UNITED NATIONS

CRC

Convention on the Rights of the Child

Distr.
GENERAL

CCPR/C/SR.1324
24 February 1995

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Fifty-first session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1324th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 6 July 1994, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ANDO

CONTENTS

GE.94-17475 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 40 OF THE COVENANT (agenda item 4) (continued)

Third periodic report of Jordan (CCPR/C/76/Add.1 and HRI/CORE/1/Add.18/Rev.1) (continued)

1. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Abul-Ethem, Mr. Kasawneh and Mr. Ghazi El Rashdan (Jordan) took places at the Committee table.

2. Mr. ABUL-ETHEM (Jordan), replying to Mrs. Evatt's question on the registration of political parties, said that the applicable procedures were published and were available for consultation in the Ministry of the Interior and that there was no restriction in that area. He also explained that the Council of Notables was composed of 40 members and that the Parliament had 80 members. Any bills were first considered by the members of Parliament and then referred to the Council of Notables. Where there was a difference of opinion, the bill was again referred to the Parliament and, if the deputies insisted on maintaining their position, Council of Notables and the Parliament held a joint meeting. The bill was voted on and had to receive the majority vote of the 120 members. To date, that type of procedure had not given rise to any problems. With regard to the special powers of deputies, it should be made clear that, according to the Constitution, they consisted only in the enactment of provisional laws in the event of the dissolution of Parliament or when it was not in session. The exercise of those special powers was subject to certain conditions in cases of force majeure: the provisional law then had to be submitted to Parliament as soon as it was in session again.

3. All Jordanian citizens were entitled to join the national armed forces. In that connection, the impression should be dispelled that a particular category of citizens occupied the majority of posts in the army. In fact, officers in the various ranks and grades were from all religious denominations and all ethnic groups.

4. In reply to Mr. Prado Vallejo's question, he said that, although radio and television were State bodies, it would be completely wrong to say that programmes reflected only one tendency, since all opinions could be expressed, including opinions opposed to the Government. The press also did not belong to the State and the Government had no control over newspapers, which were the property of limited companies of which any citizen could become a shareholder, regardless of his political opinions. Journalists were free to comment on political events and were not subject to censorship, provided that they did not harm anyone, in accordance with the principles generally applicable in all countries in the world. No journalist had been arrested or detained because of his political or other opinions, but it had happened, during the first stages of the establishment of democracy in Jordan, that journalists had entered into conflict with one another and taken legal action against one another on the grounds of slander and other personal attacks. Some journalists had been found innocent and others had been sentenced, but the Government had not been involved in any way in those conflicts between citizens.

5. With regard to Mr. Bruni Celli's question on education, he said that non-Muslim students were not required to take courses based on Islam or to practise the Islamic faith. In Christian schools, catechism was taught according to the school's faith and rite, at special times set aside for that purpose. In reply to Mr. Mavrommatis' question about the Baha'is, it should be explained that a citizen's change of religion in no way affected the exercise of his fundamental rights and that any person who had changed religion was freely entitled to own property, provided that he continued to be a Jordanian citizen.

6. In reply to Mr. Ban's question about remedies in the event of disputes involving the press, he said that the court that could be petitioned was the Court of Cassation, and not a criminal or civil court, since those were remedies against a decision of an administrative court. The Press Act established a procedure for obtaining an authorization to publish a newspaper, but it was unrelated to any considerations of a political nature. His delegation was unable to indicate to the Committee the exact percentage of members of political parties represented in the Parliament, but it would try to provide further explanations on that point later.

7. With regard to Mr. Wennergren's question, he indicated that the Press Act provided for penalties in the event of defamation and that limits on freedom of the press were set by the Parliament and could be changed without affecting the exercise of the human rights recognized in international instruments.

8. Mr. MAVROMMATIS, referring to the apparent difference in treatment of members of the Baha'i religion in Jordan, said that, according to article 18 of the Covenant, all religions must be treated equally. However, the Baha'is appeared to be subjected to a certain form of discrimination as a result of the fact that they could not own property because of their religion. In that connection, he strongly recommended that the Jordanian delegation should draw the attention of the Jordanian Government to the Committee's general comment on article 18 of the Covenant.

9. Mr. ABUL-ETHEM (Jordan) said that no distinction whatever was made between religions in Jordan. Since the establishment of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, there had been two main religions, Islam and Christianity. There was no legislation restricting the rights of the members of other religions in any way.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the Government of Jordan would be able to transmit in writing any additional information it considered necessary. He invited the members of the Committee to formulate their concluding observations on the third periodic report of Jordan.

11. Mr. EL SHAFEI thanked the Jordanian delegation for its presentation of the report and its written and oral replies to questions. The report had been prepared in accordance with the Committee's guidelines, but it still related mainly to the constitutional framework for the implementation of the Covenant, whereas it should also have contained a general description of the way in which the rights provided for in the Covenant were specifically exercised in the country and the obstacles and problems encountered in that regard. It was also regrettable that no information had been given on the implementation of

article 25 of the Covenant, particularly in view of the democratic process that had begun in Jordan. In that connection, he would have liked to have information on a whole set of questions relating to elections, the type of voting, the registration of political parties, the publication of political platforms, etc. He would also have liked to know to what extent the economic problems Jordan had been experiencing since 1992 had affected the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms, as well as education and training programmes.

12. The Covenant was probably one of the most important international human rights instruments. The Committee formulated general comments on the articles of the Covenant in order to help States parties not only to prepare their periodic reports, but also to ensure that national law enforcement authorities guaranteed the full exercise of the rights and freedoms recognized in the Covenant. It was to be hoped that the Government of Jordan would be able to acquaint itself with the reports and general comments formulated by the Committee.

13. He welcomed the positive new legislative and political developments that had taken place in Jordan during the period under consideration and, in particular, the establishment of a multiparty system and a system to monitor the Government. He hoped that Jordan would continue to move ahead on the road to democracy and be an example for the other countries in the region.

14. The Committee would probably have liked the Jordanian delegation to provide examples of cases where courts had implemented provisions of the Covenant, since some members had expressed concern about information that had been received, for example, on the treatment of prisoners, some cases of torture and restrictions on freedom of the press. Moreover, the report did not refer at all to the implementation of article 18 of the Covenant, whereas Jordan, which was an Islamic country that applied Shariah law, might have some problems in ensuring respect for freedom of religion. That was a problem for a number of other Islamic countries and some had chosen, for example, to express certain reservations when ratifying the Covenant in order to be able to implement its provisions without contravening principles embodied in the Shariah. It should be recalled that the World Conference on Human Rights, held in Vienna in June 1993, had emphasized comprehensive respect for human rights at the international level, but had not ruled out particular aspects of the implementation of international instruments in the field of religion.

15. He warmly thanked the Jordanian delegation for its cooperation with the Committee.

16. Mrs. EVATT said that the explanations given by the Jordanian delegation had been necessary because the third periodic report and the core document did not refer to all articles of the Covenant and did not contain enough practical information. The members of the Committee knew that certain factors were an obstacle to Jordan's implementation of the provisions of the Covenant, but specific measures had been taken to strengthen respect for human rights in that country. She referred in particular to the organization of multiparty elections and the establishment of the Jordanian National Charter, which laid down guidelines for the establishment of democracy. However, some points still gave rise to concern: the maintenance of the Court of State security jeopardized the independence of the entire judicial system; persons detained

in the Security Department were particularly exposed to ill-treatment and torture; the level of participation of women in public affairs was still very low and the executive was still holding on to many functions that should be transferred to elected representatives of the people. In her opinion, the consideration of the third report by the Committee should be made public in Jordan and its results communicated to Jordanian human rights organizations.

17. Mr. WENNERGREN said that the situation of human rights had improved considerably since the consideration of the second periodic report of Jordan. The peace and stability that prevailed in that country were signs of the progress made on the road to democracy. There were still some problems, such as that of torture, but, although it had, of course, not been abolished, it was regarded by the Government with more of a concern for reform. There was now no doubt that the Government was firmly determined to eliminate that scourge, which particularly affected prisoners in the Security Department. With regard to the rights of women, many problems still had to be overcome. The Government had to take specific measures to encourage women to participate actively in the management of the public affairs of the country. There were still far too many cases of prolonged pre-trial detention and of persons being held incommunicado. In accordance with article 9, paragraph 3, of the Covenant, pre-trial detention should be an exception and as short as possible. Jordan's practices in that regard were incompatible with that provision and the country had to take the necessary measures to remedy that situation.

18. With regard to freedom of religion, he shared Mr. Mavrommatis' opinion about the Committee's general comments on the meaning and importance of article 18 of the Covenant. As far as freedom of expression was concerned, he recommended that Jordan should take account of the provisions of the Covenant on defamation so that freedom of the press, in particular, would not be endangered.

19. Mr. FRANCIS expressed satisfaction with the constructive and fruitful dialogue established between the Jordanian delegation and the Committee. He also drew attention to the international importance of Mr. Arafat's arrival in the West Bank and Jericho, which symbolized the start of self-determination for the Palestinian people. He recalled that Jordan had been on the side of Palestinian people since 1948 and had continued to support it after the establishment of the PLO and he hoped that the members of the Committee would see that as a contribution by Jordan to respect for human rights.

20. Mr. BRUNI CELLI said that he welcomed the constructive dialogue established with the delegation of Jordan, but hoped that the next periodic reports would contain information on all articles of the Covenant. He recommended that Jordan should take account of the general guidelines regarding the form and contents of periodic reports (CCPR/C/20/Rev.1) and, in particular, of guidelines 6 (b), (d) and (e), since the Committee would like to have more information on the factors affecting the implementation of the Covenant and the progress made in the enjoyment of rights recognized in it.

21. Mr. POCAR pointed out that Jordan had not followed the Committee's guidelines in preparing its third periodic report, which contained very little information on the practical implementation of the Covenant. He nevertheless recognized that the dialogue with the delegation of Jordan had helped to fill

those gaps. Many specific measures had been taken since the consideration of the second periodic report, but some obstacles still remained and they had not all been clearly defined. He also considered that it should be recommended that Jordan should become a party to the Optional Protocol which supplemented the system of international protection established by the Covenant.

22. Mr. PRADO VALLEJO said he was of the opinion that the very fruitful dialogue with the delegation of Jordan had helped the Committee better to understand the difficulties that country was experiencing in the implementation of the provisions of the Covenant, as well as the progress that had been made in that regard. He recalled that Jordan had been hard hit economically by the Gulf war and that its recovery had been lengthy and difficult. He also noted that progress had been achieved on the road to democracy and that Jordan still had efforts to make in order to achieve that objective. He referred in particular to the problem of the torture of prisoners, which had been denounced as a common practice. In his view, the Government had to assume its responsibilities by investigating such practices and punishing the persons responsible. The dialogue would, moreover, be even more constructive if the report were made public in Jordan, together with the results of its consideration by the Committee.

23. Mr. AGUILAR URBINA noted that the Jordanian delegation had expressed concern at the fact that the Committee seemed to have the wrong idea about Jordanian institutions, as shown by the number of questions asked by the members. If the Committee's idea was wrong, it could be the result only of the fact that the report of Jordan was too brief and there had been no specific answers to the questions asked with regard to the initial and second periodic reports. He also pointed out that, at the current session, the Committee had been unable to determine how much importance the Covenant had in Jordanian legislation.

24. With regard to the submission of the next report, he agreed with the comments by Mr. Bruni Celli and Mr. Pocar. The situation of women had improved considerably, but there was still discrimination against them. He was also of the opinion that there were still too many offences for which the death penalty was applicable and too many sentences for which that penalty was imposed. As far as religion was concerned, he noted that the Jordanian delegation had stated that there was no discrimination against monotheistic religions. Should it therefore be concluded that there was discrimination against other religions?

25. The CHAIRMAN said that the purpose of dialogue between the Committee and States parties was to help peoples and Governments reach the level of what were regarded as minimum rules in respect of human rights, since that was first and foremost their responsibility. He was sure that the Jordanian delegation would transmit the Committee's concerns to the Government and include replies to its questions in the next report.

26. Mr. ABUL-ETHEM (Jordan) thanked the Chairman and members of the Committee for their important and useful comments, which he would not fail to communicate to his Government with a view to consolidating all human rights principles in his country. He welcomed the fact that the dialogue had given the Committee an overall idea of the difficult situation which Jordan had

faced and continued to face and he was convinced that the Committee now no longer had any doubts about the Jordanian Government's determination to advance democracy and ensure equality of opportunity for all.

27. Referring to the status of women, he said that Jordan had ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and other instruments designed to enhance the status of women. There was still, of course, a great deal to be done and Jordan would make the best possible use of the Committee's experience in that field, as in others.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would transmit its final written comments on the consideration of the third periodic report to the Government of Jordan through the Permanent Mission in Geneva. The deadline for the submission of the fourth periodic report was 22 January 1997.

29. He announced that the Committee had completed its consideration of the third periodic report of Jordan.

30. The Jordanian delegation withdrew.

The meeting was suspended at 4.40 p.m. and resumed at 4.50 p.m.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 2) (continued) (M/CCPR/94/31)

31. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at its fiftieth session, the Committee had decided to change the format of its annual reports to the General Assembly, both as far as the part dealing with the reports of States parties and the part on communications were concerned. The Working Group on Article 40 had prepared a document entitled "Methods of work of the Committee under article 40 of the Covenant" (M/CCPR/1994/31). For the time being, the Committee should discuss only the way the reports of States parties were dealt with in the annual report.

32. Mrs. EVATT (Chairman/Rapporteur of the Working Group on Article 40) said that, although the recommendations made by the Working Group in document M/CCPR/94/31 related to various matters connected with the Committee's methods of work and the format of the annual report, the most urgent problem to be solved at the current stage was that of the presentation of the final written comments. The Committee would recall that, at its preceding session, it had decided that it would no longer report in detail on the discussions during the consideration of the reports of States parties and would include in its annual report only the final written comments which it addressed to State parties following the consideration of periodic reports and that it had therefore requested the Working Group on Article 40 to draft proposals on the necessary changes and improvements to be made in the presentation of the comments. On the basis of the idea that the final comments should be useful to everyone - States parties, the Committee for its consideration of the next report of the same State party, and readers - the Working Group had discussed ways of making them more complete and had drafted the proposals contained in paragraph 8 (a) to (c); the headings of the comments were proposed in paragraph 8 (d). Paragraph 8 (e) to (h) dealt with arrangements designed to make the final comments as useful as possible.

33. It went without saying that the new format would not apply to periodic reports considered at the October 1993 and March 1994 sessions, but, if the Committee decided to adopt it, it would apply to the reports considered at the current session.

34. Mr. POCAR said that he did not understand why the Committee had begun to discuss the amended format of the final comments when it had not yet taken any decision on the proposal relating to the new format of the annual report. The Committee should be discussing the format of its annual report (paras. 2 to 7 of document M/CCPR/94/31) before looking into the format of the final comments. In any event and no matter what decision the Committee took on the format of the final comments, it was not appropriate that the final comments should be presented on the basis of two different models in the same annual report to the General Assembly. If the new format was adopted, it should be used only as of the fifty-second session and would therefore be preferable for the Committee not to take any decision at the current stage. That was another reason for starting the consideration of document M/CCPR/94/31 with paragraphs 2 to 7.

35. Mr. MAVROMMATIS said that the questions the Committee had begun to consider were of major importance for the rest of its work and that, since there was no quorum, no decision should be taken.

36. Mrs. EVATT said that the members of the Committee could always exchange ideas on the new proposals without taking any decision, since a discussion of the matter could only be beneficial.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that there was no quorum and that the Committee could not take a decision. As far as the final written comments were concerned, however, the Committee would find that the headings proposed by the Working Group in paragraph 8 (d) of its document were the same, although in a different order and with slight variations, as the headings used in the old format. It was therefore not absolutely necessary to take a decision on the format of the final comments and, at the current meeting, the Committee could exchange views on paragraphs 2 to 7 of the document.

38. It was so decided.

39. Mr. NDIAYE said that he wondered whether the decision the Committee had taken at its fiftieth session was irreversible because, in his view, the way in which the annual report had been drafted had given a clear idea of what had been said during the consideration of the report of a State party and the final comments had followed logically on that summary. If the Committee included only the final comments, it would not be reporting on the human rights situation in a State party, for which it would then be easy to challenge the Committee's final evaluation. He would like to be reminded of the reasons why the Committee had taken its decision.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the reasons were technical. At its forty-ninth session, the Committee had not been able to have summary records for its meetings and the Working Group had therefore suggested that only the final comments should be included in the report which the Committee would submit to the General Assembly in 1994.

41. Mr. WENNERGREN (Working Group on Article 40) said that, as a rule, the Committee drafted its final comments on the basis of the summary records of meetings. In the case of the reports of States parties considered at the Committee's last session but one, the Working Group had wanted the final comments to be more detailed in order to make up for the lack of summary records at that session. He was of the opinion that the Committee's annual report should reflect the particular situation resulting from the partial lack of summary records and, unlike Mr. Pocar, he thought that it would be wise to present the final comments differently depending on whether or not summary records had been prepared for the meetings of the Committee at which the report of a State party had been considered.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that, in order to ensure that the discussion was clear, and unless the Commission decided otherwise - in which case, there would have to be a quorum, the section of the annual report dealing with the consideration of the reports of States parties would stay as it was, subject to certain amendments to take account of the proposals of the Working Group on Article 40.

43. Mrs. EVATT (Chairman/Rapporteur of the Working Group on Article 40) said that the proposals made by the Working Group in paragraph 2 (a) of document M/CCPR/94/31 were intended primarily to make it easier to read the annual report by describing the situation of overdue reports by States parties more clearly. As it now stood, the annual report did not make it possible to know quickly and clearly what the situation was in a particular country and it would be appropriate, for example, to highlight especially glaring cases of reports more than five years overdue. The second proposal in paragraph 2 (a) was intended to make the annex dealing with the "status of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant" clearer.

44. Mr. POCAR said that he agreed with the two proposals made in paragraph 2 (a). It was a particularly good idea to highlight reports more than five years overdue because that was grosso modo the periodicity of reports. States parties to the Covenant thus had to submit a new report roughly every five years. He also agreed with the proposal in paragraph 2 (b) that the annex to the annual report which included the agendas adopted at various sessions of the Committee should be eliminated.

45. Mr. MAVROMMATIS said that the question the Committee was now discussing was too important for a decision to be taken in the absence of the largest possible number of members and that it was not enough to have a quorum. All members of the Committee should state their views on the question. In any event, like Mr. Pocar, he fully endorsed all the proposals made in paragraph 2 of document M/CCPR/94/31. He would go even further: the Committee should not simply highlight reports overdue for more than five years, but should sound

the alarm. In that connection, the Committee would be well advised not to follow the usual stereotyped patterns and might even use personalized methods for a particular country depending on the serious events that might have occurred there.

46. Mr. BRUNI CELLI said that there were great disparities between States parties as far as the status of their reports was concerned. The reports of Gabon and Syria, for example, were 10 years overdue, whereas those of other States parties were only two years overdue. He was not certain that the Working Group's proposals were an adequate response to that situation. In his view, several lists should be drawn up, depending on how overdue reports were, in order to avoid any confusion, for that would certainly not be the best way of encouraging States parties to submit their reports on time.

47. Mr. FRANCIS said that he fully agreed with Mr. Bruni Celli's views.

48. Mr. POCAR said that, like Mr. Mavrommatis, he was of the opinion that the Committee should sound the alarm about reports overdue for more than five years. In that connection, it might, for example, decide not to list the States parties concerned in alphabetical order, but choose another presentation based on other criteria, such as the number of years overdue or the number of reports due.

49. Mrs. EVATT (Chairman/Rapporteur of the Working Group on Article 40) said that, in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, the list of reports of States parties which should have been submitted five or more years earlier would, of course, be included in the body of the Committee's annual report, and not in the annex. A special heading might even be created and such a list could be presented as a table so that it would be even more eye catching. On the basis of Mr. Pocar's idea, she suggested that States parties might be listed in descending order, starting with those whose reports were the most overdue.

50. Mr. AGUILAR URBINA (Working Group on Article 40) said that he shared Mr. Mavrommatis' view and suggested that the Committee should adopt a stronger tone and use more incisive wording than was usually the case in the United Nations. The idea of drawing up a list, which might take the form of a table, of States parties whose reports had been overdue for five years or more was a very good one. The table could, moreover, be included at the beginning of the relevant section of the annual report dealing with the reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant, which began with a reminder of the obligations contracted by the States Parties. He was also of the opinion that the Committee should not simply highlight the status of overdue reports, but should emphasize the seriousness of the situation. He referred to the example of Angola and Burundi, whose overdue reports were of particular importance in view of the events that had recently taken place in those two countries. The Committee had taken special decisions on those countries and all those elements should therefore be brought out in some way in the annual report.

51. Mr. HERNDL said that he agreed with the need to stress the seriousness of reports overdue for a long time. The Committee should also give further thought to that problem on the basis of the proposals contained in

paragraphs 9 et seq. of the Working Group's document (M/CCPR/94/31). He was, however, not convinced that the preparation of a list of States parties to be referred to in alphabetical order would serve the purpose for which it was intended, but he would not oppose a consensus by the Committee on that point. He suggested that the decision to be taken should be of a temporary nature. The annual report of the Committee which would be adopted at the current session might thus reflect the consensus decision, without prejudice to the future, and the Committee should be free to go back on that decision later if it turned out that the new format was not satisfactory.

52. Mr. PRADO VALLEJO said that he was not opposed - quite the contrary - to changes in the format of the Committee's annual report which would be intended better to reflect its concerns, but he considered that, in itself, the list of States parties that had been suggested would not really show how deeply concerned the Committee was. Drawing up the list would be a good thing, but the Committee should go further. It might, for example, send the list to the meeting of States parties which would be held next September. In general, he agreed with the decision the Committee seemed to be moving towards, but he doubted that it would solve the problem of overdue reports.

53. Mr. POCAR said that he shared Mr. Prado Vallejo's opinion. The proposed list would only partially help to achieve the Committee's objective. In the context of the annual report, however, drawing up such a list would definitely be a good thing. The Committee should also draw up others designed to achieve the same goal.

54. He was sceptical about the effect that the suggestion that the list should be sent to the meeting of States parties might have. He recalled that the Committee had already taken such an initiative in the past, with hardly any results.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that there appeared to be a consensus in the Committee that a list or a table should be prepared to highlight reports five or more years overdue and he requested the Chairman/Rapporteur of the Working Group to draft a specific proposal which would reflect the main points agreed on during the discussion and which would subsequently be submitted to the Committee for adoption.

56. It was so decided.

57. Mrs. EVATT (Chairman/Rapporteur of the Working Group on Article 40), introducing paragraphs 3 to 7 of the document prepared by the Working Group (M/CCPR/94/31), said she was aware that some members of the Committee did not want any change in the present system (whereby all decisions adopted under the Optional Protocol, whether on the merits or on inadmissibility and whatever their importance, were reproduced in extenso in the report) as long as it was not certain that there were other ways of making such decisions widely known. The Working Group itself considered that the two things were not necessarily related. She also noted that, if the Committee decided not to adopt the proposals made by the Working Group in paragraphs 3 to 7, she would like the question raised by the Working Group to be taken up in one way or another by the Committee and that the Committee should try to find ways of enabling communities, research workers, etc. to have access to the decisions it adopted

under the Optional Protocol. That being said, she pointed out that the Committee had adopted a large number of more or less similar decisions in cases which were also very similar. Consequently, she saw no need to reproduce those decisions in extenso. That only made the annual report more voluminous and harder to read. In view of the size and cost of the annual report, the question raised by the Working Group therefore warranted the Committee's full attention. She hoped that she was clear: her aim was not in any way to restrict access to the Committee's decisions, for that would be disastrous, but, rather, to avoid pointless repetitions. In conclusion, she stressed the need for the Committee as a whole to find an appropriate solution in that regard.

58. Mr. FRANCIS drew attention to the importance of the "Selected decisions under the Optional Protocol" referred to in paragraph 3 of document M/CCPR/94/31.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that document M/CCPR/94/31 would be transmitted to the next Working Group on Article 40, which would take up the consideration of the question again. He had no doubt that all members of the Committee were aware of the problem raised in paragraphs 3 to 7 and of the need to solve it. In the meantime, the Committee would follow the current practice.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.