

**INTERNATIONAL
COVENANT
ON CIVIL AND
POLITICAL RIGHTS**



CCPR

Distr.
GENERAL

CCPR/C/SR.51
19 January 1978

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Third Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 51st MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday 18 January 1978, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. MAVROMMATIS

CONTENTS

Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of
the Covenant: initial reports of States parties due in 1977 (agenda item 4)

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

This record is subject to correction.

Participants wishing to make corrections should submit them in writing to the
Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva, within
one week of receiving the record in their working language.

Corrections to the records of the meetings of the Committee at this session
will be consolidated in a single corrigendum to be issued shortly after the end of
the session.

GE.78-1518

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 40 OF THE COVENANT: INITIAL REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES DUE IN 1977 (agenda item 4)

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (CCPR/C/1/Add.3)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of Denmark would attend the Committee's afternoon meeting on 19 January and that the representatives of the German Democratic Republic and Norway would be present on the afternoons of 27 January and 1 February respectively. In accordance with the decision it had taken on 16 January, the Committee would commence consideration of agenda item 4 with the report of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (CCPR/C/1/Add.3).
2. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Siala (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took a place at the Committee table.
3. Mr. SIALA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the report submitted by his country (CCPR/C/1/Add.3) contained texts which had now been nullified following the repeal, in March 1977, of the Constitutional Declaration, the provisions of which had been replaced by the more general principles embodied in the Koran. Consequently, he had a new report to introduce to the Committee.
4. Mr. IALIAH asked whether the new report had been compiled on the basis of the Committee's guidelines. If it had not, and related only to the new constitutional arrangements, the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya might perhaps simply refer to the changes in the report before the Committee.
5. Mr. TARNOPOLSKY also asked whether the new report merely modified the earlier one or whether it was based on the Committee's guidelines and, therefore, totally different. In the latter case, it would be useful if members could be given an opportunity to study the text.
6. Mr. ESPERSEN asked whether the constitutional changes had affected the penal code. If they had not, the Committee could base its discussion and questions on the text before it, but if they had, it might be difficult to establish a dialogue. In any event, it would be useful if the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya could indicate the essential changes.
7. Mr. SIALA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that there were only two constitutional points on which the new report differed in substance from the earlier one, and that the penal code had not been affected.
8. Sir Vincent EVANS expressed the hope that the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would explain the present constitutional position. He asked what was the general legal framework within which human rights were protected, and whether the Koran had simply been substituted for the previous constitution or whether the country had a new constitution which incorporated the text of the Koran.
9. Mr. GRAEFRATH considered that the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya should be given the opportunity to introduce the report as he saw fit, and that Committee members should not start to ask questions before he had done so.

10. Mr. SIALA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the earlier Constitutional Declaration had been repealed and replaced by the Koran, in which all the texts concerning human rights were to be found. In introducing the report, he would refer to the various articles of the Covenant.

11. Regarding article 6, concerning the right to life, the death penalty was provided for in article 17 of the Libyan Penal Code, other articles of the Code specifying the crimes to which it was applicable. The manner in which it was to be carried out was laid down in the Code of Criminal Procedure (articles 432, 435 and 437). Special provisions were applicable to young offenders and pregnant women: in the case of offenders under the age of 18, a minimum of five years' imprisonment in a reformatory was substituted for the death penalty (Penal Code, article 81); for pregnant women, execution was suspended until the second month following the date of confinement (Code of Criminal Procedure, article 436).

12. Regarding article 7 of the Covenant (torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment), article 431 of the Penal Code stipulated that officials who in the exercise of their functions used violence against a person in a manner degrading to him or causing him physical pain was punished by imprisonment and a fine, and article 435 prescribed imprisonment in the case of any official who ordered or inflicted torture on a defendant. The purpose of punishment, according to article 41 of the Code, was the reformation and social and moral education of the convicted person. The humanitarian considerations involved and the principles governing labour and education were to be taken into account in carrying out prison sentences. A judge was required to give reasons for his sentence and to order punishment falling strictly within the limits prescribed by the law.

13. Regarding article 8 of the Covenant, concerning slavery and the slave-trade, Libyan law provided that anyone holding a person in slavery or in conditions comparable to slavery was guilty of an offence punishable by 5 to 15 years' imprisonment (Penal Code, article 425). Slave-trading incurred imprisonment for up to 10 years (Penal Code, article 426).

14. Regarding article 9 of the Covenant (right to liberty and security of person), Libyan law provided safeguards in connexion with arrest and detention. Generally, no one could be arrested except on the order of the legally competent authority (Code of Criminal Procedure, article 30). Any complaint concerning unlawful imprisonment had to be the subject of an inquiry. Any official who exceeded his authority and unlawfully arrested anyone was liable to imprisonment (Penal Code, article 433). Where the evidence of an offence was considered sufficient, an accused person could be held in custody pending trial. The examining judge could order pre-trial custody for a period of 15 days, renewable up to a maximum of 45 days, which could not be exceeded except by order of a tribunal composed of three judges (Code of Criminal Procedure, article 123).

15. The provisions of article 10 of the Covenant were put into effect through various articles in the Act concerning the penitentiary system. Detainees were divided into categories and separation of the sexes was compulsory. Pregnant women were given special treatment (article 23) and anyone serving a short sentence could benefit from the privileges allowed to those in custody pending trial (article 21). Regulations covering the work and education of prisoners were laid down in the Act, which also provided for their religious welfare and medical treatment, as well as the disciplinary measures applicable to them. The right to receive visits and

letters and the right to submit complaints were recognized. Persons held in custody pending trial had to be separated from other prisoners (article 14): they were entitled to have food brought in, to receive books and newspapers and to communicate with their counsel. There were special courts and special prisons for young offenders; detainees under 20 years of age had to be kept apart from the others.

16. Regarding article 11 of the Covenant, Libyan law provided that failure to fulfil a contractual obligation was not punishable by imprisonment.

17. The provisions corresponding to article 12 of the Covenant guaranteed freedom of movement to all persons within Libyan territory, but that freedom might be restricted for security reasons. Every Libyan by birth or by naturalization could obtain a passport enabling him to leave the country and to return without a special visa. With regard to article 13, the attention of members of the Committee was drawn to article 158 of the Penal Code, relating to the deportation of aliens, and to article 493 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, concerning the extradition of criminals.

18. With respect to the administration of justice (article 14 of the Covenant), he pointed out that the Koran affirmed the need to govern in justice. Court hearings were public, except where the maintenance of public order required otherwise. The charges had to be read out to the accused, who had the right to be assisted by counsel, if necessary appointed by the State. The accused had to be present at the hearing and had the right to examine witnesses for the prosecution and for the defence; but under article 247 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, he himself could be interrogated only with his consent. Article 365 of the Code gave the accused the right of appeal and article 381 the right to appeal to the Court of Cassation. The accused was entitled to have his case re-opened if new facts came to light (Code of Criminal Procedure, article 402), but under article 416, criminal cases could not be re-opened once a final judgment had been given. In cases involving aliens, the State undertook to provide translation or interpretation services.

19. The subject of article 15 of the Covenant was non-retroactivity of the law. In that connexion, article 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provided that offences must be punished by the penalties prescribed by the law applicable at the time when the offence was committed. In addition, if a more favourable law had been enacted since the offence, the offender was entitled to benefit from it, and if the act committed had ceased to be punishable his sentence must be quashed.

20. With regard to article 16 of the Covenant, Libyan law provided that all laws in force were applicable to all without discrimination. The Penal Code defined criminal responsibility in relation to age and mental capacity.

21. Various articles of the Code of Criminal Procedure or the Penal Code gave effect to the provisions of article 17 of the Covenant. Officials were not permitted to enter dwellings except in the cases provided for by law. Any official who searched a person without a warrant was liable to imprisonment (Penal Code, article 432). Articles 446 and 447 of the Penal Code provided penalties for trespass and article 344 provided for the punishment of any post-office official who violated the secrecy of private correspondence, telegrams or telephone conversations.

22. The Koran affirmed that there must be no "compulsion in religion", a provision that was in conformity with article 18 of the Covenant. Articles 289 and 290 of the Penal Code provided for the punishment of persons guilty of sacrilege (CCPR/C/1/Add.3, pp. 14 and 15).

23. With respect to freedom of opinion, as provided for in article 19 of the Covenant, no Libyan law required anyone to be of any particular opinion, and article 217 of the Penal Code provided for the punishment of anyone who violated political rights. Freedom of expression was likewise guaranteed, except where its exercise was intended to incite to crime, calculated to cause divisions between communities, encouraged rebellion against the law, took the form of insult or defamation or infringed public morality.

24. Article 20 of the Covenant prohibited propaganda for war and any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred. In that connexion, article 203 of the Libyan Penal Code prescribed penalties for incitement to civil war and article 206 punished acts performed with the intention of seizing power for the benefit of a social class or suppressing a particular class.

25. The right of peaceful assembly set out in article 21 of the Covenant was guaranteed in Libya, except where its exercise was accompanied by offences punishable by law, such as incitement to rebellion or civil war, or endangered justice, security and public order or public health.

26. Regarding freedom of association, referred in article 22 of the Covenant, workers in Libya had the right to establish trade unions to serve their interests and protect their rights (Act No.107/75 concerning trade unions, article 1).

27. Various provisions of Libyan law gave effect to the principles of article 23 of the Covenant. In Islamic law, marriage was a contract requiring the consent of both parties, and there must be no coercion of either the man or the woman. The State encouraged marriage and paid special allowances to married persons. The law punished those who failed to fulfil their family responsibilities, mistreated members of their family, in particular their children, failed to comply with a court order to pay maintenance or refused to hand over a child to the person entrusted with its custody. It also punished marital infidelity. Islamic law regulated the dissolution of marriages and guaranteed certain rights to the two parties.

28. Regarding article 24 of the Covenant, concerning the protection of children, the law punished the abandonment or murder of the newly born and the abandonment of minor children (Penal Code, articles 373, 387 and 389). It also punished the kidnapping of children, moral offences against minors and incitement of minors to prostitution (Penal Code, articles 406, 413 and 415).

29. The right to take part in public affairs (article 25 of the Covenant) was guaranteed to all Libyan subjects and was exercised through peoples' institutions.

30. In accordance with the provisions of article 26 of the Covenant, all persons in Libya were equal before the law and no individual or group of individuals might be the subject of any discrimination on grounds of race, colour, sex, language, religion or opinion. Libyan society was based on the word of the Koran, which proclaimed: "O mankind, we have created you from a male and a female. We have made you peoples and tribes that you may know one another. The noblest of you in the sight of Allah is the most pious among you." The Koran also

affirmed that men were equal, like the teeth of a comb, and that God had no preference for white over black or red over yellow, nor for an Arab over a foreigner, except according to their piety, for all were descended from Adam, and Adam had been taken from the dust.

31. Lastly, with regard to article 27 of the Covenant, concerning the rights of ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities, he stated that Libyan society was a single entity and there were no racial minorities.

32. The CHAIRMAN congratulated the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on its promptness in submitting a report to the Committee and thanked the representative of that country for the additional information he had given. He invited questions and comments from the members of the Committee.

33. Sir Vincent EVANS, noting that the provisions of the Constitution of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had been replaced by the Koran, which contained statements on human rights, asked for details of the legal effects of the change and of the recourse available to individuals for contesting laws or acts which infringed rights recognized by the Koran. He also pointed out that, in a number of countries, ratification of international agreements such as the International Covenants entailed the incorporation of their provisions in national law and asked whether that was the case for the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

34. He also wished to ask some questions concerning rights mentioned in the report before the Committee (CCPR/C/1/Add.3), particularly the right to vote and to be elected at periodic elections by universal and equal suffrage and by secret ballot, set out in article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The principle in question was essential to the preservation of democratic freedoms and it was therefore important to have further information on the situation in that respect. Another important article of the Covenant was article 19, concerning freedom of opinion and expression. In that connexion article 13 of the Constitutional Declaration, which was quoted in paragraph 12 of the report, was open to restrictive interpretations which did not accord with the Covenant. He would like to know whether that article had been repealed and, if so, whether it had been replaced by a text from the Koran. The information given concerning freedom of political opinion merited particular attention, as article 19 of the Prison Code, which was quoted on page 19 of the report, referred to persons convicted of political crimes. He wondered what acts were considered political crimes in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. He would also like to know whether any persons, other than those convicted of such crimes, were being held without trial in that country for political reasons and, if so, whether they had any means of recourse.

35. Attention should also be given to the conditions of pre-trial detention mentioned in articles 122 and 123 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and to the possibilities of prolonging such detention to which the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had referred. The provisions in force were inadequate to ensure compliance with the principle set forth in article 14, paragraph 3 (c), of the Covenant that everyone charged with a criminal offence had the right to be

tried without undue delay. The European Commission on Human Rights had been notified of cases of improper detention in certain countries, and the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya should provide further clarification on that point. He would also like to have details of the application by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of the provisions of article 14, paragraph 3 (d), of the Covenant, concerning the right of the accused to be present at his trial and to defend himself in person. He wished to know in particular in what circumstances an individual could be tried in his absence and whether he could be represented by a third party of his choice. The initial report also gave inadequate details concerning the categories of serious crimes punishable by death (CCPR/C/1/Add.3, paragraph 7, section A). The Committee should be told in particular whether the death penalty was applicable to acts other than voluntary homicide and whether it had been imposed in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya recently.

36. Although the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had referred to the right of individuals to form trade unions for the protection of their interests, as laid down in article 22, paragraph 1, of the Covenant, no mention of that right appeared in the report. He would welcome further information from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on that topic, since the fact that, in some countries, trade unions could be formed only under the aegis of the Government did not seem to him to be in keeping with the spirit of the Covenant.

37. Mr. TARNOPOLSKY thanked the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for having submitted its report without delay and having informed the Committee of the changes in the national Constitution. He presumed that the new provisions enabled citizens to defend their rights against any decision by the courts or legislative or administrative authorities which was contrary to the principles of the Koran.

38. Taking up the examination of the legal provisions mentioned in the report in the light of certain articles of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, he pointed out that that Covenant emphasized, in article 3, the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of civil and political rights and asked what difference there was in that respect between the old and the new Constitutions. He would like to know whether the death penalty, to which Sir Vincent Evans had referred with regard to article 6 of the Covenant, continued to be applied and whether there were any statistics on that subject for the last four or five years. He also attached particular importance to article 7 of the Covenant, which prohibited torture, and those provisions of the Libyan Penal Code which provided punishment for officials who used torture; in that connexion, he would like to know whether Libyan courts could order corporal punishment and if so, under what conditions and for what crimes.

39. The Committee should be told whether detention pending trial, to which reference was made in article 9, paragraph 3, and article 14, paragraph 3 (b), of the Covenant, could be and had ever actually been prolonged indefinitely.

40. With regard to article 27 of the Constitutional Declaration, which was quoted on page 21 of the report, he wondered whether the new courts still had the duty to protect the principles of society and the rights, dignity and freedom of individuals. Article 245 of the Code of Criminal Procedure did not really specify whether the defendant had the right to interrogate witnesses for the prosecution, as laid down in article 14, paragraph 3 (e) of the Covenant. Referring to article 17 of the Covenant, which protected individuals against breaches of the privacy of the home or the secrecy of correspondence, and recognizing that there might be exceptions to the right to inviolability of the home, he asked in what circumstances the present Constitution permitted the searching of a citizen's private residence.

41. Freedom of religion was the subject of several articles in the Libyan Penal Code. It would be helpful to know whether the application of the Koran had entailed any changes in those provisions and what repercussions, if any, the new system had had on the right of citizens to take part in the conduct of public affairs and to have access to public service, as provided in article 25 of the International Covenant. It should also be stated whether the references in articles 290 and 291 of the Penal Code to public attacks on religion were to oral attacks or physical acts. He also wondered what had been and what was the status under the Constitution of non-believers, who had the right to respect of their opinions under article 19 of the Covenant.

42. He endorsed the remarks made by Sir Vincent Evans concerning article 13 of the Constitutional Declaration and article 19 (b) of the Prison Code. He would like further information concerning the crime of libel mentioned in article 439 of the Penal Code and wished to know whether the "injured party" referred to in article 441 of that Code could be a political, administrative or judicial organ and whether there were any legal statistics concerning that type of offence.

43. He had found in the report no articles of either the Constitutional Declaration or the Penal Code which corresponded to articles 21 to 27 of the Covenant concerning the right of assembly or association, the prohibition of discrimination, and the position of ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities. Information should be provided in particular on the extent to which the freedom of speech, the right of association of journalists, and the like were exercised. There had also been an inadequate exchange of views on the freedom of association of political groups and the restrictions to which it could be subject in accordance with article 22, paragraph 2, of the Covenant.

44. Mr. ESPERSEN associated himself with the congratulations expressed to the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on the promptness with which his country had submitted its report. While most of the questions he had wished to ask had already been put by previous speakers, he attached particular importance to the principle of legality mentioned in paragraph 1 of the report, which was dependent on the existence, in accordance with article 14 of the Covenant, of independent and impartial courts. He would like to know, therefore, how judges were appointed, whether they were appointed for life or could be dismissed, and, if they could, by what authority. He would also like details of the circumstances

in which pre-trial detention could be prolonged and of the relative powers of magistrates and courts of first instance in that respect. Article 30 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CCPF/C/1/Add.3, paragraph 14) was unclear. Were there laws in which the authorities legally competent to issue arrest warrants were more clearly identified?

45. Citizens needed to know not only what authority was competent to order their arrest or detention, but also in what circumstances they became guilty of offences under the law. From that point of view, article 396 of the Penal Code was too vague, for in referring to the abandonment of the family, it spoke merely of behaviour "incompatible with proper conduct or ethics".

46. He would also like to know whether there were any categories of penalty other than the fines, detention and imprisonment mentioned in the report. He associated himself with the questions which had already been asked concerning the possibility of the imposition of the death sentence in the event of incitement to change the Government or régime. The comments which had been made on the freedom of opinion and expression would undoubtedly be referred to again during the Committee's dialogue with the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

47. Mr. LALLAH observed that the report dealt at length with the penal sanctions imposed on persons who, whether or not they were exercising their official functions, prevented individuals from enjoying rights recognized to them in the Covenant. On the other hand, there was little mention of the civil and administrative remedies available to individuals, and further information on that point would be very useful.

48. With regard to the right of citizens to participate in public affairs and to vote and be elected, it should be made clear whether freedom of opinion and thought (paragraph 12 of the report) was still subject, under the new constitutional arrangements, to the restrictions provided for in the Constitutional Declaration. If it was, did the judicial authority or the executive authority have to decide what was meant by "interests of the people" and "principles of the Revolution"?

49. Article 19 of the Prison Code, which mentioned persons convicted of political crimes, was reproduced in paragraph 14. In view of the possible effects on various fundamental freedoms recognized in the Covenant, it would be useful to know what exactly was meant by the expression "political crime" in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and what régime governed the treatment of political prisoners.

50. With regard to the right of everyone to freedom of association with others, referred to in article 22 of the Covenant, and in particular the right to form and join trade unions, he wished to know what legal régime governed occupational relations and what was the situation of aliens.

51. It was apparent from paragraph 10 of the report, which related to freedom of religion, that that freedom was limited to the practice of the Moslem religion. Were there any legislative provisions or administrative measures protecting persons of another religion?

52. Clarification would also appear necessary concerning the implementation of article 3 of the Covenant, which related to the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of all civil and political rights set forth therein. To what extent did such equality exist with regard to participation in public affairs and elections (article 25 of the Covenant)? Did men and women enjoy equal rights in marriage (article 23 of the Covenant)? Was polygamy possible and, if so, did wives have similar rights?

53. Mr. HANGA, referring to paragraph 2 of the report, asked whether the principle of the equality of all citizens before the law, which had been set out in article 5 of the Constitutional Declaration recently repealed, was also included in the new Constitution. If so, it would be interesting to know whether equality of men and women was embodied in that document. In particular, could women participate in the social, cultural and political life of the country? Were they entitled to equal pay for equal work, and did they have free access to education? The Committee should be told not only what legislative provisions existed in that area but also whether the country's cultural traditions impeded equality of men and women.

54. With regard to crimes of slavery, it should be stated whether slavery had ever been practised in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and it should be confirmed that slavery was prohibited by the Koran, if that was the case.

55. Many penal provisions concerning the protection of the family, referred to in article 23 of the Covenant, were mentioned in paragraph 9 of the report, but there was no reference to any provisions of civil law. What provisions of civil law established procedures for, and facilitated, the implementation of the principles reflected in penal legislation?

56. It was indicated in paragraph 12 of the report that the "principles of the Revolution" limited the exercise of freedom of opinion and thought. He would like to know whether those principles had been established in political documents, whether they had any legal status and whether they were binding on a judge.

57. In the Constitutional Declaration, work was regarded as "a right, duty and honour for each citizen able to work". If that principle was also enunciated in the Koran, it should be made clear what specific administrative measures had been taken by the Government to ensure its implementation.

58. Lastly, he wished to know what legislative procedure had been followed in order to incorporate the provisions of the Covenant into national substantive law. Could a citizen now invoke the Covenant in defence of his interests? Did the provisions of the Covenant really form an integral part of the national legal system and was their implementation facilitated by the prevailing social and economic conditions?

59. Mr. TOMUSCHAT, referring to article 2, paragraph 3 of the Covenant, said that the report mainly described penal sanctions imposed on persons who violated certain human rights. However, the provision in question was much broader in scope: it covered the right of any person to bring before a judicial or other authority any dispute between himself and the State, for example, a dispute concerning the scope of the right to form and join a trade union.

60. With regard to the family, he would like to know what was the status of the spouses during marriage and after its dissolution. Moreover, did aliens enjoy the same rights as Libyans or did they have a special status? It would also be interesting to know the number of aliens and, in particular, foreign workers.

61. The question of the death penalty was very important. The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya should indicate how many persons had been executed in his country during recent years.

62. The information provided in the report concerning the implementation of article 12 of the Covenant gave the impression that the right to leave the country was not fully guaranteed to aliens. Further details on that point would be desirable.

63. With regard to the principle of equality before the courts, enunciated in article 14 of the Covenant, it was not clear whether the information provided in the report related to all procedures or only to normal procedures. Were there any special procedures? When a state of emergency was proclaimed, could certain cases be brought before emergency courts? Did such courts deal with political crimes?

64. Paragraph 10 of the report, which related to freedom of religion as embodied in article 18 of the Covenant, seemed to deal exclusively with the Moslem religion. He wondered whether Christians and Jews could freely hold public services and whether they enjoyed the same rights, if not the same status, as Moslems.

65. As to freedom of opinion, there was a possibility that the restrictions arising from the "interests of the people" and the "principles of the Revolution" might be couched in excessively vague terms. Under article 19 of the Covenant, freedom of opinion could be subject only to clearly determined restrictions, including restrictions necessary for the protection of public order (ordre public). In his opinion, the concept of the interest of the people was clearly broader than that of public order.

66. Mr. GRAEFRATH considered that it would be useful for the Committee to know what were the achievements of the Libyan Revolution, whether structural changes had been made in society and legislation, and, if so, whether those changes had had any effects on human rights.

67. With regard to the right to life, the legislative provisions relating to the death penalty were undoubtedly of utmost importance, but account should also be taken of the extent to which a society sought to limit infant mortality and to increase life expectancy. On the question of death sentences, it would in any case be desirable to have further information on the role of the Mufti.

68. Information should also be given on experience gained in connexion with the open or semi-open prisons.

69. In his opinion, the best means of guaranteeing the independence of the courts and judges consisted not so much in appointing judges for life as in giving every citizen the possibility of becoming a judge.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee did not expect the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to give detailed replies immediately to the many questions he had been asked. Obviously, some of those questions would require research which could be conducted on the basis of the summary record of the current meeting. He might therefore reserve the right to reply to a particular question at a later stage and to revert to certain replies or to give written explanations.

71. Mr. SIALA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the answers to some questions might be found in his previous statement. However, in view of the number of questions asked and the importance of most of them, he would prefer to reply to them in writing.

72. Mr. MOVCHAN noted with satisfaction that the report and the explanations given by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya bore witness to significant economic and social changes in that country intended to satisfy the fundamental needs of the individual and to ensure observance of the international instruments relating to human rights.

73. The CHAIRMAN said he believed that he was reflecting the wishes of all the members of the Committee in thanking the Libyan Government for the detailed report which it had promptly submitted to the Committee and in congratulating its representative for having clearly presented and supplemented that report.

74. Mr. Siala (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) withdrew.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.