

TREATY BODY MONITOR

International Service for Human Rights



Human Rights Monitor Series

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE 93RD SESSION FRANCE, 4TH REPORT 9-10 JULY 2008

Key facts	1
Information submitted to the Committee	2
State report.....	2
List of issues.....	2
NGO reports	3
Themes and issues.....	3
Status of the Covenant.....	4
Non-discrimination and protection of minorities.....	5
Criminal justice legislation	6
Expulsion and removal of foreigners (Article 13).....	7
Gender equality	7
Arrest and detention	8
Other issues	9
Conclusions and next steps	9

Key facts¹

Date of Ratification	Reservations	Party to Optional Protocols (OP)	Additional ratified core treaties
1980	Articles 4, 9, 14.	Yes, both	ICERD, ICESCR, CAT, CRC, CMW, CEDAW

Type of report	Date submitted	Report submitted on time	NGO / NHRI consultation/input	List of issues provided / Written replies	Last appearance before Committee
Fourth	13 February 2007	No	Yes ²	1 Nov 2007/ 16 May 2008	12 March 2002

¹ The information in these two tables is sourced from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and is available at www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/Pages/HumanRightsintheWorld.aspx.

² The draft report was examined by the National Consultative Commission for Human Rights, which is comprised *inter alia* of non-governmental organisations, human rights associations, and trade union organisations.

Information submitted to the Committee

State report

The fourth periodic report of France was submitted to the Human Rights Committee (the Committee) on 13 February 2007, three years late.³ In its three previous reports,⁴ France outlined the mechanisms and policies by which it guarantees the rights laid out in *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (the Covenant). At the Committee's request,⁵ the fourth report focused on progress made in implementing the Committee's previous recommendations, particularly in the areas of gender equality, treatment of foreigners, and administration of justice.

In the report, France asks that the Committee 'forgive it for the late submission' and explains that it was prepared in collaboration with civil society, taking their recommendations into account 'to the extent possible'. At 94 pages, the report is a detailed assessment of the status of civil and political rights in France. It systematically addresses the recommendations contained in the Committee's concluding observations after its previous consideration of France.⁶ Among other points, it includes a lengthy summary of measures taken to combat discrimination against women in both overseas territories and in France proper, details about disciplinary actions taken against law enforcement officials for human rights abuses, explanations of various anti-terrorism and criminal law provisions, and descriptions of various commissions and offices established to protect human rights.

List of issues

The Committee's list of issues⁷ focuses heavily on human rights violations associated with France's criminal justice system. Treatment of minorities and foreigners is also a prominent issue. Although it contains 28 questions, the overall length of the compilation is relatively brief compared to States of comparable geopolitical status.⁸

Inquiries regarding controversial new criminal justice provisions⁹ were wide-ranging. Foremost, the Committee asked about anti-terrorism legislation that allows for up to six days of investigative custody, 72 hours of detainment without access to a lawyer, and, most strikingly, up to four years of pre-trial detention during a criminal investigation for certain serious crimes.¹⁰ The Committee drew attention to a new statute that authorizes the indefinite detention of persons convicted of a serious crime, should they be deemed 'dangerous' after they have finished serving their penal sentences.¹¹ The Committee also inquired into the situation and legal status of minorities in France, although France's refusal to recognize minorities as such was not mentioned.¹² A law against the display of 'conspicuous' religious symbols and clothing in public

³ CCPR/C/FRA/4, available at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/hrcs93.htm. In its concluding observations, the Committee refers to a 'six-year delay' in the submission of this report.

⁴ See, for example, CCPR/C/46/Add.2 and CCPR/C/76/Add.7.

⁵ See CCPR/C/66/GUI/Rev.2.

⁶ See CCPR/C/79/Add.80 for the Committee's previous concluding observations.

⁷ CCPR/C/FRA/Q/4, available at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/hrcs93.htm.

⁸ See for example the list of issues for the United Kingdom, CCPR/C/GBR/Q/6.

⁹ Other judicial issues included access to justice and pre-trial detention for juveniles; overcrowding, violence and suicide in prisons; ill-treatment of detainees by authorities, including blind-folding during interrogations; reports of prisoners being hired out to private enterprises in French Polynesia; and general queries concerning judicial reform and progress in prison monitoring.

¹⁰ Question 4, under the section entitled Counter-terrorism measures and respect for rights guaranteed in the Convention.

¹¹ Question 12, under the section entitled Liberty of the person and guarantees against retroactivity (arts. 9 and 15).

¹² Other minority and non-discrimination issues included ill-treatment and acts of violence against foreigners by authorities, mass expulsions of undocumented aliens and asylum-seekers, restrictions impeding family reunification, anti-Semitic violence, the social phenomenon of 'elite racism', de facto residential segregation, and difficulties in obtaining employment reportedly faced by persons with North African or Arabic names.

schools, which has received a lot of attention in the international media, was raised for its allegedly adverse effects on students belonging to the Muslim, Jewish and Sikh faiths.

The State Party issued a thorough and timely written response to the list of issues. Its response covered all the questions in detail. Particular attention was given to clarifying controversial criminal justice provisions and providing statistics about gender equality.

NGO reports

11 non-governmental organisations (NGOs) submitted reports to the Committee.¹³ Several NGOs called the Committee's attention to torture and other ill-treatment by law enforcement officials in France.¹⁴ Amnesty International in particular the Government's failure to take adequate measures to prohibit such acts. Other issues raised by NGOs included gender inequality and discrimination against women of immigrant background;¹⁵ discrimination against minorities, particularly Roma;¹⁶ the situation of asylum-seekers, including the use of waiting zones in ports;¹⁷ 'special detention' under anti-terrorism laws;¹⁸ human trafficking;¹⁹ ambiguity of laws on conscientious objection;²⁰ and lack of protection of children from corporal punishment.²¹

Themes and issues

France sent a small delegation to the session. Ms Edwige Belliard, Director of Legal Affairs at the Ministry for European and Foreign Affairs, was head of the delegation. Five other officials joined Ms Belliard in representing France before the Committee: M. Jean-Baptiste Mattei, Ambassadeur, Représentant Permanent de la France auprès de l'Office des Nations Unies à Genève; Ms Anne-Françoise Tissier, Magistrat, Sous-Directrice des droits de l'homme, Direction des Affaires Juridiques, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et Européennes; Ms Florence Ricaud, Responsable du bureau d'aide à la décision, Section du contentieux, Conseil d'Etat; Ms Olivia Diego, Adjointe au Chef du Bureau des questions juridiques et du contentieux, Service des affaires européennes et internationales, Ministère de la Justice; and Mr Eric Dumand, Chargé de mission droits de l'homme », Direction des libertés publiques et des affaires juridiques, Ministère de l'Intérieur, de l'Outre-Mer et des Collectivités Locales. Although the experts sent were high-level and knowledgeable, such a small delegation could not possibly constitute relevant expertise under all aspects of the Covenant.

In its opening remarks, the delegation listed France's recent ratifications of international human rights instruments, including the *Council of Europe's Convention on Action Against Trafficking* and the *Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR*. It stressed respect for diversity, equality and the guarantee of rights as its three main areas of achievement.

¹³ Amnesty International, Association nationale d'assistance aux frontières pour les étrangers, Behatokia Basque Observatory of Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, International Federation of Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture, Conscience and Peace Tax International, Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, European Roma Rights Centre, Ni Putes Ni Soumises, Ligue des Droits de l'Homme, Commission Nationale de déontologie de la sécurité. All NGO reports are available at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/hrcs93.htm

¹⁴ Amnesty International, Behatokia Basque Observatory of Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, International Federation of Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture, Ligue des Droits de l'Homme.

¹⁵ Ni Putes ni Soumises.

¹⁶ European Roma Rights Centre.

¹⁷ Association nationale d'assistance aux frontières pour les étrangers.

¹⁸ Behatokia Basque Observatory of Human Rights, Human Rights Watch.

¹⁹ Ligue des Droits de l'Homme.

²⁰ Conscience and Peace Tax International.

²¹ Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children.

Some Committee members illustrated a curiously high level of emotional investment in France's human rights situation. For example, Ms Wedgewood declared that she was 'a grandchild of France' because her mother was raised in Paris, and Mr Glele-Ahanhanzo followed a stinging indictment of France's immigration procedures with the proclamation that his criticism was issued only 'out of duty and friendship'. Other members took pains to insert French phrases into their comments.

The delegations generally gave comprehensive responses to questions during the discussion, prompting several Committee members to commend France for its attention to detail.

Status of the Covenant

France acceded to the Covenant on 4 November 1980. It holds a general reservation with respect to the interpretation of the Covenant²² and maintains reservations to Article 4(1) concerning limitations of presidential power during states of emergency, as well as Articles 9 and 14 concerning the effect that these articles could have on military disciplinary regimes. France has also submitted declarations to Articles 13, 14(5), 19, 21, 22, and 27 of the Covenant.²³ Since its last report, France has refused to reconsider any of its reservations, but stated that French authorities are examining the declarations concerning Article 13 and Article 14(5), in order to assess the possibility of modification.

France's reservation to Article 4 received the most attention from the Committee. Article 4 provides that a State may derogate from its obligations under the present Covenant to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation in a state of emergency, and that the State must inform other State Parties to the Covenant of its declaration. France insists that its Constitution grants the French President 'exceptional powers that cannot be circumscribed *a priori* by a treaty provision.' This explanation drew the ire of Ms Wedgewood, who pointed out the Constitution lacked the 'auto-limitation' on presidential power that the Covenant sought to impose, and stressed that 'no matter how dire a situation is, a State cannot use torture or discriminate on grounds of race'.

The Committee spent considerable time probing France's declaration regarding Article 27, which guarantees the rights of ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities to 'enjoy their own culture'. France's Constitution prohibits the formulation of distinctions 'as to origin, race or religion', thereby precluding the recognition of specific rights arising solely from belonging to a minority group. Such a principle has wide-ranging implications for the implementation of the Covenant. These are discussed below under the issue of 'Non-discrimination'.

The French delegation did not spend much time outlining legislation meant to incorporate the provisions of the Covenant into domestic law. Rather, most discussion of legislation by the delegation was limited to descriptions and insistences that the laws were in fact compatible with Covenant provisions.

The delegation did, however, provide a list of instances and areas of direct applicability of the Covenant in domestic courts, suggesting that while traditional French principles sometimes trump Covenant provisions, the judiciary is taking significant steps to mainstream France's obligations under the Covenant. The Covenant has been invoked before both ordinary courts and administrative courts.

²² In this session, it reasserted its concerns over the Covenant's 'compatibility' with 'the purposes and principles of the UN', as expressed in its general reservation. This reservation stresses that 'in case of conflict between its obligations under the Covenant and its obligations under the Charter [of the UN] (especially Articles 1 and 2 thereof), its obligations under the Charter will prevail.' France insists that this proclamation of hesitation to fully embrace the Covenant is 'intended to ensure consistency within the United Nations system'.

²³ See State party report, CCPR/C/FRA/4, paras. 6-12. Specific reservations and declarations were preserved at this session on account of purported conflicts between the identified articles and other legal or quasi-legal documents to which France is bound, such as its own Constitution and the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights.

Before ordinary courts, the Covenant is most often applied in procedural questions. For example, Article 14, concerning the functioning of tribunals and courts, is frequently cited by judges. Specific rights that have been protected in this regard include, among others, the right of a person not to testify against himself or herself, the right to be heard, and the right to a public hearing. The Covenant has on occasion been invoked in cases regarding substantive rights, including freedom of movement, prohibition of torture and inhumane and degrading treatment, and the principle of non-discrimination.

Administrative judges have recognized the direct applicability of several of the Covenant's provisions. These include the incorporation of Article 9, paragraph 2, into regulations regarding the commitment of individuals into psychiatric care and the application of Article 10, paragraph 1, to extradition decrees.

Non-discrimination and protection of minorities

Perhaps the most controversial and complex debate of the session concerned France's non-recognition of domestic minorities. France adheres to the principle that 'the French people are one',²⁴ and thus collects no information or statistics about the ethnic origins or religion of its citizens. All citizens are protected by the individual rights afforded them in France's Constitution and minority groups do not have any specific collective rights.

While France insists that 'the practical effect' of this principle is that 'application of identity is a personal choice', empirical evidence suggests that the concept may do more to stunt substantive equality than promote non-discrimination. As Mr Nigel Rodley pointed out, inequality is 'perfectly capable of passing as...formal equality'. Without data on minorities, he said, policymakers are unable to identify and respond to 'the needs of these communities', which are often comprised of the most disadvantaged members of society. Ms Wedgewood illustrated Mr Rodley's point by drawing attention to the complete absence of Muslims and North Africans in France's National Assembly. France's response when confronted with such information inevitably involves a simple assertion that it has no way of knowing which ethnicities are represented in its legislature. She argued that this 'abstract ideal' renders France 'blind' to the plight of members of disadvantaged groups, and helpless to change the situations of those minorities who are systematically discriminated against. After all, Ms Wedgewood reminded the delegation, 'there *is* racism', and 'to get beyond race you may have to initially account for race'.

This conflict between ideals and practice also surfaced in the discussion over freedom of religion. For example, Mr Rodley commented that the *Act of 15 March 2004* prohibiting the wearing of 'conspicuous' religious symbols in public schools could be seen as putting some citizens 'in the position of denying their religious tenets'. The law has a discriminatory effect on Muslims, Jews, and Sikhs, whose religious attire is particularly distinctive. Ms Wedgewood went even further, suggesting that such policies could actually contribute to racial and religious tensions. 'Denying these differences' sends the message that they 'are so dangerous that they must be repressed,' she explained, so it should come as no surprise that 'there are problems with intergroup relations on the sidewalk'.

The delegation stayed firm in defending France's Constitutional principles, asserting that non-recognition is a 'philosophical approach' that allows individuals to choose their own identity. In response to Ms Wedgewood's comments about the lack of minorities in the National Assembly, it reiterated its stance that 'the French concept prevails' and 'nothing has shown that another system, approach or philosophy is better' than France's. It also restated its explanation of the law against religious symbols as a way to 'organize an open forum based on the dignity of persons' and a method of 'reaffirm[ing] freedom of conscience' and 'guarantee[ing] respect for everyone's identity'.

²⁴ This principle is embodied in Article 1 of France's Constitution.

In its concluding observations,²⁵ the Committee recommended that the State review its long-standing position concerning the non-recognition of ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities. Similarly, it encouraged the State to collect and report adequate statistical data disaggregated on the basis of racial, ethnic or national origin. Moreover, the Committee requested that the State redouble its efforts to fight racist and anti-Semitic, and to undertake public education on the necessity for mutual respect among citizens of a democratic society. It moreover urged the State to reinforce its legislative framework and institutional mechanisms to exclude all discriminatory practices, as well as facilitate the participation of members of minority groups in publicly elected bodies.

Criminal justice legislation

The Committee repeatedly questioned the delegation about a number of recently passed criminal justice provisions, including measures aimed at combating terrorism and at curbing recidivism. Although France insisted that its legislation does not conflict with its obligations under the Covenant, the Committee did not appear convinced.

The *Act of 23 January 2006* drew abundant criticism, in particular for a provision that allows a suspect to be placed in pre-trial detention for up to four years, should the sitting magistrate determine that a person ‘likely’ participated in a serious crime.²⁶ Mr Rodley worried that the legislation could be used not to secure convictions but to destabilize groups, and asked for additional information about the level of proof required for pre-trial detention and the percentage of acquittals after such a detention. His concerns were echoed by many Committee members, who generally agreed that the list of occasions meriting the use of such detention was perhaps too broad. The Committee was also troubled by other aspects of the law, which stipulate that a person may be held in police custody for up to six days²⁷ and that an individual detained for a terrorism-related offense may not meet with a lawyer until 72 hours have elapsed from the time of arrest.

The Committee indicated further misgivings over a statute enacted on 25 February 2008 to rein in recidivism. Under the new law, a person sentenced to 15 years or more for serious offenses²⁸ may be indefinitely placed in ‘a social-medical-judicial security centre’ following the completion of his or her term should he or she be deemed dangerous. Mr Lallah voiced particularly poignant views on the legislation, pointing out that ‘if someone has been in prison for a long time and there is reason to believe they must be retained after the end of their sentence ... the State has failed in its obligation to ensure that prison involves treatment.’

The delegation went to great lengths to set the Committee at ease over prolonged pre-trial detentions. It explained that ordering such a detention is a long, complicated process requiring a special judge, hearing and numerous avenues for appeal. Various mechanisms are in place to afford as many rights as possible to the detained individual. For example, authorities immediately communicate the nature of the charges to the detainee, family members are informed, and the individual has access to a lawyer and doctor.

The delegation explained that the *Act of 25 February 2008* was a response to public outcry over repeat offenders, saying that ‘society is less and less tolerant of recidivism’. The delegation insisted that ‘all procedural guarantees are provided to ensure that this deprivation of liberty is ordered and extended only on an exceptional basis, in cases where it is strictly necessary in order to prevent reoffending’ and that the Act is ‘in full conformity’ with the Covenant.

²⁵ CCPR/C/FRA/CO/4, available at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/hrcs93.htm.

²⁶ These include terrorism-related offenses and cases where an individual is being prosecuted for more than one of the crimes listed in Book II (attacks on persons) and Book IV (attacks on the Nation, the State and public peace) of the criminal code, or for trafficking in narcotic drugs, procuring, extortion or crimes committed by an organized group.

²⁷ This is limited to situations where there is ‘serious risk of imminent terrorist action’ or ‘the requirements of international cooperation make it essential’.

²⁸ Especially the murder or rape of minors.

In its concluding observations, the Committee urged the State to ensure that anyone arrested on a criminal charge, including persons suspected of terrorism, is brought promptly before a judge. It also reminded the State that the right to have access to a lawyer constitutes ‘a fundamental safeguard against ill-treatment’. Furthermore, the Committee stated that the State should limit the duration of pre-trial detention.

Expulsion and removal of foreigners

Issues related to expulsions were frequently touched upon, both in the written materials and oral discussion. The topic elicited heated comments from some Committee members and stern responses from the French delegation.

The Committee referred in the list of issues and in the discussion to reports of mass expulsions, violence by border police, and restrictions impeding family reunification. Mr Glele-Ahanhango, for example, made impassioned remarks about the separation of families, declaring that as someone ‘born out of colonization’ he was ‘anguished’ by France’s recent attitude of ‘rejecting foreign citizens’. Ms Wedgewood echoed his concerns, referring to reports of expulsion of children without their families as evidence of a ‘certain hardening of feelings toward aliens’. Mr Rodley cited specific examples of foreigners who were sent from France back to States where they were at risk of being tortured, and asked what measures were followed in taking the decision to return someone to such a country.

In its response, France contended that each expulsion was conducted based on ‘an individual examination of the situation’ and insisted that authorities will only remove an individual if ‘there is every reason to believe they face no risk in their country of origin’. Such decisions are ‘subject to control by a judge’ and all necessary steps are taken to ‘ensure the rights of the concerned individual’ are not violated. The delegation further maintained that there were ‘mechanisms in place to keep families together’. It explained that reports of children being sent back to countries of origin without their parents were limited to cases of intercepted boats containing mainly minors, at which time the adult on board is considered to be the guardian of the children. However, even given these guarantees, France asserted that ‘those who do not fulfil criteria for a residence permit remain in the country at their own peril’. One member of the delegation stated that most of these issues were ‘political, not legal’, and implied that as mere ‘humble official[s]’ the members of the delegation had little authority to address them.

In its concluding observations, the Committee recommended that the State review its detention policy in regards to undocumented foreign nationals and asylum-seekers. It also expressed its concern about alleged ill-treatment of foreign nationals, including some asylum-seekers, by law enforcement officials. Accordingly, the Committee encouraged the State to establish adequate systems of monitoring and deterring abuses, as well as develop further training opportunities for law enforcement officials. On family reunification, the Committee recommended that the State review its procedures in this area with a view to ensuring that applications are processed as speedily as possible. Finally, the Committee urged the State to fully comply with the principle of *non-refoulement* and exercise the utmost care in the use of diplomatic assurances.

Gender equality

Issues concerning gender equality and women’s rights were addressed in detail on the first day. In its list of issues the Committee asked for specific information regarding sexual harassment laws, violence against women and women’s access to executive and senior-level posts in the private and public sectors. The delegation offered exhaustive statistics about these topics, including proportions of women in various sectors, incentives to promote women’s career development, and laws and convictions related to sexual harassment. The State Party’s written response also contained a comprehensive report about violence against women, which set forth a wide range of measures taken to reduce such violence. In general, the delegation was open about acknowledging gender issues and areas in need of progress.

Ms Motoc focused on gender equality in her questions to the delegation, expressing concerns over France's 'restrictive interpretation of women in the private sector' and over the extent to which new laws on sexual harassment were put into practice. She also asked about discriminatory custody laws in overseas territories and requested information about migrant women. Mr Lallah seemed disturbed by the 'very serious' issue of conjugal violence, which he had become familiar with by regularly reading French newspapers. He firmly told the delegation that while he appreciated their descriptions of the measures taken to address this 'thorny issue', he did not 'want to wait ten years' to learn what real progress had been made on the ground. He also detected sexism in the unsolved three-time burglary of the home of female presidential candidate Segolene Royal, and wondered whether an investigation of these crimes was ongoing.

In answering the Committee members' questions, the delegation admitted to problems but insisted that 'the place of women has evolved'. In particular, it referred to the 'feminisation of jobs' taking place in France and that a 2002 reform was responsible for important strides in helping immigrant women fight 'double discrimination'. It also assured Mr Lallah that the burglaries of Ms Royal were being investigated, to which he replied that he was 'satisfied'.

The Committee, in its concluding observations, welcomed the creation of the High Authority to Combat Discrimination and Promote Equality (HALDE) as well as new legislation on the punishment of domestic violence. The Committee moreover expressed its satisfaction that France now applies the same minimum age for marriage to both genders. The Committee encouraged the State to strengthen its efforts to increase representation of women in high-level and managerial positions, narrow the wage gap between men and women, and facilitate women's access to full-time work.

Arrest and detention

The Committee exhibited interest in various aspects of the conditions of arrest and detention throughout its review. Reports of blindfolding of detainees during interrogation drew substantial queries. Police brutality,²⁹ juvenile justice, and overcrowding, violence and suicide in prisons were also touched upon.

The delegation contended that the faces of detainees were covered only in transport in order to maintain 'a presumption of innocence'. When Committee members informed the delegation that NGOs had reported cases of blindfolding well beyond transport, the delegation stayed firm in its claim that such measures were not sanctioned by the State.

The delegation stated that authorities are trained in 'professional and personal ethics' in order to curb ill-treatment of detainees. It assured the Committee that it 'rigorously punish[es] all proven wrongdoing' on the part of law enforcement officials and provided statistics of disciplinary measures undertaken. In the context of juvenile justice, France conceded that some negative trends existed, such as the 25 percent increase in the number of minors in pre-trial detention from 1999 to 2008. However, it drew the Commission's attention to progress in other areas. For example, six prisons that have been specially adapted for minors, and domestic law guarantees minors legal assistance.

France explained that the National Committee on Security Ethics (CNDS) exists to monitor prison conditions. The CNDS addresses prisoner complaints about prison administration and investigates cases of inter-prisoner violence and suicides. The delegation also said that 'only some prisons are faced' with overcrowding, and outlined 'major efforts' in progress to renovate prisons and increase the number of places.

In its concluding observations, the Committee took note of the efforts made by the State to improve prison conditions and resolve prison overcrowding. It nevertheless called upon the State to 'multiply its efforts' in

²⁹ Mr Rodley referred specifically to Amnesty International's 2005 study about fatal shootings by law enforcement in his questioning.

this regard and ‘enhance its monitoring of prisons in a proactive way’.

Other issues

Human trafficking and the establishment of specialized bodies to prevent and remedy human rights violations were also briefly discussed.

France said it was ‘resolutely pursuing a policy of combating all forms of trafficking in persons and gave detailed examples of laws passed and measures taken to that end. On the topic of national human rights bodies, it drew particular attention to the National Consultative Commission for Human Rights (CNCDH), the Ombudsman of the Republic, the Children’s Ombudsman, the National Commission for Information Technology and Liberties (CNIL), and the High Authority to Combat Discrimination and Promote Equality (HALDE) as bodies that ‘ensure an exchange of information between the State and civil society’ and ‘guarantee pluralism of opinions and beliefs in respect of human rights’.

Conclusions and next steps

The Committee, in its concluding observations, expressed its concern about the ‘breadth and number’ of reservations and declarations made by the State to narrow the application of the Covenant, and encouraged it to review its reservations and declarations with a view to withdrawing them.

Other treaty monitoring bodies have raised similar issues in their examination of France. The request for relevant disaggregated data was repeated by various committees.³⁰ *De facto* discrimination against persons belonging to racial, ethnic or national minorities is another issue that arose in many treaty bodies’ examinations of France.³¹ The establishment of HALDE was welcomed by both the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights³² and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.³³

The Committee set 31 July 2012 as the ‘firm’ date for the submission of the fifth periodic report of France.

Last revised and updated: 23 October 2008.

³⁰ Committee against Torture (CAT/C/FRA/CO/3, available at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cat/cats35.htm), Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW/C/FRA/CO/6, available at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/cedaws40.htm), Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/C.12/FRA/CO/3, available at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/cescrs40.htm)

³¹ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/C.12/FRA/CO/3), Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW/C/FRA/CO/6), Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD/C/FRA/CO/16, available at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds66.htm).

³² CEDAW/C/FRA/CO/6.

³³ E/C.12/FRA/CO/3.

TREATY BODY MONITOR STAFF

Eléonore Dziurzynski, Communications Officer, Geneva
Gareth Sweeney, Deputy Manager, Geneva
Katrine Thomasen, Manager International Programme, Geneva
Michael Ineichen, Human Rights Officer, Geneva
Michelle Evans, Representative to the UN, New York
Paul Dziatkowiec, Human Rights Officer, Geneva
Vanessa Jackson, Human Rights Officer, New York
Yuri Saito, Fellow, Geneva

AUTHORS OF THE FRANCE REPORT

Kathrina Szymborski, Intern

ABOUT THE PUBLICATION

The *Treaty Body Monitor* forms part of the Human Rights Monitor Series produced by ISHR. It reports on each country reviewed by the six treaty bodies (all but the Committee on the Rights of the Child) and provides an overview of every treaty body session. It is currently an online publication that can be found at www.ishr.ch/hrm.

COMMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

We would welcome your feedback on this publication so please send any comments and suggestions to information@ishr.ch. You can check the latest Treaty Body Monitor reports published on www.ishr.ch.

COPYRIGHT, DISTRIBUTION AND USE

Copyright © 2008 International Service for Human Rights

Material from this publication may be reproduced for training, teaching or other non-commercial purposes as long as ISHR is fully acknowledged. You can also distribute this publication and link to it from your website as long as ISHR is fully acknowledged as the source. No part of this publication may be reproduced for any commercial purpose without the prior express permission of the copyright holders.

ISHR accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracies arising from or connected to unapproved or unofficial translations of its publications or parts thereof.

DISCLAIMER

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information contained in this publication, ISHR does not guarantee, and accepts no legal liability whatsoever arising from any possible mistakes in the information reported on, or any use of this publication. We are however happy to correct any errors you may come across so please notify information@ishr.ch.