

**INTERNATIONAL  
COVENANT  
ON CIVIL AND  
POLITICAL RIGHTS**



Distr.  
GENERAL  
CCPR/C/SR.44  
31 August 1977  
Original: ENGLISH

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Second Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 44th MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Monday, 29 August 1977 at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. MAVROMMATIS

CONTENTS

Other matters (agenda item 6) (continued)

Draft guidelines (continued)

Meetings of the Committee in 1978 and 1979 (agenda item 5, formerly item 6) (continued)

Other matters (agenda item 6) (continued)

Reconstitution of the Working Group

Question of the co-operation between the Committee and the specialized agencies  
concerned (agenda item 4, formerly item 5)

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

GE.77-9005

OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 6) (continued)

Draft guidelines (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its consideration of the draft guidelines.

Paragraph 4 (continued)

2. Mr. GRAEFRATH proposed that subparagraph (v) of Part I be amended to read: "What other measures have been taken to ensure the implementation of the provisions of the Covenant".

3. It was so decided.

4. Sir Vincent EVANS proposed the deletion from Part II, subparagraph (i), of the words "to give effect to the rights recognized in the Covenant".

5. It was so decided.

6. Sir Vincent EVANS proposed that the phrase "as well as any reservation ... made under article 4" be deleted from subparagraph (ii) and that the subparagraph be amended to read: "Any restrictions or limitations, even of a temporary nature, imposed by law or practice, or any other manner, on the enjoyment of the right".

7. It was so decided.

8. The CHAIRMAN suggested that in the absence of any proposal to the contrary, subparagraphs (iii) and (iv) of Part II should remain as drafted.

9. It was so decided.

Paragraph 5

10. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the square brackets should be removed and the text, as drafted, adopted. It should be understood that the legislative texts referred to would be available in the original language.

11. It was so decided.

Paragraph 6

12. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the words "in your country" should be deleted.

13. It was so decided.

Paragraph 7

14. Mr. GRAEFRATH said that the paragraph was unnecessary.

15. Sir Vincent EVANS suggested that it would be of some value to indicate that the Committee hoped to have a constructive dialogue with each of the States parties concerned in regard to implementation of the Covenant and that the Committee's aim was to contribute to the development of friendly relations between States in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

16. After an exchange of views in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. GRAEFRATH, Mr. MOVCHAN and Mr. LALLIAH took part, Sir Vincent EVANS suggested that the paragraph should be amended to read: "On the basis of the reports prepared according to the above guidelines, the Committee is confident that it will be enabled to develop a constructive dialogue ... Charter of the United Nations".

17. It was so decided.

18. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the general guidelines should be dispatched to all States parties in accordance with the provisions of rule 66 of the rules of procedure. Those States parties that had already submitted reports should be told that it was entirely up to them to decide whether or not to submit a supplementary report drawn up in accordance with the guidelines. Copies of the new rules of procedure should be appended to the Secretary-General's letter accompanying the guidelines.

19. It was so decided.

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE IN 1978 AND 1979 (agenda item 5, formerly item 6) (continued)

20. Mr. MAZAUD (Assistant Director, Division of Human Rights) said that another cable had been received from New York on the subject of the availability of meeting facilities at Headquarters. The prospects were not bright. Members would recall that they had requested facilities in New York in January or March 1978. According to the cable, two sessions of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament had to be accommodated in New York for eight weeks during that period, with the result that facilities would not be available for the Committee. It would appear, therefore, that the Committee would have to hold its third session at Geneva in January 1978. As he had indicated at a previous meeting, the Working Group could convene on 9 January and the Committee could meet from 16 January to 3 February.

21. According to information he had received earlier, it would have been possible for the Committee to hold its fourth session in New York from 10 to 28 July 1978. According to the cable he had just received, those dates were now uncertain. The relevant part of the cable read: "Regarding fourth session, which is now scheduled for 10 to 28 July in New York, since dates of Special Session of General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament scheduled for New York are now being negotiated and may involve this period, it is desirable that the Human Rights Committee be accommodated at Geneva". He had been told that that part of the cable should be taken with reservations. If the Committee wished to hold its meetings in Geneva and New York alternately it should say so and should insist on holding its fourth session in New York. In the calendar

of conferences approved by the Economic and Social Council, provision had been made for that session to be held in New York. Should the Committee consider it desirable to hold a special session in 1978, such a session could be held at Geneva in October/November.

22. Mr. LALLAH said that under the Covenant it was within the discretion of the Committee to decide where it would meet and the Secretary-General was to provide the necessary facilities for the effective performance of the functions of the Committee. At its first session, the Committee had decided that it would meet in New York and Geneva alternately. In order to accommodate the Secretariat, it had agreed that, exceptionally, it would hold its next two sessions at Geneva. The Committee was now being told that it had no power of decision. That was a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. In its report, the Committee should state that it very much regretted the way in which the situation had developed and wished to reaffirm its decision to meet in New York and Geneva alternately.

23. Mr. MOVCHAN said that he fully agreed with everything Mr. Lallah had said. The Committee should reaffirm its decision to meet in New York in the winter and at Geneva in the summer. He asked whether it would not be possible for the Committee to meet in New York in February. Indeed, in view of the time-limits established by the Committee for the submission of information relating to communications, it should perhaps meet in February rather than in January.

24. Mr. MAZAUD (Assistant Director, Division of Human Rights) said that even if accommodation were available in February in New York or Geneva, it would be very difficult for the Division of Human Rights to service a session of the Committee as the Commission on Human Rights was meeting at that time and, until sufficient staff was available, the Division could not service both at the same time.

25. Mr. TARNOPOLSKY said that he deplored the lack of resources offered to the new Committee and hoped that its report would stress that point. For him, it was very important to know when the Committee would meet so that the year could be planned in advance. He therefore requested that a decision be made at that meeting and the possibility of rotation considered for 1979. The dates proposed should be accepted and then the Committee would be in a strong position to demand that its meetings be held in New York in January 1979 and at Geneva in July 1979.

26. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should agree to hold its sessions at Geneva in January and in New York in July 1978, but should express its deep regret at being forced to accept that situation, reaffirm its decision to hold its winter sessions in New York and its summer sessions in Geneva, stress that changes entailed almost insurmountable difficulties and emphasize its sincere hope that its normal alternation would be resumed from 1979 onwards.

27. Mr. GRAEFRATH pointed out that the decision had been made by the Secretariat and not the Committee, which apparently had no choice in the matter.

28. Mr. GANJI agreed that the Committee should give a year's notice of its preferences so that the Secretariat could plan accordingly. As it had given the Secretariat 18 months' notice to arrange the sessions, the Secretariat should have been in a position to act in accordance with the wishes of the Committee.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee should make it clear that it could work only in accordance with its schedule, which it had planned more than a year ago.
30. Mr. PRADO-VALLEJO emphasized that the Committee found itself in the deplorable situation of having to alter its arrangements because of extraneous factors and the report should reflect its deep concern on that subject.
31. The Committee should take up the excellent suggestion made by Mr. Ganji that it could meet elsewhere for its third session in 1978. Obviously the Committee could not alter the fait accompli it had been presented with; it should meet at Geneva in January and try to plan its two subsequent sessions, wherever they were held.
32. Mr. GRAEFRATH proposed that the Committee should formally ask the Secretariat to transmit an account of events directly to the Secretary-General, who should then try to make it possible for the Committee to meet at Vienna.
33. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had not received any invitations from Governments with promises to defray extra expenses and therefore could not meet elsewhere.
34. Mr. GRAEFRATH replied that the Secretary-General could perhaps make it possible for a session to be held at Vienna under United Nations auspices, for which a government invitation was not required.
35. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the usual budgetary provisions did not allow for that.
36. Mr. MAZAUD (Division of Human Rights) explained that Vienna was not a centre comparable to New York or Geneva for United Nations meetings, as all staff had to be transferred there and that therefore the Secretary-General was not in a position to make such arrangements, although the situation would be different if the General Assembly were to give its permission. He regretted that the only possibilities were as stated. The calendar for 1979 was at the preliminary stage of preparation and if the Committee expressed its needs clearly he could ask that the dates be altered to revert to the New York in winter/Geneva in summer rotation. Further discussion regarding the 1978 sessions was useless and could only result in uncertainty about the dates and venues of the subsequent sessions.
37. Sir Vincent EVANS said that he agreed with Mr. Movchan that there were good reasons for meeting in February or March and found it difficult to see why the Secretariat could not service both the Committee and the Commission at the same time. If that was impracticable, however, the Working Group should meet from 9-13 January and the Committee from 16 January to 3 February 1978 at Geneva.
38. Although it was perhaps important to alternate between Geneva and New York, it was very difficult to work in New York during the summer, and he would be happy if the Committee met at Geneva in 1978. The Committee's sessions should be spaced as evenly as possible; it had been told that its fifth session could take place on dates of its choice between 10 July and 22 December at Geneva, and if the sixth session was to be

held in January 1979, the fifth session could perhaps be held during the last week of October and the first week of November. Since the Committee was willing to accommodate the Secretariat for 1978, and the programme of meetings for 1979 was still provisional, the Secretariat should be able to accommodate the Committee for 1979, especially as it was new and had as yet no fixed work patterns like those of long-established bodies.

39. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the major drawback that present arrangements envisaged four or even five consecutive sessions at Geneva. The Committee should therefore perhaps brave the summer of 1978 in New York to provide some alternation. In any case, a decision should be taken on the session proposed for January/February 1978 at Geneva.

40. Mr. TARNOPOLSKY requested that a decision should be taken on at least the dates of the July session. He was concerned that the range of proposed dates for the 1979 summer session extended into September, as that involved the re-arrangement of even more classes. Perhaps a decision should be taken on the dates of the fifth session before 1979 dates were discussed to ensure that sufficient time elapsed between sessions.

41. The CHAIRMAN suggested reverting to the idea of meeting in March in New York and July/August at Geneva. Under the rules of procedure, the Committee must take a decision on its special session. A prior decision must therefore be taken about meeting from 10 to 28 July 1978.

42. Mr. LALLAH pointed out that a decision had already been taken, and was recorded in document CCPR/C/SR.18, paragraph 22.

43. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should confirm that it would meet in New York from 10 to 28 July 1978 and request the Secretariat to explore possibilities of holding a meeting in New York in March 1979.

44. Mr. MAZAUD (Assistant Director, Division of Human Rights) said that these dates had already been refused, but that if the Committee re-affirmed its views, giving dates in March/April, he would be in a stronger position to ask again.

45. Sir Vincent EVANS reiterated that the Secretariat should find a way to accommodate the wishes of the Committee.

46. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, if the Committee's wishes could not be accommodated in 1979, it might have difficulty in finding a quorum. It should therefore insist on meeting in March/April of that year, and having most of its subsequent session in August 1979.

47. Mr. LALLAH said that such a decision appeared inevitable, but that the Chairman should write directly to the Secretary-General expressing the views of the Committee and inviting him to take all the steps necessary to implement the decision to meet alternately at Geneva and New York.

48. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the summary record would reflect sufficiently the very strong views of the Committee on that point. Once he had received the necessary information, he could contact the officers of the Committee and, having obtained through them the views of all members of the Committee, convey those views to the appropriate quarter.

49. Mr. MAZAUD (Assistant Director, Division of Human Rights) explained that it was impossible to change the dates of sessions of the Commission on Human Rights. Its time-table depended on the time-table of the Economic and Social Council, of which it was a subsidiary body and to which it had to submit reports six weeks before the opening of the Council's session. The Committee could hold its sessions partly in one month and partly in the next month if that would simplify matters for its members. He thought that in 1979 it would be possible to arrange the Committee's sessions in a way which would give it satisfaction.

50. Mr. MOVCHAN said that the proposed arrangements for the Committee's sessions in 1979 were presumably based on the assumption that the Committee would hold three sessions in 1978. He personally questioned that assumption and, if it held only two sessions in 1978, then its January 1979 session could be held in New York and its July 1979 session at Geneva. That would simplify matters both for the members of the Committee and for the Secretariat.

51. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee's decision to meet in March 1979 had been taken as a matter of convenience and was not necessarily dependent on a third session being held in 1978. Under rule 3 of the rules of procedure, the Committee was required to take a decision if it wished to convene a special session. He asked members of the Committee to express their views on the need for such a session.

52. Mr. TARNOPOLSKY said that the rule of procedure which was applicable was rule 2 and not rule 3. The Committee was not in fact considering the holding of a special session for a specific purpose but of a third regular session. Presumably the intention was to do so only in 1978.

53. Sir Vincent EVANS said that he was of the same opinion as Mr. Tarnopolsky. The Committee was thinking in terms of a third regular session in 1978 to enable it to deal, in particular, with the reports which States were under an obligation to submit to it. It was not right that the Committee should delay for too long the preliminary examination of reports submitted to it by States parties, but that would be the position if the Committee held only two sessions in 1978 and its fifth session in January, February or March of 1979. If the Committee held an extra two-week session at the end of 1978 that would enable it to keep abreast of its work.

54. Mr. TARNOPOLSKY said that paragraph 2 of rule 3 made it clear that the rule applied to emergency sessions for a specified limited purpose, whereas the only reason for the proposal to hold a third session in 1978 was to enable the Committee to catch up with its work.

55. Mr. GRAEFRATH said that he was against the Committee taking any decision concerning the convening of a third session in 1978. Quite a number of members of the Committee were not convinced that it was necessary. Preparations should however be made for it so that, if it did prove necessary, it could be convened.

56. Mr. KOULISHEV said that it was his impression that it would be difficult at the present time to take a decision regarding the holding of a third session in 1978. However, it would probably be wise for the Committee to plan for the possibility of

such a session in its time-table. The actual decision should be taken only when it became obvious, if it did, that the Committee was getting behindhand with its work. In any case, it was much too early for the Committee to decide what items would be on its agenda at a third session in 1978.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that he was prepared to accept the fact that the third session in 1978, if it were held, would be a regular session, but rule 2 of the rules of procedure did not refer specifically to the holding of a third regular session in any given year. Should the Committee decide that a third session was needed in 1978 to examine the reports submitted by States parties, it could always cancel the session if it found that its work was so advanced as to make it unnecessary.

58. Mr. TOMUSCHAT said that the Committee had an extremely heavy work load. It had just begun to consider State reports but had not yet finished one. Moreover, it would have to consider each of the reports in the light of the additional information submitted to it. It would then have the very difficult task of formulating observations on the reports. He personally considered the third session essential, inasmuch as the Committee could expect to have 40 reports pending by the end of 1978. He did not think that a decision on the need for that session could be postponed. If no decision were taken forthwith, it would be impossible for budgetary and other reasons to hold a third session in 1978. However, the Committee should be ready to cancel the session should it become apparent that there was no real need for it.

59. The CHAIRMAN said he thought it would be helpful to have in mind a text for inclusion in the Committee's report concerning the holding of a third regular session in 1978.

60. Sir Vincent EVANS wondered whether the Chairman was thinking in terms of the majority view only. If so, the text might read: "The majority of members, or the Committee, felt it was necessary to cater for a third session, which would take place at Geneva in November 1978. It was felt that it was not possible to cope with the work load of the Committee by holding only two sessions in 1978. The holding of the session was subject to a final decision to be taken at the second of the sessions held in 1978."

61. Mr. TARNOPOLSKY said that he was not absolutely convinced of the need for a formal text on the subject. It might be difficult to reach agreement on it. No-one wanted a third session if the work could be done in two sessions. If it was found during the second session that it was unnecessary, then the third session would not be held. Some members of the Committee were proposing that a decision of some kind should be taken during the present session only because of the difficulties which the Secretariat had with the calendar of conferences. In fact, there were no serious differences of opinion among the members of the Committee.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that unless there was something on record it might be extremely difficult to take a decision later on in 1978. The report should at least mention the fact that a possible third session in 1978 should be catered for.



63. Sir Vincent EVANS suggested a paragraph along the following lines:

"After discussing its work programme for 1978-1979, the Committee came to the conclusion that, in view of the anticipated work load, provision should be made for the fifth regular session to be held at Geneva from 23 October to 3 November 1978."

64. The CHAIRMAN said he thought it would be well to add a sentence along the following lines:

"If the work load at the end of the second regular session in 1978 did not justify the holding of such a session, it would be automatically cancelled."

65. Mr. GRAEFRATH said that, with the addition of the sentence suggested by the Chairman, he could accept the wording.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that the Rapporteur would include a text along those lines in his report and the Committee would be able to amend it, if it so wished, when it considered the report.

67. Mr. TOMUSCHAT said he would like to know from the Secretariat whether such a paragraph in the report would be sufficient or whether a formal decision should be taken.

68. Mr. MAZAUD (Assistant Director, Division of Human Rights) said that any proposal made to the General Assembly should have solid foundations, particularly when it had financial implications, as the proposal regarding a third regular session of the Committee in 1978 did. Its proposal should certainly be justified by a reference to its work programme for 1978 and the volume of work which would be involved. Whether the proposal was contained in a decision or in a formal statement in the report did not, in his view, make much difference.

Mr. Lallah, Vice-Chairman, took the chair.

OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 6) (continued)

Reconstitution of the Working Group

69. The CHAIRMAN said that it would be necessary to reconstitute the Working Group, as a number of representatives and alternates now serving on it would be unable to do so when it next met. Mr. Opsahl, for instance, would not be able to serve on it at the next session.

70. Mr. URIBE VARGAS said that the Latin-American members of the Committee nominated Mr. Prado-Vallejo to represent them on the Working Group at the next session.

71. The CHAIRMAN asked Sir Vincent Evans, who had been Mr. Opsahl's alternate on the Working Group, whether he was prepared to be a member of the Working Group.

72. Sir Vincent EVANS said that in the circumstances he was willing to do so.
73. The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Kelani whether he could serve on the Working Group at the next session.
74. Mr. KELANI expressed regret that he would be unable to do so because of his professional commitments.
75. The CHAIRMAN said that he was not sure that Mr. Ganji, who had been Mr. Kelani's alternate, would be available either. He himself would also find it very difficult to be a member of the Working Group at the next session. He hoped that Mr. Ben-Fadhel, who had been his alternate, would be able to replace him.
76. Mr. PRADO-VALLEJO expressed the view that it would be much better for each region to nominate its own representative and alternate, as had been done at the first session, than for the Committee as a whole to nominate members.
77. Mr. KOULISHEV proposed that Mr. Graefrath should continue to serve on the Working Group.
78. Mr. GRAEFRATH agreed to do so.
79. Mr. KELANI said that, in the absence of Mr. Ganji, a decision with regard to the Asian representation would have to be postponed until the next meeting.
80. Mr. BEN-FADHEL said that, if Mr. Lallah was unable to do so, he was prepared to represent the African region on the Working Group at the next session.
81. The CHAIRMAN said that there might be some difficulty in finding an alternate to replace Mr. Prado-Vallejo if he were unable to attend meetings of the Working Group.
82. Mr. URIBE VARGAS said he thought Mr. Mora Rojas would be willing to do so.
83. Mr. PRADO-VALLEJO expressed the hope that the Committee would establish the principle that each group should nominate its representatives. The members of each group would naturally wish to consult one another and the Secretariat before reaching a decision.
84. The CHAIRMAN said that was precisely the way in which nominations were being made. He hoped that the group to which Sir Vincent Evans belonged would indicate who his alternate would be at the next meeting, if it could not do so at the present time.
85. Mr. KOULISHEV, in answer to an appeal by the Chairman for a nomination for an alternate to Mr. Graefrath, proposed Mr. Hanga.
86. Mr. HANGA accepted the nomination.

87. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should pass on to another item and revert to the question of the reconstitution of the Working Group at its next meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 5.30 p.m. and resumed at 5.50 p.m.

Mr. Mavrommatis took the Chair.

88. The CHAIRMAN said that, since it was not yet known whether Mr. Ganji would be able to take part in the Working Group, he himself could agree to attend the Working Group's meetings, although he could not promise to be present every day and preferred not to be the Chairman of the Working Group.

89. Accordingly, the Working Group would be composed of Mr. Prado-Vallejo, whose alternate would be Mr. Mora Rojas; Sir Vincent Evans, whose alternate would be Mr. Opsahl; Mr. Lallah, whose alternate would be Mr. Ben-Fadhel; Mr. Graefrath, whose alternate would be Mr. Hanga; and Mr. Ganji, for whom he (the Chairman) would act as an alternate.

QUESTION OF THE CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE COMMITTEE AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES CONCERNED (agenda item 4, formerly item 5) (CCPR/C/L.3 and L.3/Add.1)

90. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, because of the lack of time, the Committee should express regret that it had had to postpone detailed consideration of the question of its co-operation with the specialized agencies concerned. He also suggested that the Committee should decide to inform the specialized agencies concerned of the dates of its next session, at which the question of co-operation with the specialized agencies concerned would be considered.

91. Sir Vincent EVANS said that, since a representative of UNESCO had come to Geneva to attend the Committee's current session, he could agree only reluctantly to the Chairman's suggestions.

92. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt his suggestions.

93. It was so decided.

94. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the question of the transmission to the specialized agencies concerned of copies of such parts of the reports of States parties as might fall within their field of competence, in accordance with article 40, paragraph 3, of the Covenant and rule 67 of the rules of procedure.

95. Mr. MAZAUD (Assistant Director, Division of Human Rights) drew the attention of the Committee to the provisions of rule 67 of the rules of procedure and to the communications which the Committee had received at its first session from the International Labour Office (CCPR/C/L.3) and from UNESCO (CCPR/C/L.3/Add.1), in which those two specialized agencies had indicated the articles of the Covenant relating to their field of competence.

96. He noted that the task of transmitting to the specialized agencies concerned copies of such parts of the reports of States parties as might fall within the agencies' field of competence posed practical difficulties, since the reports contained scattered references to the articles of the Covenant and to the activities of the specialized agencies concerned. It might therefore be appropriate and practical for the Committee to transmit to the specialized agencies concerned the reports as a whole, drawing their attention to the parts of the reports which fell within their field of competence.

97. Although WHO had not expressly stated that it wished to co-operate with the Committee, it had indicated, during the preliminary interagency meetings which had taken place before the Covenant had entered into force, that certain articles of the Covenant were relevant to its mandate and activities. The Committee might therefore subsequently find that some parts of the reports of States parties would be of concern to WHO.

98. Mr. MOVCHAN said he did not think that it was advisable for the Committee to transmit to the specialized agencies concerned the full text of six reports which it had considered at the current session.

99. Mr. TOMUSCHAT said that, in view of the importance of co-operation with the specialized agencies, it would be a serious matter if the Committee appeared to have refused to provide information to the specialized agencies by not transmitting to them the reports it had received. The transmission of those reports for information was all the more important now that it was too late for the Committee to invite the specialized agencies to submit comments on them, in accordance with rule 67, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure.

100. The CHAIRMAN said that it would be a matter of courtesy for the Committee to transmit to the specialized agencies concerned the reports it had considered at the current session, even though those reports would not give the specialized agencies a great deal of information concerning the implementation of the Covenant.

101. Sir Vincent EVANS said he thought that there was a great deal to be said for transmitting to the specialized agencies concerned the six reports considered at the current session, if only as a response to the agencies' indication of their willingness to co-operate with the Committee. He also considered that the Committee might request the Secretariat to transmit to the specialized agencies concerned any additional material it might receive in reply to the questions put to the representatives of the States parties concerned, and that the specialized agencies might be invited to submit comments on the reports. Such comments would be of great assistance to the Committee when it considered those reports at a later session. In addition, such a procedure would enable the Committee and the specialized agencies concerned to gain experience in co-operating to achieve observance of the Covenant.

102. Mr. MOVCHAN said he was of the opinion that article 40, paragraph 3, of the Covenant and rule 67 of the rules of procedure contained no obligation for the Committee to transmit to the specialized agencies concerned the full text of the reports of States parties which it had considered at the current session. Indeed, he thought that the transmission of the full text of those reports would conflict with the provisions of the Covenant and that it might lead to complaints by States parties that the Committee was going beyond its terms of reference. Moreover, he did not see how the Secretary-General would have time to hold the consultations with the Committee called for in rule 67, paragraph 1. He therefore considered that the Committee should avoid establishing a regrettable precedent by taking a hurried decision on the question of the transmission of reports to the specialized agencies concerned.

103. Mr. GRAEFERATH drew attention to the fact that the Third Committee of the General Assembly had reached agreement on the words "as may fall within the field of competence" in rule 67, paragraph 1, only as a result of lengthy discussions. Those words meant that the specialized agencies were concerned only with reports submitted by their own member States. Before transmitting reports to the specialized agencies, the Committee therefore had to ensure that the subject of the reports fell within the field of competence of the specialized agency in question and that the State party involved was a member of that specialized agency.

104. Mr. TARNOPOLSKY said that, since it would be helpful for the Committee to have the comments of the specialized agencies concerned on all 16 of the reports it had received until now, the six reports which had already been considered should not be distinguished from the ten other outstanding reports and should not be transmitted to the specialized agencies concerned until it had been possible to work out an arrangement by which reports would be transmitted to the specialized agencies as they were received from States parties.

105. The CHAIRMAN said he agreed with Mr. Tarnopolsky that the comments of the specialized agencies concerning the reports of States parties would be very helpful to the Committee. He therefore suggested that the Committee should include the question of co-operation with the specialized agencies on the agenda of its next session.

106. Mr. TOMUSCHAT said that high priority should be given to that question at the next session.

107. Mr. MOVCHAN said he thought that that question should be considered in due course, but that priority should be given to the reports submitted by States parties.

108. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, at its next session, the Committee should give due priority to the question of co-operation with the specialized agencies.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.