



**Convention against Torture and
Other Cruel, Inhuman or
Degrading Treatment or
Punishment**

Distr.: General
8 December 2006
English
Original: French

COMMITTEE AGAINST TORTURE

Thirty-seventh session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST PART (PUBLIC)*
OF THE 728th SESSION

Held at the Palais Wilson, in Geneva on Wednesday, 8 November 2006, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. MAVROMMATIS

Then: Mr. KOVALEV

Then: Mr. MAVROMMATIS

SUMMARY

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY THE STATES PARTIES
UNDER ARTICLE 19 OF THE CONVENTION (*cont'd*)

Fourth periodic report of Mexico

* The summary record of the second part (private) of the session was published under the reference number CAT/C/SR.728/Add.1.

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 be incorporated in a copy of the report. They should be sent to the Official Records Editing Section, Room E.4108, Palais de Nations, Geneva, *within one week of the date of this document*.

Any corrections to the records of the public sessions of the Council will be consolidated in a single corrected version, which will be issued soon after the session.

The session was called to order at 10:10 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY THE STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 19 OF THE CONVENTION (item 6 on the agenda) (*cont'd*)

Fourth periodic report of Mexico (CAT/C/55/Add.12;CAT/C/MEX/Q/4 and Rev.1; HRI/CORE/MEX/2005)

1. *At the invitation of the President, the Mexican delegation took their places at the Committee table.*

2. Ms. GONZÁLEZ DOMÍNGUEZ (Mexico) indicated that the fourth periodic report of Mexico had been prepared in accordance with a new method which consisted in taking account of the information provided by the agencies of the United Nations system, the university communities, and organizations of civil society.

3. The Mexican Government continued to make considerable efforts towards meeting the obligations incumbent on it under the Convention against Torture. In 2004, the federal executive branch presented an ambitious project of judicial reform, which the legislative branch currently sitting was charged to revise and, if appropriate, approve. The implementation of this project, however, had not gone forward at the same speed in each of the states of the country.

4. On 18 August 2003, in the context of the implementation of the Istanbul Protocol, the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the Republic published in the official journal the decision A/057/2003, in which the official directives were announced that were to be followed by the medical examiners for the purpose of rendering medical and psychological expert opinions in the event that acts of torture or of ill-treatment were suspected. This text was currently applied at the federal level. Furthermore, on 11 April 2005, Mexico had ratified the Optional Protocol of the Convention, which entered into force in June 2006. As a result, the Mexican Government undertook to create a national mechanism for the prevention of torture by June 2007; to this end, it had already begun a process of consultation with different public agencies and members of civil society.

5. Mexico still had a long road to go in order to totally eradicate torture. The government therefore depended on close cooperation with international organizations for the defense of human rights, among them the Committee against Torture, in order to improve the administration of justice and to protect the fundamental rights of all persons.

6. Mr. ÁLVAREZ LEDESMA (Mexico) indicated that the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the Republic was informed of cases of torture or of ill-treatment in two ways: through the National Commission on Human Rights and through the Public Ministry of the Federation. During the period from 2001 to 31 October 2006, the National Commission for Human Rights had received 4,041 complaints filed against personnel of the Office of the Chief Prosecutor regarding violations of human rights, of which 92 were concerned solely with acts of torture, and the commission had submitted to the Office of the Chief Prosecutor 12 recommendations of which two dealt with acts of torture and one with cruel or degrading treatment.

7. In September 2003, a committee for monitoring and evaluating medical and psychological expert opinions that were submitted in cases where torture was

suspected and an advisory group on this question were formed. Since its creation, the committee had held four sessions and had examined 75 medical and psychological expert opinions rendered as a consequence of complaints which held officers of the state liable. The presence of ill-treatment and acts of torture had been demonstrated in 12 and nine cases, respectively. However, it should be emphasized that in none of the cases where acts of torture were uncovered were the facts applied to employees of the Office of the Chief Prosecutor.

8. With much yet to do in order to end the practice of torture in the country and to do away with impunity, the Mexican government had to ensure that the relevant international standards were incorporated into the domestic judicial system, that they were applied, and that the technical cooperation programs with the High Commissioner of the United Nations for Human Rights were implemented towards these ends. In particular, it was to take measures so as to define ill treatment in local and federal legislation.

9. The Istanbul Protocol was already being implemented by the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the Republic, by the public prosecutor offices of the five states, as well as by that of the federal district, and the Protocol ought to be applied in the near future by the public prosecutor offices of the five other states. It was thought to be necessary for their counterparts in the other states where the Protocol has not yet been applied as well as in the public prosecutors office of the military justice system to follow their example so that the recommendations of the Committee against Torture would be completely implemented throughout the country. Inasmuch as the decision A/057/2003 stipulated the mechanisms that were designed to guarantee transparency, public opinion had to be informed of presumed cases of torture and ill-treatment in which a medical or psychological expert opinion was rendered.

10. The authorities charged with administering the federal centers of social re-adaptation of the Ministry of Public Safety provided training to their personnel so that the latter were capable of carrying out a medical and psychological examination in cases of presumed acts of torture and ill-treatment. This was one example that all prison authorities at the local, municipal, and military levels should follow.

11. Mr. LAGUNES LÓPEZ (Mexico) indicated with regard to the application of the Istanbul Protocol that the Ministry of Public Safety since 2001 had been implementing a training program aimed at its personnel and at the employees of the decentralized administrative agencies. The courses stipulated in this regard were being given by instructors taken from different federal and local departments, university bodies, international agencies, and organizations of civil society. This training was mandatory and supplemented that which was provided by the police training center for judicial personnel engaged in the fight against torture. Furthermore, along with other public agencies, including the Office of the Chief Prosecutor, the National Commission for Human Rights, and the local communities, the Ministry of Public Safety had launched a joint training program in the Istanbul Protocol aimed at employees working in the federal centers of social reintegration and the centers of reeducation for minors. In sum, 878 courses had been given to 32,721 people. The implementation of this program had brought about a reduction in the number of complaints regarding violations of human rights received by the Ministry of Public Safety, which fell from 1,377 in 2001 to 709 in 2005 and then to 257 in 2006. It was to be remembered that the federal law prohibiting and punishing

torture applied to all officers of the State, including the members of the armed forces and the staff of maximum-security prisons.

12. As a consequence of the activities of the fight against torture conducted at the federal level, three suspects and two indicted persons were currently in provisional detention at the federal Center for Social Reintegration No. 1, "Altiplano," and one convicted person is serving a sentence, delivered in 1991, in the Center for Social Reintegration No. 3, "Noreste." Finally, in 2006, the National Commission for Human Rights trained 46,000 officers of the State, including employees of the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the Republic as well as members of the armed forces.

13. Ms. PÉREZ DUARTE (Mexico), raising the question of violence against women, said that the Government was engaged in doing everything possible to prevent, punish, and eradicate this phenomenon. It was towards this end that a special office of the Prosecutor charged with violence against women had been created in April 2006, which had the same jurisdiction as federal prosecutor offices. In the context of its mandate, the office had established mechanisms of coordination and cooperation with the local prosecutors, specifically regarding the application of strategies and concrete measures for eliminating violence against women in the context of crime prevention, criminal justice, and implementing the Istanbul Protocol. Furthermore, cooperation agreements had been concluded with a view to providing training in this area to personnel of the Public Ministry and to female members of the police involved in investigations.

14. Citing an example indicating actions undertaken by the special office of the Prosecutor, Ms. Pérez Duarte indicated that in May 2006 a preliminary investigation had been opened automatically, i.e., without a complaint having been submitted, in order to shine a light on the incidents that occurred in the prison of Santiaguito in San Salvador Atenco (State of Mexico), in the course of which several women who had been arrested during demonstrations were subjected to ill treatment, incidents of which the special office had been informed by the media. When the agents of the special office met the 13 women involved, the former indicated to the latter that they believed their statements and that the special office would be charged with proving the existence of the sexual misbehavior that they had endured. Having confirmed that in this particular case the sexual violence that had been committed were acts constituting torture, the special office reconsidered the count of the indictment and placed the case in the context of the Convention against Torture and the Inter-American Convention on the prevention, punishment, and the elimination of violence against women (Convention de Belém do Pará). This approach led the special office to order expert opinions to be submitted in conformity with the Istanbul Protocol by specialists chosen by the victims, to seek to avoid the double victimization of the women involved, and to invite the National Commission on Human Rights to communicate to it the evidence that it had gathered in this case.

15. In conclusion, Ms. Pérez Duarte considered it encouraging that after eight months of activity the special office had been able to establish working mechanisms which marked a new stage in the administration of justice with regard to applying international standards and taking into consideration the problems of women.

16. Mr. GROSSMAN (Rapporteur for Mexico) noted with satisfaction the high level of work of the Mexican delegation, which he thanked for its oral presentation as well as for the written responses to the list of points to be explicated. He

confirmed with pleasure that the state party was disposed to maintain a dialogue with the Committee and gave evidence of self-criticism in its report. He also considered it encouraging that Mexico had received the visit of the special procedures from the United Nations, including the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture, and that it had ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention. Finally, he was pleased to note the importance that the state party accorded to the participation of Mexican civil society in implementing the Convention.

17. Regarding the application of the first article of the Convention, the Rapporteur noted that in accordance with paragraph 25 of the report, in domestic law torture was defined as inflicting pain or acute suffering. In addition, he read elsewhere in the report that, according to nongovernmental organizations, in practice judges considered that if the bodily lesions took less than 15 days to heal, they might not be considered as the consequence of torture because they wouldn't correspond to serious pain or suffering (paragraph 278). Mr. Grossman wondered whether this interpretation was compatible with the first article of the Convention and whether such crimes as rape, psychological torture, and physical torture, which did not leave any visible trace beyond 15 days, were punished as acts of torture or under other designations. Mr. Grossman wished furthermore to know whether the many international treaties to which Mexico was a party, which contained provisions prohibiting torture, were directly applicable by the courts. Noting that the criminal code of the federal district punished any public official who in the exercise of his functions inflicted pain or suffering to a person even though the definition of torture set out in federal legislation did not provide for punishments except when the suffering inflicted was "acute," he wanted to know whether the foregoing had repercussions on the number of legal proceedings initiated and of convictions handed down for acts of torture. Confirming that the Code of Military Justice did not contain a precise definition of torture, he wished that the delegation would clarify this subject.

18. With respect to article 2 of the Convention, Mr. Grossman noted the establishment of a special system of medical and psychological expert opinion for presumed cases of torture and/or of ill-treatment. He asked whether the delegation might be able to furnish to the Committee a copy of a medical and psychological certificate so that it would have an idea of the nature of the investigations being undertaken. In this regard, he considered it surprising that only 75 certificates had been submitted between September 2003 and October 2006. This number was certainly commensurate with the number of cases of torture brought before the courts, but it seemed relatively deficient in the absolute. Emphasizing the necessity for the alleged victims to have an independent examination during detention, he asked the state party to indicate the measures that had been adopted with regard to guaranteeing the independence of physicians charged with preparing the medical and psychological certificates. He also asked whether programs had been established to train independent experts as well as medical personnel.

19. The Special Rapporteur noted that generally the courts had held that the medical and psychological expert opinions which disclosed lesions were insufficient for establishing the presence of an act of torture. But such expert opinions were often the only way for a victim to prove his or her allegations. For Mr. Grossman, even if absolute proof was not possible, the medical and psychological certificate should give rise to a simple presumption of an act of torture, with the burden of proof falling on the accused officer of the state. Moreover, Mr. Grossman wished to

obtain information regarding the progress report on the project of creating a national medical and legal institute charged with training experts in all the branches of criminology.

20. Recalling that numbers of homosexuals had been victims of attacks which had been committed with the complicity of members of the police force, Mr. Grossman emphasized the unacceptable nature of all violence motivated by sexual orientation and he asked whether legislative or sensitization measures had been undertaken by the state party to take steps so that such events did not recur. He also wished to obtain more information regarding acts of torture whose victims were members of ethnic minorities, specifically in the states of Chiapas and Oaxaca.

21. The fact that the courts seemed to give greater credence to declarations made by a person immediately after his or her arrest by the police than to declarations made by the same person in provisional detention seemed worrisome to him, knowing in particular that an arrested person did not benefit systematically from the presence of a lawyer as soon as he or she was arrested, that the medical and psychological certificate did not have probative force, and that the notion of *in flagrante delicto* was interpreted very loosely by the officers charged with applying the law. Mr. Grossman thought that such factors, taken together, were plausible grounds to suspect violations of the provisions of the Convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading punishments or treatments. This was why he hoped that the delegation would indicate whether it was the intention of the state party to proceed to adopt a certain number of changes in this area.

22. Regarding article 3 of the Convention, Mr. Grossman wished to know whether, in the case of Francisco Rafael Arellano Felix, the Mexican authorities had obtained, before the extradition of the accused person to the United States, assurances that he would not be prosecuted for crimes for which the death penalty was possible in that country, in conformance with the agreements signed by Mexico under the Convention. He also asked for information regarding the amendments that had been adopted to article 33 of the Constitution, which authorized the President of the Republic to engage in the immediate expulsion of any alien whose presence in Mexico was considered to be inopportune, without the latter being permitted to file an appeal in the local courts. It would seem in this regard that the provisions governing the expulsion of an alien did not conform to the international agreements undertaken by Mexico, in particular regarding the principle of non-refoulement. It would be welcome to have more information regarding the cases of expulsion for reasons of national security and, more particularly, regarding the opportunities for persons subject to an expulsion order to petition a court for a stay.

23. Regarding article 4 of the Convention, Mr. Grossman wished to have the observations of the delegation regarding information provided by Amnesty International in accordance with which a great number of acts of torture and of cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment were not being recognized inasmuch as they were being designated as abuses of authority. He also wished to know what the follow-up had been to recommendations that had been addressed to the authorities by the Mexican Commission on Human Rights and asked whether these recommendations had obligatory force. In this regard, it turned out that four recommendations concerning torture had been addressed to the Office of the Chief Prosecutor between 1997 in September 2004, but that only a single agent had been sentenced to prison. Recalling, furthermore, that according to the international

agreements ratified by Mexico the jurisdiction of the military courts was limited to crimes committed in the context of the exercise of military functions, he noted that in accordance with the Code of Military Justice currently in effect, the simple fact for the person committing a crime of wearing the uniform was sufficient to establish the jurisdiction of military justice. He also asked the delegation to indicate which court would be competent in the case of acts of torture committed on a civilian by a soldier. In this regard, he recalled that according to the jurisprudence of the Inter-American Court for Human Rights, the Code of Military Justice did not apply in such a situation. Finally, he wished to know whether the new Code of Military Justice would contain a more precise definition than the expression "in the exercise of military functions," and would establish the non-jurisdiction of the military in cases of acts of torture committed by a soldier upon a civilian.

24. Regarding the articles 6 and 7 of the Convention, Mr. Grossman wondered why the authorities had not sufficiently demonstrated effectiveness in their reaction to the events of Juarez, where grave human rights violations had been committed.

25. With regard to article 9, the Special Rapporteur desired to know whether the serious problems posed by terrorism and the trafficking in narcotics were leading the Mexican authorities to consider that the best way to effectively fight these phenomena might lie in curbing guarantees with respect to human rights.

26. Finally, Mr. Grossman wished to know what follow-up had been accorded to the report of the National Commission on Human Rights regarding the events that occurred on 28 May 2004 during a demonstration in Guadalajara in the state of Jalisco and according to which 73 people had been victims of acts of torture or of cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment during their arrest and their detention by the police. He also wished to know whether for an alleged victim of acts of torture the fact of abandoning his lawsuit before the courts had the effect of closing the case, in particular when the victim was in possession of a medical certificate attesting to the existence of lesions. He also wished to know whether the victims of acts of torture had received compensation before the Mexican courts. With respect to the duration of police custody, he inquired regarding conformity with international standards in this matter. He asked the delegation to indicate whether suspects had been kept in provisional detention beyond the period fixed by law and, if so, to provide statistical data in this regard. Finally, he wished to know where in the Mexican judicial system the principle of the presumption of innocence had its place.

27. Mr. MARIÑO MENÉNDEZ (Corrapporteur for Mexico), referring to article 11, asked whether the practice of secret detention had actually been abolished. The state party, in paragraph 156 of the written responses, cited the creation of special teams charged with detecting cases of secret detention, and more generally of arbitrary detention, but it did not make clear how these teams were functioning. It would also be useful to know whether this measure was being applied at the level of the federal states.

28. With regard to article 12, Mr. Mariño Menéndez asked whether a victim of torture could contest the decision of the Public Ministry to not follow up on his or her complaint, or to denounce a prosecutor for inaction, or whether a prosecutor could be subject to sanctions if he did not investigate a case of torture. The Chief Prosecutor of the Republic apparently could act in a case in the jurisdiction of the prosecutor of a federal state if he considered that the latter would not handle the

case appropriately—it would be interesting to know whether this had already occurred.

29. With regard to the medical examination of the facts of torture, the state party energetically insisted on the establishment of a medical and psychological diagnosis based on the Istanbul Protocol, but it remained to be seen whether the physicians who carried out this diagnosis were truly independent, inasmuch as they were part of the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the Republic. The victim was certainly able to be examined by a physician of his or her choice, but this presupposed that he or she had the means. It would also be interesting to know what proof value the courts accorded to this diagnosis. Similarly, victims of torture rarely had the means to hire a lawyer and therefore generally made use of public defenders, but the state party itself recognized that they were overwhelmed. It would be useful if it would specify whether measures were envisaged to strengthen this mechanism. Unofficial detention ("arraigo") had been declared contrary to the Constitution, but one could wonder whether it had actually been suppressed in practice, in particular as regards those requesting asylum or clandestine migrant workers. Moreover, article 33 of the Constitution authorized the executive branch to expel, immediately and without preliminary judicial decision, any alien who threatened national security. Had this measure ever been invoked, if so, by whom, and could it be appealed?

30. Moreover, the delegation was invited to specify whether there was a record of arrests made in flagrante delicto, in particular when they were carried out by military personnel, and whether the Government foresaw taking measures to protect the defenders of human rights who, according to certain information, were targets of harassment.

31. The authorities had reacted energetically in response to the homicides committed against women in the Ciudad Juarez, both at the federal level as well as that of the state of Chihuahua, but it was still worrisome that many of the victims had not been identified and that in many cases the investigation had not yet begun regarding the prosecutions for want of permission to establish responsibility. This setback may have been due to a lack of coordination, or to the fact, often denounced, that it was the same body that was charged both with investigation as well as with prosecution. In this regard, more precise information regarding the future role of the prosecutors after the reform cited in paragraph 240 of the report would be welcome.

32. With regard to article 13, Mr. Mariño Menéndez recalled that the Public Ministry had a monopoly of criminal proceedings and that a proceeding for acts of torture could therefore be completely paralyzed if the prosecutor remained inactive, which resulted in depriving the victim of the right of access to the judicial system. The victim would be able to file an appeal *en amparo*, but it would be interesting to know whether this means had been utilized in practice, and whether there were statistics on its use.

33. With regard to the right to reparations and compensation (article 14), the state party was content, in paragraphs 258 and following of the report, to explain the provisions that were in effect without giving examples of their application. In its written responses, it declared that there were no statistics regarding the compensation afforded to victims of torture. This absence of data was troubling because it made it possible to think that there had been no judicial decisions in this

area, and that this absence of decisions in turn was explained by the absence of criminal proceedings regarding cases of torture.

34. With regard to the prohibition of retaining the admissibility of confessions obtained under torture (article 15), it would be useful to know whether these confessions were totally excluded, or whether it happened that they were used as one element of the judicial decision. It had been proposed in order to prevent the use of torture that a suspect could only make statements before a judge. Did the state party foresee introducing such a provision in its legislation?

35. With regard to article 16, Mr. Mariño Menéndez asked why the state party was implementing a program of sterilization that was solely aimed at indigenous communities. If this program had been established in the context of control over the birth rate, it should be applied to the entire population.

36. Moreover, Mr. Mariño Menéndez wondered whether the creation of a prosecutor's office specially charged with cases of torture would in actuality bring about a modification of the Constitution, as the state party affirmed. It did not seem that a constitutional reform of this type had been necessary to create other special offices such as the one charged with violent crimes against women. Furthermore, he inquired whether a database existed on victims of torture. A database regarding complaints of torture would also be useful, even if the state party thought that its creation would be problematic.

37. Finally, Mr. Mariño Menéndez wished to have explanations regarding the tensions that seemed to exist between the National Commission for Human Rights and the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the Republic, as well as regarding the investigation the object of which would have been the mediator. He also asked whether it was planned to renew the national program for human rights that had been established in December 2006. In conclusion, he saluted the recent initiatives of the state party such as the abolition of the death penalty and the recognition of the jurisdiction of the Committee to receive communications.

38. Mr. KOVALEV wanted clarification regarding the measures that had been adopted to promote a culture for protecting human rights within the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the Republic (paragraph 63 of the basic document).

39. *Mr. Kovalev (Vice President) took on the presiding role.*

40. Ms. BELMIR confirmed that the state party had demonstrated a genuine determination to fight against torture and that to this end it had taken a very large number of measures in multiple areas, but that the practice of torture and of impunity had persisted. She therefore wondered where the shoe pinched. In particular, she noted that distributing the allocations among the various relevant courts was very vague. For example, it was impossible to know where the limit was between the functions of judges and those of prosecutors, and specifically to what extent the former were independent of the latter. Similarly, one could wonder whether there wasn't overlapping between the activities of the Ministry of Justice and those of the Ministry of the Interior, and what the respective roles were of the police and prison guards.

41. Ms. GAER wished to know what follow-up had occurred to the recommendations formulated by the Committee regarding the confidential investigation carried out in Mexico in 2001 with respect to article 20 (CAT/C/75),

and specifically whether measures had been undertaken to fight against the factors that were responsible for the persistence of the practice of torture among policemen. She noted with satisfaction that in its fourth periodic report, the state party had devoted significant space to the question of violence against women. The creation of a special office in the Prosecutor's Office charged with violence against women constituted a significant advance in this area. It would be welcome to have additional information regarding the policy implemented by the Government to fight against this type of violence.

42. Regarding the events that occurred on 3 and 4 May in San Salvador Atenco, Ms. Gaer was interested to hear the delegation designate violence committed by policemen on this occasion as acts constituting torture. The investigation that had been opened following these events seemed to have been hampered by the partiality of certain investigators. Was this correct? If so, what measures were being taken to guarantee the impartiality of the investigation? Did the Government foresee entrusting it to the special office of the Prosecutor charged with violence against women? It would also be interesting to know whether the policeman under suspicion had been suspended, or whether other provisional measures had been taken, specifically to protect the victims or the witnesses against any reprisals or attempts at intimidation. According to certain allegations, the policeman who participated in the operations in San Salvador Atenco wore masks. It would be useful to hear what the delegation had to say on this subject, specifically regarding the point of knowing whether this was a practice that was authorized by law.

43. The application of the Istanbul Protocol by the state party as well as the training programs for medical personnel in the medical evaluation of torture and other ill-treatment were very positive points. It would be useful to know what kinds of services, specifically of scientific policing, were to be implemented in practice.

44. According to certain sources, persons making visits to prisoners were subjected to humiliating body searches involving exploration of natural orifices. Was this practice confirmed? It would also be useful to know whether mechanisms existed for the surveillance of sexual violence within prisons, as well as within other institutions such as psychiatric hospitals, old-age homes, etc.

45. *Mr. Mavrommatis resumed the presiding role.*

46. Ms. SVEAASS wished to know which measures were to be taken by the Government to fight against violence against women in the family. A draft law seeking to protect women against this type of violence was being studied. Clarifications regarding its progress would be welcome. Regarding the investigation into the events of San Salvador Atenco, Ms. Sveaass was worried by the fact that according to certain information the plaintiffs had been interrogated only a very short time after the events and that, despite the condition of posttraumatic stress in which they found themselves, they had been asked to prove that they had actually been the object of the ill-treatment that they alleged.

47. Ms. Sveaass greeted with satisfaction the work done by the state party in collaboration with the international council on re-adaptation for the victims of torture for the purpose of training medical personnel in the techniques of evaluating the physical and psychological elements of proof of torture and other ill-treatment. Nevertheless, she encouraged the state party not to concentrate its efforts only on the training of experts, but rather to see to measures to help medical personnel in the

largest sense become familiarized with these techniques. The psychological symptoms of torture should be the object of particular attention because they were often more difficult to identify than physical symptoms since they often manifested themselves only several weeks or months after the events. Ms. Sveaass also wished to know more regarding the programs of re-adaptation that had been implemented in accordance with article 14 of the Convention.

48. The PRESIDENT thanked the delegation, the Rapporteurs, and the other members of the Committee for their contribution to the first phase of the consideration of the fourth periodic report of Mexico, and he invited them to continue the dialogue in a later meeting.

49. *The Mexican delegation retired.*

The first part (public) of the meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.