

PROVISIONAL
For participants only

CERD/C/SR.681

14 August 1984

Original: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Thirtieth session

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 681st MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 9 August 1984, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Michael SHERIFIS

CONTENTS

Consideration of reports, comments and information submitted by States parties
under article 9 of the Convention (continued)

- Republic of Korea
- Mozambique

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E-6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES
UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (continued)

Republic of Korea, third periodic report (CERD/C/113/Add.1)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Park (Republic of Korea) took a place at the Committee table.

Mr. PARK (Republic of Korea), introducing his Government's third report, said that it followed the revised general guidelines concerning form and content as well as those relating to article 7 of the Convention. The first part of the report explained the homogeneity of the Korean people, the legal effect of the Convention in the Republic of Korea and the rights enjoyed by foreigners residing there. Part two provided information on actions taken by the Government to implement articles of the Convention. They included the signing in 1983 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the refusal to issue visas to citizens of South Africa to participate in events held in Seoul and the condemnation of South Africa's policy of apartheid and racism. The report also answered the questions raised by members of the Committee regarding domestic legislation in respect of article 5 of the Convention and furnished relevant information in respect of articles 6 and 7, following guidelines adopted by the Committee in March 1982. He stressed the importance attached by his Government to teaching and education with a view to promoting understanding, tolerance and friendship among nations.

Article 9 of the new Constitution, enacted in 1980, stipulated that "all citizens have human dignity and value and shall have the right to seek happiness and it shall be the duty of the State to confirm and guarantee the inviolable human rights of individuals." The Government had achieved an impressive record in the field of human rights. With its background of homogeneity and its constitutional safeguard, it had never engaged in or sponsored racial discrimination or in sponsoring or supporting such discrimination, and it reaffirmed its continuing efforts to fulfil its obligations under the Convention.

Mr. PARTSCH said he was happy to have a report drafted according to the Committee's guidelines and doubly happy in having the representative of the Republic of Korea present in order to enter into a dialogue, which was one of the main elements of the Committee's working technique. He had noted with interest that the Convention was incorporated in domestic law. That was a very important element which did not exist in all States parties. Those with common law tradition had no such possibility.

He only questioned whether the conclusion drawn in paragraph 12 - that there was no need to take legislative measures to incorporate the Convention into domestic law - followed from the fact of incorporation. Of course legislative measures were not necessary to incorporate the Convention into domestic law; nevertheless, certain legislative measures were necessary. Article 2, for instance, said that the Convention should be implemented by legislation if the situation so required. The Convention itself did not represent such legislation, and it was up to the States parties to choose their own means of implementation.

In article 4 of the Convention there was an absolute obligation of the States parties to enact certain legislation. The Convention as such was not sufficient, because it did not express the sanctions and penalties to be imposed.

With regard to article 5, it had been pointed out in the discussion of the second report of the Republic of Korea that the right to leave the country and to return, as well as the right of equal pay for equal work, had not been mentioned. In paragraphs 23(a) and (b) of the present report it now appeared that the right of freedom of movement included the right to leave and return, and that the right to work included equal pay for equal work. He wished to know whether that statement was based on judgements of the court in Korea, because in many constitutions a distinction was made between freedom of movement within the frontiers of a state and the right to cross the frontier and return. The same was true of the right of equal pay for equal work, which generally was not included in the right to work but required a special provision.

He recalled that in the discussion of the previous report it had been said that special legislation was necessary. Paragraphs 21 and 22 of the present report implied condemnation of racial discrimination, but mentioned no penal sanction. Since the Convention itself could not contain penal sanctions, it was an obligation of the States parties to impose them. When the Committee had come into being in 1970, practically no State had had provisions in its penal code against racial discrimination. Since then about 60 States parties of the Convention had introduced such legislation, and that was one of the great successes of the Committee's work. It was remarkable that such success had been reached not by formal recommendation but mainly through dialogue with representatives of the States parties: Governments had shown great understanding when their attention was drawn to their obligations under article 4.

Finally, he asked whether, as in article 6 of the Convention, judicial guarantees, whether in penal, civil or possibly administrative courts, also covered acts of racial discrimination. Since the system differed in each State party to the Convention it would be helpful if particulars were reported. On the other hand, there was interesting information in the report on the implementation of article 7 according to the Committee's guidelines.

Mr. DE PIEROLA Y BALTA, welcoming the representative of the Republic of Korea, said that he was interested to see that the Korean population was descended from the Tungusic tribes living in the Altaic mountains 5,000 years ago, that it still shared the same language and culture and that the foreign minority groups in the country represented only 0.8 per cent of the total population, all the rest forming a completely homogeneous group. He asked for clarification as to whether that homogeneous group in former times had been composed of tribes, clans or other types of social organization, each with its own peculiar characteristics and social levels. He also asked why, if the Convention was domestic law it was not necessary to take legislative measures. Was the Convention domestic law or not? There seemed to be a contradiction between paragraphs 11 and 12.

He was satisfied to see from paragraph 12 that the Government had suspended all exchanges with the racist regime in South Africa, including diplomatic relations. Under article 5 concerning the right to work he had seen no reference to the right of citizens to choose their work or to form trade unions. He asked for additional information on those points. With regard to the statement in paragraph 25 under article 6, he thought it would be a good thing if the Committee had in its library the procedural or special legislation relative to protection and remedies against racial discrimination in each State party to the Convention, since constitutional norms were often complemented by special legislation.

Mr. SONG, extending a warm welcome to the representative of the Republic of Korea, said that the report was comprehensive and concise. It showed a response to many questions of the Committee and had been drafted according to its guidelines.

However, he wished to know whether any legal measures existed to enforce the provisions of the Constitution in conformity with article 4 of the Convention. With regard to article 5, which was rich in content and very important, he had seen no reference to the right of workers to form and join a trade union. He

also asked whether the Republic of Korea had any immigrant workers and, if so, how they were protected, legally, economically and with regard to health. He had noted that the foreign resident minority represented less than **1 per cent** of the population and he asked whether there were any special legal measures for their protection and how long foreigners had to reside in the Republic of Korea before they could become citizens.

Mr. GHONEIM welcomed the format of the report and the additional positive information it contained on articles 3 and 7. He returned, however, to the point raised by Mr. Patsch, which had also been raised during the examination of the second periodic report. Reference was made in paragraph 23 to article 13 of the Constitution, guaranteeing to all citizens the right of freedom of movement. That same article had been referred to in the previous report and had not prevented some members of the Committee from asking questions. They had perhaps been led to do so by the reference in paragraph 24(b) to article 5, paragraph 2 of the Constitution, which said that the right to leave the country freely was subject to the Exit and Entry Control Act. The reference to that Act had been made with regard to foreigners, but he wished to know whether it applied to foreigners only or to everyone living in the Republic. In addition, he had found in the previous report, a reference to article 13, in which the article read: "No citizen shall be subject to restriction of freedom of choice of occupation, except as provided by law". It did not deal, as in the present report, with the freedom to leave and return to the country. He wondered if there had been some change in the numbering of the articles.

Mr. STARUSHENKO said that the collaboration of the Republic of Korea with the Committee and with the United Nations was a positive event and strengthened the international legal order. He noted the specific measures in paragraphs 18 and 19 which had been taken under article 3, namely, that diplomatic relations with the South African regime had been broken off and that visas had been refused to citizens of South Africa. Article 4 had already been mentioned by various speakers. It could be firmly stated that obligations pursuant to article 4 had not been fulfilled by the Government of the Republic of Korea. Measures needed to be taken but nothing of the kind had been done.

With regard to article 5 he recalled what he had said about the report by Seychelles. Different conditions in different countries imposed a selection of rights to be guaranteed. It had been noted with satisfaction in discussing the Seychelles report that the right to work was guaranteed, but in the present report all that was said was that citizens had the right to work. Optimum wages were guaranteed for those who succeeded in exercising that right. He was not reproaching the Government of the Republic of Korea. The wording simply reflected the real situation in that country.

Referring to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Constitution cited in paragraph 33 of the report, he asked what happened if the rights mentioned there were violated, rights had to be defended if they were to be considered rights. He drew the Government's attention to the fact that its legislation did not correspond with the obligations that arose from signing the Convention.

Mr. YUTZIS joined previous speakers in thanking the representative of the Republic of Korea for his report, which had generally followed the guidelines of the Committee and the Convention. It was both surprising and impressive that the provisions of the Convention had been incorporated into the Constitution, which, as had been noted, was not the case in other countries.

He had two questions. The first arose from the positive act of incorporating the norms of the Convention. The Convention did not contain a code of penalties, and he joined Mr. Partsch in asking for data on local judicial norms and their implementation and whether any penalties were imposed for racial discrimination. His second point concerned article 5 (e) of the Convention, which spoke of the right to form and join unions. Giving the term a broad interpretation, he asked whether conditions existed in the Republic of Korea to permit groups of diverse orientation and social levels, such as workers, students and people from the professions to meet within their own framework and with their own internal organization and make demands relating to their work and to the Government.

Mr. PARK (Republic of Korea), replying to questions and comments said that he thought "incorporate" might be too strong a term to use in connection with the legal effects of international conventions, including the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. He would prefer to use

some other term such as "implemented by" or "reflected in" domestic legislation. As stated in paragraph 11 of the report, all international agreements concluded by the Government, ratified by the National Assembly and promulgated in accordance with the Constitution had the same effect as domestic laws.

Referring to the right to leave and enter the country, he pointed out that every male Korean citizen had a duty to do a period of military service. Under the Exit and Entry Control Act, every Korean male, wishing to travel abroad, was therefore required to provide evidence that he had done his military service. There were exceptions to that rule, and for instance, students were allowed to pursue their studies in foreign universities and to postpone their military service until the age of 26.

It was true that there had been unfortunate cases of Koreans being prevented for political reasons from returning to their country but that was a thing of the past as the Government formed in 1980 had abolished all restrictions on the right to return. The Commission on Human Rights had decided in consequence to discontinue its consideration of that aspect of the human rights situation in the Republic of Korea.

The Exit and Entry Control Act placed restrictions on the right of foreigners to enter Korea and on the duration of their stay in the country. Every foreigner allowed to live in the country was, however, free to engage in any commercial, social and economic activity. There were about 27,000 permanent foreign residents in Korea. The Chinese, numbering some 20,000, were the largest foreign community followed by the Japanese and the Americans. Many Chinese had taken out citizenship papers. With regard to the time it took to complete the process of naturalization, he would endeavour to provide the information for the member of the Committee who had put a question on that point. The information would in any case be included in the fourth periodic report.

Turning to the right to work and to form trade unions, he said that article 4 of the Constitution specifically provided that workers had the right of association and the right to collective bargaining and collective action in order to improve working conditions. The provision did not apply to public officials. Article 30, paragraph 1 of the Constitution and article 5 of the Labour Standard Act, which dealt with that matter, were set out in paragraph 23 of the report.

The average Korean worker worked a total of 231.9 hours in every month. There were practically no immigrant workers in Korea but almost 200,000 Koreans worked abroad in 76 countries. Almost 160,000 of those workers were employed by Korean firms and the remaining 40,000 by foreign firms. Korea had a unique employment security system which comprised a National Employment Security Office in Seoul, the capital, and 41 regional offices.

Sixteen industrial trade unions were affiliated to the Federation of Trade Unions. Their 85,000 members were employed by more than 1,600 firms.

Industrial undertakings employing 10 or more workers were obliged by law to subscribe to the labour insurance scheme. In 1982 the amounts paid to 140,000 victims of industrial disasters or accidents had totalled 97 billion won.

In 1982, 88 labour disputes had occurred, 26 of them concerning overdue wages and seven low wages. Seventy-nine of those 88 disputes had been settled through a labour-management conciliation process which covered about 5,000 Korean firms in that year.

Labour policy aimed at securing optimum wages for the workers, improved working conditions, better vocational training and the prevention of industrial accidents. Wages policy took three factors into account: the financial structures of business firms, the prices of goods and the productivity of the labour force. White collar workers currently earned 40 per cent more than blue collar workers, but the aim was to reduce that differential to 10 per cent in the near future.

Turning to the question of the homogeneity of the Korean people, he said that the first settlers in the Korean peninsula, who had come from the Altaic Mountains thousands of years ago, had formed a homogeneous people, sharing distinctive physical characteristics, one language and one culture. Ethnologically, Koreans were members of the Altaic family of races which included the Turkish, Mongolian and Tungusic peoples. Political unity had been attained in the seventh century with the constitution of a single kingdom. Strong racial consciousness and a sense of unity had become inalienable characteristics of the Korean people, which no invader had ever succeeded in erasing.

The homogeneity of the Korean people had made it largely unnecessary to provide for penalties for acts of racial discrimination but there was a relevant provision in the Penal Code. Paragraph 35 of the report made it clear that dissemination of

information for the purpose of racial discrimination or incitement to it was an offence. The questions raised in connection with article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination were fully answered in paragraphs 20 and 21 of the report, but further information would be given in the fourth periodic report.

Mr. Park (Republic of Korea) withdrew.

Mozambique initial periodic report (CERD/C/111/Add.1)

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should proceed to consider Mozambique's initial report, despite the absence of a representative of Mozambique.

It was so decided.

Mrs. SADIQ ALI said that all members of the Committee welcomed the fact that Mozambique had agreed to enter into a dialogue but, as had happened in the case of some other States, its initial report was inadequate. The Committee should make known to the Government its disappointment at the absence of a representative from Mozambique and at the very brief report submitted.

Mozambique was a country which in both domestic and foreign policy had done a great deal under difficult conditions to comply with the provisions of the Convention. She herself had been in Mozambique when it had been suffering a period of great hardship and she had seen large hoardings reading "Down with racism". She had also learnt that Frelimo had appointed a number of whites to prominent ministerial positions. In spite of the pressures exerted on it by the South African Government, Mozambique was a truly multiracial and multi-ethnic society and details of its experience would be valuable. She believed that the Committee should ask the Government to submit a more substantive report on the next occasion and should indicate the basic information required.

Such information should cover other aspects of the Convention in addition to racial discrimination. In particular, it should give the demographic composition of the country, since it was well known that there were many different ethnic groups, as well as small Asian and European minorities, and the Government was endeavouring to bring about a nationally integrated society. Similarly, in terms of article 2, she would like information on the steps taken to rescind and nullify the various discriminatory laws which had been inherited at the time of independence. She would like to know what socio-economic plans were being made to help to raise disadvantaged groups to the level of the rest of the population. Despite its difficult situation, the Government had produced an economic plan for the whole country and she would like to know how it was tackling the development of areas

which had been neglected under colonialism, and which suffered from a lack of transport infrastructure and from the attempts by the South African Government to break up the transport and communications infrastructure and destabilize Mozambique.

Mozambique already had a constitution, and she would like all relevant extracts from it relating to article 5. She stressed the importance of articles 4 and 6, and emphasized in particular the implementation of article 7, since she had seen for herself how the Mozambican Government was endeavouring to create awareness among the people so as to avert potentially divisive ethnic and religious cleavages. She was convinced that if Mozambique were to provide more substantive information relating to the various provisions of the Convention, the Committee would be impressed by the steps the young Government was taking to eliminate racial discrimination.

Mr. DE PIEROLA Y BALTA, welcoming the initial report from a new State, enquired whether, in view of the word "Addendum" in the title of the report and the word "further" in the first line, some previous report had been submitted. If that was not the case, the report was unduly short and did not take into account the Committee's guidelines. It was conceivable that Mozambique had encountered difficulties in compiling the report and that it needed technical assistance in preparing it. If so, the Centre for Human Rights or UNITAR would be appropriate bodies to provide such assistance. In his view, the Government should be requested to submit an additional report in accordance with the Committee's guidelines.

Mr. GOMEZ del PRADO (Secretary of the Committee) explained that the Government had submitted a note verbale, the first part of which had been purely formal and had not been reproduced as a Committee document. It was for that reason that the words "Addendum" and "further" appeared in the text before the Committee.

Mr. EVRIGENIS said that it always gave reason for satisfaction to receive an initial report, but he agreed with previous speakers that the brevity of the present document was disappointing. It was to Mozambique's credit that it had submitted its initial report so promptly, within six months of its accession to the Convention, but he would suggest that the Committee, under rule 65 of its rules of procedure, should request the Mozambican Government to submit a more substantive report drafted in accordance with its guidelines, without waiting for the two year period when the next periodic report would be due.

Mr. YUTZIS endorsed those remarks. In his view, and without wishing to exceed the bounds of protocol, the present report could not be considered a proper report at all and he asked the Committee to decide whether it could receive it as such. He did not entirely subscribe to the suggestion that the Government might have been in need of technical assistance in compiling the report. Had it been, it could have requested such assistance.

Mr. SHAHI considered the Committee should offer technical assistance to Mozambique for the preparation of its initial report. The situation must have been difficult for the Government, since it had been an embattled State.

At its twenty-ninth session, the Committee had given extensive consideration to the question of reporting under international human rights instruments and had concluded that the failure of certain States to submit the required reports was due either to difficulties resulting from unavailability of personnel with the requisite competence or to a lack of political will to fulfil obligations flowing from the Convention (CERD/C/29/CRP.2, paragraph 3 (a)). Since the Committee would not be justified in assuming that Mozambique lacked the political will, the only possible conclusion was that it had had genuine difficulties in providing the type of information required under the Committee's revised guidelines. In that connection, he noted that the Chairman would be attending a meeting of the Chairmen of the monitoring bodies of the human rights instruments the following week.

He suggested that the Chairman should write to the Government expressing appreciation of its accession to the Convention and the information provided in the initial report, indicating that the Committee would welcome further information within a period of six months, and making a polite offer of aid in compiling a further report.

The CHAIRMAN confirmed that the Chairmen of the monitoring bodies would be meeting on 16 and 17 August, and that a report on the results of that meeting would be submitted to the Committee in connection with its discussion of agenda item 6 on 20 August.

Mr. KARASIMEONOV said he was glad that a dialogue had been begun with the Mozambican Government, but regretted that he was unable to pay the Government the real tribute it deserved for its struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination and against the destabilizing acts of the South African Government because the report was too brief to permit any substantive comment. He had met some of the Mozambican leaders and was inclined to believe that the situation must be due to some

misunderstanding. He would be reluctant to suggest there was a lack of trained personnel or that technical assistance was necessary and did not believe the Committee should proffer advice unless technical assistance was actually requested. He noted that the Committee decisions to which Mr. Shahi had referred related to countries which had not submitted any report at all.

Although the Committee might take action under article 9 of the Convention and rule 65 of its rules of procedure, he believed it would be better for the Chairman to make informal contact with the Mozambican Government representative, if one was available in Geneva, and ask the Government to submit a fuller report to the Committee at its next session.

Mr. STARUSHENKO felt that the members of the Committee had appreciated the difficulties faced by Mozambique in preparing its report. The latter was dated 28 December 1983. At that time, not the least of Mozambique's difficulties had stemmed from South Africa's aggression against it and from the cost of Mozambique's continued struggle against the forces of racism. Following the agreement signed between Mozambique and South Africa, the front-line States, meeting at Arusha, had reaffirmed that the struggle against the racism regime would be continued by all means short of military action. Because of the difficulties faced at the time, the Government of Mozambique had submitted its report under cover of a note to the Secretariat, which had rightly forwarded the report to the Committee.

He agreed with the proposal that the Committee should communicate its views on the subject to the Government of Mozambique, forwarding copies of the revised general guidelines concerning the form and contents of reports by States parties under article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention. Possibly, by way of example, copies of other countries' reports could be sent also. At the same time, the Committee could request the urgent presentation of a report.

Mr. YUTZIS pointed out that suppositions were being made about Mozambique's need of technical assistance which were not supported by any documentation and which might be regarded as patronizing. In any case, the Committee would first have to decide whether it was prepared to accept document CERD/C/111/Add.1 as a report.

Mr. GHONEIM said he agreed with previous speakers that the report was unsatisfactory. The case was not, however, the first of its kind and the Committee had accepted some equally brief texts in the past. It had made suitable observations and the Governments' subsequent reports had been better. To reject the initial report by Mozambique would be, in effect, to discriminate against that country.

Mrs. SADIQ ALI shared those views.

Mr. YUTZIS thanked Mr. Ghoneim for pointing out what the Committee had done in the past. But surely one main purpose of recalling past events was to avoid repeating actions subsequently proved wrong. Avoidance of past errors was not discrimination but progress in the light of experience. He respectfully suggested that the previous procedure had been wrong and should not be repeated.

Mr. DE PIEROLA Y BALTA said that the Committee could either reject the document and request a text which conformed to the guidelines concerning the form and contents of the report by States parties, or it could consider the document, make observations and request an additional report under the provisions of article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention, according to rule 65 of the Committee's rules of procedure. Alternatively, an offer of technical assistance could be made to Mozambique. The only remaining option would be to wait two years until the next report was due.

In his view, the Committee should reply pointing out that the text before it was inadequate and requesting the Government to provide further information in accordance with the revised general guidelines, so that the Committee could make an in-depth study of the situation in Mozambique. The Chairman might also, after further consultations, communicate to the Government the suggestion that it could, if it wished, avail itself of technical assistance. In any case, he did not think that the report before the Committee should be returned or rejected.

The CHAIRMAN said that no Committee member had said that the Government had not acted in conformity with the general guidelines but members were concerned that the communication was too brief to enable them to make observations. There seemed to be agreement that the report was inadequate, although it had been pointed out that some equally inadequate reports had been dealt with in the past and subsequently improved upon.

What the Committee had to decide was whether it should request additional information under rule 65 of its rules of procedure, to be received by the end of 1984, so that the Committee could consider it at its March 1985 session in New York, or whether it should refrain from doing so, in which case further information would next be considered when Mozambique presented its second periodic report in two years' time.

Mr. SHAHI said there seemed to be substantial agreement that the Committee should request additional information, to be received, if possible, in time for its March 1985 session. Where the rules of procedure provided means of requesting additional information, the Committee should use them. He himself saw nothing

patronizing in suggestions about technical assistance. Third world countries were constantly requesting and receiving technical assistance of all kinds, from one another as well as from elsewhere. In his view, a suitable letter by the Chairman would be the way to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN said the majority view seemed to be that the Committee should request the Secretary-General to communicate with the Government of Mozambique, forwarding copies of the three documents mentioned and requesting further information, on the basis of the revised general guidelines, to be received, if possible, by 31 December 1984, in order that the Committee could consider it at its March 1985 session in New York. Perhaps the communication could also indicate that the Committee would appreciate the presence of a government representative at that time, a request which should be easier to comply with in the case of a session in New York. In that way, a dialogue would be initiated.

Mr. YUTZIS said that, in his view, the idea of seeking dialogue was not exactly in accordance with the Committee's task and the latter would not be facilitated by too conciliatory an approach, which, moreover, would not serve to help Mozambique or any other State in a similar situation.

Mr. DE PIEROLA Y BALTA said he wished to emphasize the importance of technical assistance. He himself was aware of the valuable experience gained, for example, by government officials of many countries through fellowships and attendance at seminars and meetings of ILC, under technical assistance measures provided through UNITAR. He saw no reason why the Committee should not advocate similar assistance.

The CHAIRMAN said that those comments would be taken into account during the Committee's deliberations under agenda item 6.

Mr. EVRIGENIS said that, although the solution the Committee seemed about to adopt was convenient, he himself appreciated Mr. Yutzis' observations, including the reminder that reappraisals of past procedure did not come amiss.

If the Committee requested further information from the Government of Mozambique and suggested a time-limit for its presentation with a view to considering it at the Committee's next session, it would be responding, to some extent, to the concern expressed by Mr. Yutzis.

Mr. SONG said that the Committee should respect the report before it, from a new State party to the Convention. It could ask the Government for further information under the provisions of article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention,

according to rule 65 of the Committee's rules of procedure. That information could be submitted in time for consideration by the Committee at its next session. It would not matter if a precedent was set. It would simply mean that if any similarly scanty reports were received in the future, the Committee could again request further information.

The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee agreed that a letter should be sent to the Government, enclosing copies of the revised general guidelines concerning the form and contents of reports by States parties under article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the summary record of the current meeting and the pertinent part of the Committee's report to the General Assembly, and requesting the Government to submit further information by 31 December 1984, for consideration by the Committee at its next session, when it might be possible for a government representative to attend.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.