

Ratification procedure under way

63. The Governments of *Azerbaijan* and *Burkina Faso* informed the ILO that the preparatory work for the ratification of Convention No. 182 had started. The Government of *Côte d'Ivoire* stated that Convention No. 182 would be submitted in the very near future to the Council of Ministers, with a view to being put before the National Assembly. It thought, however, that the exceptional situation currently prevailing in the country²⁶ would be an obstacle to ratification in 2000. The Government of *Croatia* pointed out that the Labour Ministry was preparing a bill approving the ratification of the Convention and the date set at the Ministry for the presentation of that bill was 30 October 2000. The Government of *Poland* indicated that, now that examination of the conformity of the legislation with the provisions of Convention No. 182 and the procedure for the consultation of the social partners were complete, the Minister for Labour and Social Policy had instructed the Minister of Foreign Affairs to begin the ratification procedure. The Government of *Thailand* stated that the national committee responsible for examining the ratification of ILO Conventions on child labour, meeting on 3 July 2000, had unanimously recommended the ratification of Convention No. 182, though not without certain misgivings. For that reason the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, while adopting the measures needed to

²⁶ See paragraph 52 for further details.

begin the ratification procedure for this instrument, had decided to undertake a systematic compilation of all laws and regulations relating to child labour in order to determine as accurately as possible the consequences for Thailand of ratifying the Convention. The Government of *Tajikistan** stated that it had initiated the ratification procedure for this instrument.

Legislation being amended

64. The Government of *Israel* indicated that it was examining its legislation in order to bring it into line with the requirements of the Convention. The Government of *Lithuania* stated that the analysis of the conformity of its legislation with the provisions of Convention No. 182 had revealed a number of divergences and it would have to make certain legislative amendments before considering ratification of this instrument. The Government of *Norway* informed the ILO that Parliament had approved the ratification of the Convention subject to amending the legislation concerning conscription. The Government of the *Netherlands* stated that at the request of the Members of Parliament of its country it was preparing a report on child labour, which would serve as a basis for examination by Parliament of a draft ratification of the Convention. It also specified that before ratifying Convention No. 182 it would have to undertake a number of legislative amendments. The Government of *Sweden* informed the ILO that, since consultations with the social partners had shown the need for prior amendment of the Penal Code, a bill amending that Code and a proposal for ratification of Convention No. 182 would be submitted in the very near future to the Swedish Parliament for approval.

Ratification being considered

65. The Government of *Albania* stated that the Labour Ministry was preparing a draft decree to submit in the very near future to the Council of Ministers, after obtaining the assent of the social partners on the advisability of ratifying this instrument. The Government of *Saudi Arabia* pointed out that it was still awaiting comments from the entities to which it had submitted the examination of Convention No. 182. The Governments of *Australia*, *Austria*, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, *Jamaica* and *Lebanon* said that the ratification of Convention No. 182 was still under consideration. The Government of *Belgium* informed the Office that the bill ratifying this Convention was currently before the Council of State for opinion and as soon as this opinion had been issued it would make a second pronouncement on the bill, which would then be transmitted to Parliament. It also drew attention to the fact that, since Belgium was a federal State, the ratification of the Convention would also have to be approved by the various federal entities (communities and regions), since some of the provisions of this instrument came within their competence. The Government of *China* stated that the ratification of Convention No. 182 was being considered by the competent departments. The Government of *Egypt* pointed out that it had brought together the social partners with a view to examining the possibility of ratifying the Convention but the latter wished to defer their decision until a seminar was held on the issue with the active participation of the ILO.
66. The Governments of *Eritrea* and *Kazakhstan* stated that they were consulting the various competent authorities on the advisability of ratifying Convention No. 182. The Government of *India* stated that it was examining the conformity of its law and practice in relation to the principles enshrined in Convention No. 182 in order to be able to ratify this instrument as soon as possible. The Government of *Malaysia* indicated that the ratification of Convention No. 182 was being considered with a view to possible ratification in the near future. The Government of the *Russian Federation* declared that the ratification of Convention No. 182 was being examined by the competent authorities. The Government of *Suriname* informed the Office that the Labour Advisory Board would soon be placing the question of the ratification of Convention No. 182 on its agenda.

Ratification not being considered

67. The Government of the *Republic of Moldova* felt that it was not in a position at present to adopt the immediate and effective measures needed to ensure the prohibition and elimination in practice of the worst forms of child labour.
68. The ILO still has no official information on prospects for the ratification of this instrument by *Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Georgia, Grenada, Guinea, Honduras, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia,*²⁷ *Sudan, Swaziland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uruguay, Yugoslavia,*²⁸ *Zambia.*

II. References to ILO assistance

69. The following countries referred to ILO technical assistance in their replies to the Director-General's last circular letter. The Government of *Armenia* reiterated that it first needed to have a translation in Armenian of any international treaty, and therefore of the ILO Conventions, before submitting a proposal for ratification to Parliament. It had therefore requested assistance from the ILO in this respect, and the latter had responded favourably. The Government of *Bolivia*,* which was considering the possibility of ratifying Conventions Nos. 29 and 182, had requested ILO assistance for examining the conformity of its legislation with these two instruments; the ILO was examining ways of providing this assistance. The Government of *China* recalled the assistance given by the International Labour Standards Department, in particular with regard to Convention No. 111.
70. The Government of *Egypt* would like to see the ILO participate in the organization of a seminar bringing together the social partners with a view to examining the possible ratification of Convention No. 182; the Office was exploring ways and means of responding favourably to this request with the Government. The Government of *Jamaica* recalled that, on 5 September last, it had signed a memorandum of understanding with the ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), an agreement which should enable it to go ahead with ratification of the two instruments in the near future. The Government of *Lithuania* requested assistance from the Office to bring its legislation into line with the provisions of Convention No. 182 and to carry out a scientific study on the extent of the commercial exploitation of children in Lithuania. The Government of *Mauritius* requested assistance from the Office in order to remove the obstacles to ratification of Convention No. 100 concerning equal remuneration for men and women workers; the ILO proposed to the Government that a technical mission, composed of experts on remuneration, objective evaluation of jobs and classification, should go to the country at the beginning of next year. The Government of the *Russian Federation*, feeling that the problem of child labour had reached worrying proportions, requested urgent assistance from the Office to help it establish an effective policy to combat this phenomenon; the ILO was examining ways of providing this assistance. The Government of *Thailand* recalled that the ILO had undertaken to finance a study next year on its law and practice with regard to freedom of association in the context of the campaign for promoting the ratification of the fundamental Conventions, in this case Conventions

²⁷ See footnote No. 19.

²⁸ See footnote No. 18.

Nos. 87 and 98; it also mentioned the technical assistance provided by the Office in relation to promoting the ratification of Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 through the organization of two national workshops (in December 1999 and April 2000). The Government of *Viet Nam** referred to the assistance provided by the Office in the form of two seminars held during 2000: the one in April covered the actual content of Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 and the one in August brought together all the parties concerned (government bodies, people's organizations, workers' and employers' organizations, etc.) so that together they could examine the implications for Viet Nam of the ratification of these instruments.

III. Concluding remarks

71. While information on prospects for the ratification of the fundamental Conventions has been received to date from the majority of member States, the following 12 countries have still not replied directly to the Director-General's various letters: *Afghanistan, Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Kiribati,*²⁹ *Liberia, Saint Lucia, Somalia,*³⁰ *Swaziland, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago.* As regards *Comoros*, it is no longer on this list since the Office received a letter from the Government, just after the 277th Session (March 2000) of the Governing Body, providing information on the ratification prospects for Conventions Nos. 111 and 138 (see paragraph 44). As regards the *Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*, the Government had just sent the ILO a copy of the ratification instruments for the two fundamental Conventions that it had not yet ratified (Nos. 87 and 182).
72. It is proposed that a report should again be presented to the Governing Body, at its 282nd Session (November 2001), on the progress made in ratifying the fundamental ILO Conventions and on the ratification prospects for these instruments.

Geneva, 9 October 2000.

²⁹ Since *Kiribati* has only been a Member of the ILO since February 2000, it was not until 8 August 2000 that the country was invited for the first time to indicate its position with regard to the ratification of the eight fundamental ILO Conventions.

³⁰ See footnote No. 19.

Appendix 1

Ratifications or confirmations of previous commitments since the start of the campaign for the ratification of the fundamental Conventions (25 May 1995-29 September 2000)

I. Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)

Botswana	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
El Salvador	South Africa
Eritrea	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Estonia	Turkey
Georgia	Turkmenistan
Malawi	Uruguay
Moldova, Republic of	Uzbekistan
Oman	Zimbabwe

II. Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)

Botswana	Mozambique
Cambodia	Papua New Guinea
Cape Verde	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Chile	South Africa
Eritrea	Sri Lanka
Georgia	Tanzania, United Republic of
Indonesia	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Turkmenistan
Malawi	Zambia

III. Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)

Botswana	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Burundi	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Cambodia	Seychelles
Chile	South Africa
Congo	Suriname
Eritrea	Switzerland
Georgia	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Madagascar	Turkmenistan
Moldova, Republic of	Uzbekistan
Mozambique	Zambia
Nepal	Zimbabwe

IV. Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)

Bangladesh	Nepal
Belize	Papua New Guinea
Botswana	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Cambodia	Seychelles
Congo	South Africa
El Salvador	Thailand
Eritrea	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Estonia	Trinidad and Tobago
Ethiopia	Turkmenistan
Georgia	United Arab Emirates
Korea, Republic of	Uzbekistan
Lesotho	Viet Nam
Malaysia	

V. Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)

Albania	Indonesia
Azerbaijan	Kyrgyzstan
Bahrain	Malawi
Belarus	Mauritania
Botswana	Romania
Bulgaria	Russian Federation
Burkina Faso	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Cambodia	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Chile	Slovakia
Congo	Slovenia
Croatia	South Africa
Czech Republic	Tajikistan
Eritrea	Togo
Estonia	Turkmenistan
Ethiopia	United Arab Emirates
India	Zimbabwe

VI. Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)

Albania	Moldova, Republic of
Belize	Papua New Guinea
Botswana	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Cambodia	Seychelles
Congo	South Africa
El Salvador	Sri Lanka
Eritrea	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Georgia	Turkmenistan
Indonesia	United Kingdom
Ireland	Uzbekistan
Kazakhstan	Viet Nam
Korea, Republic of	Zimbabwe
Lesotho	

VII. Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)

Albania	Korea, Republic of
Argentina	Kuwait
Austria	Lithuania
Barbados	Madagascar
Belize	Malawi
Bolivia	Malaysia
Botswana	Moldova, Republic of
Burkina Faso	Morocco
Burundi	Nepal
Cambodia	Panama
Central African Republic	Philippines
Chile	Portugal
China	San Marino
Congo	Senegal
Cyprus	Seychelles
Denmark	Slovakia
Dominican Republic	South Africa
Ecuador	Sri Lanka
Egypt	Switzerland
Eritrea	Tanzania, United Republic of
Ethiopia	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Georgia	Tunisia
Guyana	Turkey
Hungary	United Arab Emirates
Iceland	United Kingdom
Indonesia	Yemen
Jordan	Zimbabwe

**VIII. Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention,
1999 (No. 182)**

Barbados	Malaysia
Belarus	Mali
Belize	Mauritius
Botswana	Mexico
Brazil	Nicaragua
Bulgaria	Niger
Canada	Panama
Central African Republic	Papua New Guinea
Chad	Portugal
Chile	Qatar
Denmark	Rwanda
Ecuador	Saint Kitts and Nevis
El Salvador	San Marino
Finland	Senegal
Ghana	Seychelles
Hungary	Slovakia
Iceland	South Africa
Indonesia	Switzerland
Ireland	Togo
Italy	Tunisia
Jordan	United Kingdom
Kuwait	United States
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Yemen

Appendix 2

Table of ratifications and information concerning the ILO's fundamental Conventions (as at 29 September 2000)

- No. 29 – Forced Labour Convention, 1930
- No. 87 – Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948
- No. 98 – Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949
- No. 100 – Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951
- No. 105 – Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957
- No. 111 – Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958
- No. 138 – Minimum Age Convention, 1973
- No. 182 – Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999

Explanation of symbols in the table

- × Convention ratified.
- Formal ratification process already initiated (with or without mention of time frame); approval of ratification by the competent body, although the Director-General has not yet received the formal instrument of ratification or it is incomplete (concerns chiefly Convention No. 138) or is a non-original copy; bill currently before the legislative body for approval.
- ▲ Ratification will be examined after amendment/adoption of a Constitution, Labour Code, legislation, etc.
- Convention currently being studied or examined; preliminary consultations with the social partners.
- Divergencies between the Convention and national legislation.
- ◆ Ratification not considered/deferred.
- No reply, or a reply containing no information.

Member States	Forced labour		Freedom of association		Equal treatment		Child labour	
	C. 29	C. 105	C. 87	C. 98	C. 100	C. 111	C. 138	C. 182
Afganistán	-	X	-	-	X	X	-	-
Albania	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Algeria	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Angola	X	X	O	X	X	X	O	O
Antigua and Barbuda	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	O
Argentina	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Armenia	●	●	O	●	X	X	●	O
Australia	X	X	X	X	X	X	◆	●
Austria	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Azerbaijan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Bahamas	X	X	■	X	●	●	●	—
Bahrain	X	X	●	●	●	X	●	●
Bangladesh	X	X	X	X	X	X	●	●
Barbados	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Belarus	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Belgium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Belize	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Benin	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	O
Bolivia	▲	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Bosnia and Herzegovina	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	●
Botswana	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Brazil	X	X	▲	X	X	X	O	X
Bulgaria	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Burkina Faso	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Burundi	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Cambodia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Cameroon	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	-
Canada	O	X	X	■	X	X	■	X
Cape Verde	X	X	X	X	X	X	●	◆
Central African Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Chad	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Chile	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
China	◆	◆	◆	◆	X	●	X	●
Colombia	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	O
Comoros	X	X	X	X	X	O	O	-
Congo	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-

Member States	Forced labour		Freedom of association		Equal treatment		Child labour	
	C. 29	C. 105	C. 87	C. 98	C. 100	C. 111	C. 138	C. 182
Costa Rica	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Côte d'Ivoire	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	●
Croatia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Cuba	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Cyprus	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲	O
Democratic Republic of the Congo	X	O	O	X	X	O	O	O
Denmark	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Djibouti	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-
Dominica	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	◆
Dominican Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Ecuador	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Egypt	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
El Salvador	X	X	■	■	X	X	X	X
Equatorial Guinea	O	O	-	-	X	O	X	O
Eritrea	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Estonia	X	X	X	X	X	●	●	●
Ethiopia	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Fiji	X	X	O	X	O	O	O	O
Finland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
France	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Gabon	X	X	X	X	X	X	●	O
Gambia	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Georgia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Germany	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Ghana	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Greece	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Grenada	X	X	X	X	X	▲	▲	-
Guatemala	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Guinea	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-
Guinea-Bissau	X	X	O	X	X	X	O	O
Guyana	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Haiti	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	O
Honduras	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Hungary	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Iceland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Member States	Forced labour		Freedom of association		Equal treatment		Child labour	
	C. 29	C. 105	C. 87	C. 98	C. 100	C. 111	C. 138	C. 182
India	X	X	●	●	X	X	◆	▲
Indonesia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Iran, Islamic Republic of	X	X	▲	▲	X	X	▲	●
Iraq	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	◆
Ireland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Israel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲
Italy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jamaica	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲	●
Japan	X	●	X	X	X	●	X	●
Jordan	X	X	●	X	X	X	X	X
Kazakhstan	●	●	○	●	●	X	●	●
Kenya	X	X	●	X	●	●	X	○
Kiribati*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Korea, Republic of	●	●	▲	▲	X	X	X	○
Kuwait	X	X	X	◆	◆	X	X	X
Kyrgyzstan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Lao Peoples Democratic Republic	X	●	●	●	●	●	●	-
Latvia	○	X	X	X	X	X	○	-
Lebanon	X	X	●	X	X	X	▲	●
Lesotho	X	●	X	X	X	X	●	-
Liberia	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	●
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lithuania	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲
Luxembourg	X	X	X	X	X	○	X	○
Madagascar	X	●	X	X	X	X	X	●
Malawi	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Malaysia	X	◆	■	X	X	■	X	X
Mali	X	X	X	X	X	X	●	X
Malta	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲
Mauritania	X	X	X	○	○	X	○	-
Mauritius	X	X	▲	X	▲	▲	X	X
Mexico	X	X	X	■	X	X	●	X
Moldova, Republic of	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	◆
Mongolia	○	○	X	X	X	X	●	-
Morocco	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	○
Mozambique	○	X	X	X	X	X	○	○

Member States	Forced labour		Freedom of association		Equal treatment		Child labour	
	C. 29	C. 105	C. 87	C. 98	C. 100	C. 111	C. 138	C. 182
Myanmar	X	◆	X	●	◆	◆	◆	●
Namibia	X	X	X	X	●	X	X	X
Nepal	●	●	●	X	X	X	X	●
Netherlands	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲
New Zealand	X	X	▲	▲	X	X	◆	▲
Nicaragua	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Niger	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nigeria	X	X	X	X	X	◆	▲	-
Norway	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲
Oman	X	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Pakistan	X	X	X	X	●	X	●	●
Panama	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Papua New Guinea	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Paraguay	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	-
Peru	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	O
Philippines	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Poland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Portugal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Qatar	X	■	■	■	■	X	■	X
Romania	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Russian Federation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Rwanda	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Saint Kitts and Nevis	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Saint Lucia	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	X	X	O	X	O	O	O	O
San Marino	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sao Tome and Principe	●	●	X	X	X	X	O	-
Saudi Arabia	X	X	●	●	X	X	●	●
Senegal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Seychelles	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sierra Leone	X	X	X	X	X	X	◆	-
Singapore	X	●	M	X	●	●	●	O
Slovakia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Slovenia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Solomon Islands	X	-	O	O	M	M	-	-
Somalia	X	X	-	-	-	X	-	-

Member States	Forced labour		Freedom of association		Equal treatment		Child labour	
	C. 29	C. 105	C. 87	C. 98	C. 100	C. 111	C. 138	C. 182
South Africa	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Spain	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Sri Lanka	X	▲	X	X	X	X	X	●
Sudan	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	X
Suriname	X	X	X	X	◆	◆	O	●
Swaziland	X	X	X	X	X	X	●	●
Sweden	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲
Switzerland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Syrian Arab Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲	▲
Tajikistan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Tanzania, United Republic of	X	X	X	X	●	●	X	O
Thailand	X	X	▲	▲	X	●	●	O
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	X	●	X	X	X	X	X	-
Togo	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Trinidad and Tobago	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	▲
Tunisia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Turkey	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Turkmenistan	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	-
Uganda	X	X	●	X	▲	▲	▲	-
Ukraine	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	O
United Arab Emirates	X	X	◆	◆	X	●	X	O
United Kingdom	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
United States	●	X	■	■	●	O	●	X
Uruguay	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Uzbekistan	X	X	O	X	X	X	●	●
Venezuela	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Viet Nam	●	●	◆	◆	X	X	●	O
Yemen	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yugoslavia**	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	-
Zambia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Zimbabwe	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	O

* Kiribati only became a Member of the ILO on 3 February 2000.

** The former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Pursuant to decisions taken by the ILO Governing Body on the basis of relevant United Nations resolutions, no State has been recognized as the continuation of that Member.