



**Convention on the Elimination
of all Forms of Discrimination
Against Women**

Distr.
GENERAL

CEDAW/C/SR.25
23 August 1983
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

UN LIBRARY

SEP 14 1983

~~UN/CA COLLECTION~~

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Second session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 12 August 1983, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Ms. IDER

CONTENTS

Annual report of the Committee on its activities to the General Assembly through
the Economic and Social Council under article 21 of the Convention

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-0750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ITS ACTIVITY TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY THROUGH THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL UNDER ARTICLE 21 OF THE CONVENTION (CEDAW/C/8 and Add.1-16)

1. The CHAIRPERSON said that, before beginning consideration of the Committee's report (CEDAW/C/8 and Add.1-16), she wished to draw the attention of members of the Committee to General Assembly resolution 36/117, to which Ms. Sellami-Meslem had referred in her statement. In part C of that resolution, the General Assembly urged "all treaty bodies, as a matter of priority, to review their requirements for documentation in all languages and for meeting records, with a view to adopting immediate measures to restrict substantially the present volume of documentation".
2. Ms. CREYPT (Secretary of the Committee) asked whether, for the sake of brevity, members of the Committee could agree that the replies of representatives of Governments to questions asked by the experts should be published as an addendum to the report of the country concerned, which would thus be more complete.
3. Ms. OESER supported the proposal made by the Secretary of the Committee, and also felt that it would ensure broader dissemination of the replies from Governments, which sometimes contained more information than the reports themselves; she therefore hoped that the proposal would be acted upon.
4. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said that while she understood the desire for brevity motivating the proposal made by the Secretary of the Committee, she believed that, if the proposal meant that the questions would appear in the report and the replies to those questions would be published in a separate document, the result would not be satisfactory. The report should give more details on the policies outlined by Governments in their replies and on the observations and recommendations made by members of the Committee. She therefore sought clarification on the proposal made by the Secretary of the Committee.
5. Ms. PEYTCHEVA said that she also felt that the replies to questions asked by members of the Committee were sometimes as informative as the reports of Governments. She was therefore in favour of publishing them in an addendum, but wished to know whether the proposal of the Secretary of the Committee also applied to statements made by the representatives of Governments when introducing their reports.
6. Ms. ILIC said that two quite separate questions had been raised. The first was the question of what should be included in the report. It would be better for all the data on a given country to appear in the same part of the report. However, that question should perhaps be taken up during the consideration of the report proper. Second, while she favoured the proposal that statements made when introducing reports should be published as addenda to the respective reports, she felt that the financial implications should be considered.
7. Ms. CREYPT (Secretary of the Committee) said that it was essential to reduce the volume of documentation. The replies could be published as an annex to the Committee's report to the General Assembly and as addenda to the country reports.

8. Ms. CARON, referring to the first question raised by Ms. Ilic, which actually dealt with the structure of the report, said that in the final text, everything relating to a particular country (introduction of report, discussion, questions and replies) would be included under the same heading.

9. Ms. ILIC, noting that the Secretary of the Committee had just made a new proposal, namely that the replies to questions should be published as an annex to the Committee's report to the General Assembly, suggested that the Committee should first take up the report and then consider the question of addenda and annexes.

Consideration of the draft report (CEDAW/C/8)

10. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, suggested that the Committee should first consider the introduction to the report (CEDAW/C/8) and then the various addenda, and requested members of the Committee wishing to propose amendments to hand them into the Secretary of the Committee.

11. In the interest of brevity, she proposed the following additions and amendments to the introduction to the report: in paragraph 1, the date (12 August 1983) should be filled in, as well as the number of States parties (50) and, in paragraph 2, the number of meetings (18). The words "by letter dated" in the first line of paragraph 10, and the words "by letter dated 12 July 1983", in the third line, should be deleted. In the eighth line, the words "in its note of 12 July 1983" should be deleted; and in paragraph 13, first line, the words "except the experts from China and Sri Lanka" should be inserted between the words "members" and "attended". The sentence in brackets should be deleted and replaced by the following sentence: "The expert from Cuba arrived for the 16th meeting". In paragraph 14, the words "decide to form" should be replaced by "decide on the formation of"; in paragraph 15, the second and third sentences should be deleted and the words "After general discussion" should be added at the beginning of the fourth sentence; paragraph 18 should be deleted.

12. Ms. BIRYUKOVA thanked the Chairperson and the Rapporteur for the considerable amount of work they had done in preparing the draft report, but said that it was too long, and almost amounted to a summary record of the Committee's discussions. An attempt had been made to include most of the questions asked by members of the Committee and, although that demonstrated the importance they attached to the measures for implementation of the Convention in the various countries, it reduced the draft report to a series of anecdotes, and did not place sufficient emphasis on the policies pursued by Governments to implement the Convention or reflect the substance of the discussions which had taken place in the Committee. Moreover, failure to combine questions and answers gave the impression that the doubts and reservations expressed by certain experts in their questions had not been allayed, whereas the representatives of States had in fact given replies to the point and in detail. Instead of listing the questions, it would have been better to reproduce the observations and proposals made by members of the Committee. For example, she had proposed that the Committee should recommend in its report to the General Assembly that advantage should be taken of the experience of certain countries, including the German Democratic Republic, in incorporating the provisions of the Convention in their legislation and practice, as described in their reports; yet there was no trace of that proposal in the report. At the same time, some points

(Ms. Biryukova)

were developed too fully: for example, over a page and a half was devoted to the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General when two paragraphs would have sufficed.

13. She was particularly concerned about the approach adopted in preparing the draft report because it was the first report prepared by the Committee after considering the reports of States parties and should, a fortiori, be better structured and more substantial. For example, as the expert from Yugoslavia had suggested, everything relating to a particular State could be synthesized under the same heading. There did not seem to be any point in publishing the statements made in introducing reports and the replies to questions as annexes to the report. More consideration would have to be given to the matter in an effort to find an acceptable solution.

14. Ms. REGENT-LECHOWICZ congratulated the Chairperson and the Rapporteur on the considerable work they had done but shared the view expressed by the Soviet expert and endorsed her proposals. It was important for the report to contain not only the questions asked but also the views expressed by the experts and the proposals they had made after considering the reports of Governments. She recalled, for example, that after considering the report submitted by the German Democratic Republic and after their questions had been answered, members of the Committee had commented on how the German Democratic Republic had given effect to the Convention in the legal, administrative and practical areas. However, there was no mention in the report of the views expressed by the Committee on that occasion.

15. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said that she had hoped to hear the general observations of members of the Committee about the introduction to the report. It would be preferable to proceed one step at a time and to have general comments on the report as a whole after it had been considered paragraph by paragraph.

16. Ms. CORTES and Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ agreed and felt that the relevant comments should be made as each section of the report was discussed.

17. Ms. VELIZ DE VILLALVILLA also agreed with the Rapporteur and with the general observations made by the expert from the Soviet Union. She also asked the Rapporteur whether the text of addendum 4 was to be included in section F of the introduction to the report (CEDAW/C/8).

18. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, replying to the expert from Cuba, said that she intended to include a summary of the addendum, which she read out, in section F of the introduction to the report.

19. Ms. LAMM suggested that paragraph 4 of the introduction might outline a few general ideas about the Convention and that an appeal to Member States which had not yet ratified the Convention to do so might appear somewhere else in the document.

20. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, proposed that the appeal should be added to paragraph 1 and should state that the Committee requested those Governments which had not yet ratified the Convention and those which had not yet submitted an initial report to do so as soon as possible.

21. Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ agreed that the appeal should be included in the report, but wondered whether the end of paragraph 1 was the best place for it.
22. Ms. CORTES pointed out that under article 21 of the Convention, the Committee was supposed to make suggestions and recommendations; the reminder about ratification should be contained in a paragraph relating to that article.
23. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, proposed that it be included in paragraph 18, which would conclude the report.
24. Mr. NORDENFELT expressed the view that there were two different ideas and they should be dealt with separately. In the first, the Committee would ask the Secretary-General to remind Member States which had not yet done so to submit their reports and, in the second, Member States would be invited either to ratify or to accede to the Convention.
25. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, proposed that the two ideas should be reflected in the following two sentences, which would form one paragraph: "In organizing its work, the Committee recommended that Governments which have not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention should do so as early as possible. The Secretariat was requested to remind States parties which have ratified the Convention but have not submitted their initial reports to submit those reports".
26. It was so decided.
27. The CHAIRPERSON asked the Committee to consider the introduction to the report paragraph by paragraph.
28. It was so decided.

Paragraphs 1 and 2

29. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

Paragraph 3

30. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that only the first two sentences should be retained; the rest of the paragraph was superfluous.
31. It was so decided.
32. Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 4 and 5

33. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said that all of paragraph 5 should be deleted.
34. Ms. PEYTCHEVA thought that paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 should be combined in a single paragraph 4, which would state simply that, in her opening statement, the representative of the Secretary-General had congratulated members of the Committee.

35. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD was of the view that the report should not be shortened too much, because it must clearly reflect the Committee's task and the importance of its work as well as the importance Member States attributed to the Convention.

36. Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ agreed to the deletion of paragraph 5 but not of paragraph 4, because she felt it was important to stress that the Convention had been very favourably received. Moreover, it would not be right to delete something that related to the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General. Paragraph 6 should therefore remain as it stood.

37. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, therefore proposed that paragraph 5 should be deleted and that paragraphs 4, 6 and 7 should be retained.

38. Ms. BIRYUKOVA observed that, as the expert from Mexico had indicated, paragraph 4 contained important information about the support the Convention had received in each geographical area. In her opinion, paragraph 6 should also be retained, because it dealt with the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, for which the representative of the Secretary-General had invited the Committee to make preparations.

39. The CHAIRPERSON therefore proposed that paragraph 4 should remain as it was and that paragraph 5 should be deleted.

40. It was so decided.

Paragraph 6

41. Paragraph 6 was adopted.

Paragraph 7

42. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that the paragraph should be reduced to the first few words, namely, "With regard to future sessions of the Committee", which would be linked up with the last sentence.

43. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said she agreed with the expert from the Soviet Union but felt that a reference should be made to the third session of the Committee.

44. Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ wondered whether the reference to the decision of the Economic and Social Council might not also be retained.

45. Ms. ESCUDERO-MUSCOSO said that there was no point in reviewing established procedures in the report, such as the submission of the Committee's report to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

46. The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the members of the Committee should leave it to the Rapporteur to draft paragraph 7 more concisely, taking into account all the views expressed.

47. It was so decided.

Paragraph 8

48. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that all of paragraph 8 should be deleted.
49. Ms. ESCUDERO-MUSCOSO said that the paragraph was very important because it dealt with summary records and, in any case, she did not see the value of deleting a paragraph which was only three lines long.
50. Paragraph 8 was adopted.

Paragraph 9

51. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that everything preceding the actual text of the agenda should be deleted and the paragraph should thus begin as follows: "The Committee adopted the provisional agenda as amended. The agenda is as follows:".
52. It was so decided.
53. Paragraph 9, as amended, was adopted.
54. Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ proposed that the Committee should continue its consideration of the draft report section by section, rather than paragraph by paragraph.
55. It was so decided.

Section D (paras. 10 and 11)

56. Ms. BIRYUKOVA proposed that paragraph 10 should be deleted and paragraph 11 retained.
57. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said she could accept that proposal as long as the sentence "The curriculum vitae of the two nominees had been circulated to the experts" was shifted to paragraph 11.
58. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD proposed that, in paragraph 11, the phrase "the appointment of" should be replaced by the phrase "the appointments, as proposed by the respective governments, of".
59. It was so decided.
60. Section D, as amended, was adopted.

Section E (para. 12)

61. Section E was adopted.

Section F (para. 13)

62. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said that she intended to amend paragraph 13 by including a summary of document CEDAW/C/8/Add.4, which could then be withdrawn.

(Ms. Bernard, Rapporteur)

The new version would state that all members, with the exception of the experts from China and Sri Lanka, had attended the second session, and the expert from Cuba had not arrived until the 16th meeting. Her late arrival was due to a delay in securing the necessary visa to travel to the United States. A representative of the Government of the United States who was present at the meeting had expressed regret at the delay and inconvenience caused to the expert from Cuba and had given his assurance that the United States would continue to honour its obligations under the Agreement with the United Nations relating to the granting of visas.

63. Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ said that, unfortunately, she could not agree to that wording; she felt that it should be stated clearly that it had been the members of the Committee who had requested the Secretariat to inquire into the reasons for the absence of three members. It was important to mention that the experts from China and Sri Lanka had sent cables apologizing for their absence and that the expert from Cuba had had difficulties in obtaining a visa for the United States. The text proposed by Ms. Bernard only gave a brief summary of the facts, and she felt that document CEDAW/C/8/Add.4 should be retained, with the possible exception of paragraph 3, but including the fourth paragraph, which contained the explanations provided by the expert from Cuba, the fifth paragraph, which set forth the views of the United Nations Secretariat and the contents of the Agreement with the host country regarding the granting of visas, and the sixth paragraph, which explained the position of the representative of the United States.

64. Ms. BIRYUKOVA supported Ms. Gonzalez-Martinez's proposal and said that the draft report should take account of the discussion which took place in the Committee on the difficulties encountered by the expert from Cuba in obtaining a visa from the United States Government in good time, although she had complied with her obligations. The United States Government had violated the agreements concluded between the United Nations and the United States on the granting of the necessary visas for people who had to travel to United Nations Headquarters in New York. The wording proposed by Ms. Bernard was too brief and a fuller account should be given in paragraph 13.

65. Ms. VELIZ DE VILLALVILLA said she fully agreed with the experts from Mexico and the USSR. It was important to state why members were absent. She also thought that it would be useful if the report drew attention to the difficulties which might be encountered by people who had to work in New York.

66. Mr. NORDENFELT said he could not see how the report could present facts other than those which emerged from the explanations provided by the expert from Cuba and by the representative of the United States. The report should simply record both views.

67. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, proposed reverting to the text of document CEDAW/C/8/Add.4, taking into account the comments made. The text could then be placed under section F of the draft report, entitled "Attendance". Paragraph 13 of the report would then read as follows: "All members attended the second session, with the exception of the experts from China and Sri Lanka, who sent cables explaining their absence. With regard to the expert from Cuba, a member of the Committee stated that she had been informed ... etc." The fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of Add.4 would follow.

/...

68. Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ supported Ms. Bernard's proposal and felt that it would also be very useful to specify when the visa was requested and when it was granted.

69. Ms. VELIZ DE VILLALVILLA also supported Ms. Bernard's proposal, as well as that of Ms. Gonzalez-Martinez. She informed the Committee that she had applied for a visa on 18 July 1983.

70. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, suggested that the fourth paragraph of Add.4 should be worded as follows: "The Cuban expert arrived in time to participate in the Committee's 16th meeting. She explained that she had submitted her request for a visa on 18 July". The words "well ahead of time" should be deleted.

71. Ms. VELIZ DE VILLALVILLA drew the Committee's attention to the fifth paragraph of Add.4. It might only be a problem of the wording or translation of the Spanish text but that paragraph might create the impression that the Host Country Agreement provided that a period of 15 days was required before a visa could be obtained. According to the explanations given, however, nothing in the Agreement specified time-limits for the submission of applications.

72. Mr. NORDENFELT noted that nothing in the Host Country Agreement prevented the latter from following its normal procedures either. There would be no irregularity except where the host country failed to observe the normal procedures and time-limits. He therefore felt that there was no need to pursue the matter further.

73. Ms. VELIZ DE VILLALVILLA insisted, nevertheless, that in her case there had been a violation, or at least irregularities, in the issuance of a visa by the United States Government. She would like to know whether other members of the Committee or the representatives of other countries had encountered similar difficulties when they were invited to meetings of experts in New York. In her case, it seemed clear that there was discrimination by the United States against Cuba.

74. The CHAIRPERSON said she thought that if the members of the Committee had no further observations and if there was no objection, she would take it that the Committee adopted the wording suggested by the Rapporteur, Ms. Bernard.

75. It was so decided.

76. Section F, as amended, was adopted.

77. Mr. NORDENFELT said he thought that it might be useful for the Secretariat to provide information and particulars on how to obtain visas in the letters of invitation it sent to experts.

78. Ms. NAHON (Representative of the Secretary-General) suggested that those letters should indicate simply that the Secretariat of the United Nations should be notified immediately if there were any problems in obtaining visas.

Section G (paras. 14-18)

79. Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ, turning to section G: "Organization of work", said she would like the first sentence of paragraph 14 to be deleted and replaced by the sentence: "Consultations were held on the advisability of forming an informal working group ...". The rest of the paragraph would stand.

80. Ms. BIRYUKOVA supported that proposal. The rest of the paragraph included many technical details which could easily be omitted. Similarly, paragraph 15 could be reduced simply to the last sentence because the particulars of the discussions regarding the composition of the working group were far less important than the result achieved and the agreement reached on that question.

81. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, said she had been about to suggest that the Committee should cut paragraphs 14 and 15; they could even be condensed into a single paragraph reading as follows: "Consultations took place on the advisability of establishing a working group in good and due form to work out the guidelines for the preparation of reports by States parties. After a general discussion, it was finally decided that the working group would be composed of the members of the Bureau, etc.".

82. It was so decided.

83. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, recalled that a proposal had been made to add a paragraph inviting the States which had not yet done so to ratify the Convention. That could be done in a paragraph at the end of section G.

84. Section G, as amended, was adopted.

CEDAW/C/8/Add.1, page 2 (item 6)

85. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up the part of the draft report relating to the consideration of the reports of States parties and specifically, the report of the German Democratic Republic. She proposed that paragraphs 1 to 5 of Add.1 concerning the consideration of reports, comments and information submitted by States parties under article 18 of the Convention, should be considered first.

86. Ms. BERNARD, Rapporteur, suggested that the first sentence of paragraph 4 should be retained and the second and third sentences deleted. The States parties which had sent representatives to present reports would be named at the end of paragraph 4.

87. The CHAIRPERSON therefore suggested that the Committee should adopt those five paragraphs, with paragraph 4 being shortened as suggested by the Rapporteur and paragraph 5 remaining unchanged because it contained some details which could be useful in connection with the procedure for the presentation and consideration of reports.

88. It was so decided.

89. The CHAIRPERSON proposed that the Committee consider the part of the Committee's report dealing with the reports submitted by States parties. The first of those reports was that of the German Democratic Republic (CEDAW/C/8/Add.1 and Add.6).

90. Ms. PEYTCHEVA thanked the Secretary of the Committee for her explanation of the procedure for the consideration of country reports. That procedure was described in detail in paragraph 5 of the draft report, which had been adopted. That paragraph indicated that the Committee's report should include a summary of the report submitted by the State party concerned. In that connection she questioned whether paragraph 6 of Add.1 could be considered a sufficiently comprehensive summary of the initial report of the German Democratic Republic.

91. It had been proposed that the members of the Committee should give their views on the procedure for the consideration of country reports. Her view was that the Committee's task was to study the implementation by the States parties of the provisions of the Convention. Like the experts from the USSR and Poland, she thought that during the consideration of the reports, the Committee should give maximum attention to questions raised by the experts and proposed that due weight should be given to the replies of representatives of Governments. Furthermore, she was surprised that the report before the Committee made no mention of the important statements of certain experts who wanted certain specific data to be included in the Committee's report. That applied, for example, to the proposal made by Poland regarding the evaluation of the report submitted by the Soviet Union.

92. Ms. GONZALEZ-MARTINEZ said that if the Committee decided to insert a summary of the report submitted by each country in the section of the report dealing with consideration of reports, comments and information submitted by States parties, it could cause difficulties because details which experts considered peripheral might be included while others which they judged important might be omitted.

93. It should be stressed that paragraph 7, in commending the German Democratic Republic for the excellent report it had submitted, accurately reflected the opinion of the Committee.

94. Paragraph 9 did not give a full enough account of the various questions raised concerning women's participation in the political life of the country. She therefore proposed to add the following sentence at the end of that paragraph: "Several experts also requested more information on women's participation in the State's political decision-making organs and wished to know whether nominations of candidates to stand for election to responsible positions were based on women's political activities or solely on certain quotas". The percentages referred to in the report seemed, in practice, to hover around the 50 per cent mark.

95. Ms. BIRYUKOVA said that she had listened with great interest to the statements by Ms. Peytcheva and Ms. Gonzalez-Martinez and felt that it was essential to include in the report, if only in a few lines, a summary of the report submitted by each State party. The Committee was interested in each country's policy towards women and in how it implemented the Convention. States' reports were not addressed to the Secretary-General who could not read them all in any case. Neither were they addressed to the Economic and Social Council, nor to the General Assembly.

(Ms. Biryukova)

Consequently, it was essential to include information on States' policies in the report. In the case of the German Democratic Republic, there was no doubt that there was no discrimination against women and that the Convention was fully observed. There was no reason not to include such information in the report. On the other hand, it would be superfluous to include the text of the questions posed and the replies given by representatives, particularly when, as in the case of the German Democratic Republic, the Committee had said it was entirely satisfied with the replies given. That would probably make the report more cumbersome. Further, paragraph 3 of document CEDAW/C/8/Add.6 read: "Information was provided which related to the internal structure of the Government of the State party and on how international conventions were applied and publicized". That sentence was an inadequate reflection of what had taken place in the Committee, since the representative of the German Democratic Republic had not confined himself to describing the structure of his country's Government but had given ample statistics on women's participation in decision-making organs, specifying the level at which they were employed.

96. Ms. REGENT-LECHOWICZ thought the amendment proposed by Ms. Gonzalez-Martinez would create an imbalance between the section of the report dealing with questions and the section dealing with answers. If it said that questions had been put, the report would also have to include all the information provided in response to those questions.

97. Ms. SMITH said that while she thought it would be difficult to include a summary of the report in paragraph 6, it might be useful to refer in that paragraph, at least briefly, to the additional information supplied orally by representatives. She did not think that the report as it stood was too detailed. Moreover, as Ms. Gonzalez-Martinez had said, each expert was likely to give more weight to one question than to another. Experts were entitled to request the inclusion of additional questions which had been raised together with the replies. The fact that replies had been provided to questions raised did not justify the omission of the questions. The draft report was no more voluminous or detailed than reports of other committees, such as, for example, that of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. That being so, the replies given by the German Democratic Republic had, in general, been satisfactorily incorporated in the report.

98. Ms. CARON endorsed the view expressed by Ms. Biryukova, namely that it would be useful to incorporate a summary of the presentation made by each country's representative - in the case in hand, that of the German Democratic Republic. She did not, however, subscribe to the view that the questions should be omitted because the Committee's primary task was to consider the reports. The text of the questions put by the experts should be recorded because they elicited very useful information which was not contained in reports, which were often too succinct. As for the concerns expressed by Ms. Regent-Lechowicz, it should be noted that paragraph 7 reflected in a general way the Committee's satisfaction with the German Democratic Republic's report as a whole. Compared with the reports of other committees, the draft under consideration was not too voluminous and once some of the suggestions had been implemented it would be quite satisfactory.

99. Ms. MACEDO DE SHEPPARD endorsed the views expressed by Ms. Smith and Ms. Caron. She herself felt that the Committee was bound by the text it had already adopted, and in particular by paragraph 5 of the text under consideration, which stated that part of the report contained a summary of each country's report and the substance of the replies given by the representatives of the States parties. The Committee could not depart from the rules it had itself adopted. It would be useful to prepare an analytical summary of the reports submitted by each country. That was, however, a difficult undertaking if everything which had been included in the report was to be reflected and she wondered whether it was feasible.

100. Ms. OESER thought it would not be practical, at the beginning of the report, to include a summary of the reports submitted by each country. What should be done was to supply as much information as possible. Information should not be limited to that given in reply to questions, but should include that proffered spontaneously, particularly when reports were introduced. It was to that that Ms. Smith had alluded. Consequently, paragraph 6 should contain a brief summary in the case of the German Democratic Republic, but also in the case of other States parties, of the information which had emerged when the report of the State party had been presented. That would create a balance between information obtained from various sources.

101. It should be noted that far more stress had been placed on the questions put to the representative of the German Democratic Republic than to the replies he had given, which created a certain imbalance. That problem could be resolved by adding two or three sentences to the summary record of the meeting at which the report had been considered.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.