

**This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also 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.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva. Any 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.03-41647 (E) 090503 140503 UNITED NATIONS**

**E**



---

**Economic  
and  
Social  
Council**

Distr. GENERALE/C.12/2003/SR.614  
May 2003 Original: ENGLISH

---

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

Thirtieth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,

on Wednesday, 7 May 2003, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. RIEDEL (Vice-Chairperson)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS:

(a) REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLES 16 AND 17 OF THE COVENANT

Third periodic report of Luxembourg (continued)

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

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS:

(a) REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLES 16 AND 17 OF THE COVENANT (agenda item 6) (continued)

Third periodic report of Luxembourg (continued) (E/1994/104/Add.24; E/C.12/Q/LUX/2; written replies to the list of issues prepared by the Government of Luxembourg (document in French only without a symbol); HRI/CORE/1/Add.10/Rev.1)

At the invitation of the Chairperson, the members of the delegation of Luxembourg resumed their places at the Committee table.

The CHAIRPERSON invited the delegation of Luxembourg to reply to the questions outstanding from the previous meeting.

Mr. FABER (Luxembourg), replying to a question asked by Mr. Texier, said forced labour was no longer a penalty under the Penal Code. A person sentenced to a prison term not exceeding six months might, at the court's discretion, be asked to perform unpaid community service, but that could not be termed forced labour since it required the individual's consent. He had been somewhat surprised at the question.

Mr. TEXIER said he had perhaps not expressed his question sufficiently clearly: he was interested in whether prisoners were placed at the disposal of private companies, a practice which was not permitted under ILO Convention No. 29 concerning forced or compulsory labour.

Mr. FABER (Luxembourg) said prisoners had a right, but no obligation, to work in prison. Many preferred to do so in order to avoid being idle, but there was currently too little work to meet demand, and the Ministry of Justice was planning to create jobs for such prisoners by offering services of various kinds to public institutions.

Replying to a question on child and youth labour, he said no one below the age of 15 was permitted to work. However, unpaid work for educational purposes as part of the school curriculum was not classed as "child labour"; the same applied to domestic work by family members in their own home. Young people up to the age of 18 were permitted to perform work corresponding to their level of development, provided it did not involve a disproportionate effort and there was no risk to their mental or physical health or their morals. The relevant legislation also listed specific areas in which they were not permitted to work.

Statistics concerning accidents at work would be forwarded to the Committee members at a later date.

The minimum wage was 1,368.74 euros per month for a 40-hour week, adjustable pro rata; the guaranteed minimum income was 974.17 euros per month for a single adult.

Unemployment benefit could be claimed for one year, provided the claimant had worked for 6 months during the preceding 12-month period. A six-month extension would be granted if the claimant could prove he or she had worked for 20 years, and a further six-month extension could be obtained by those aged over 50, raising the maximum period to 2 years.

With regard to the case law on equality of treatment of men and women, he was unable to express any views relating to the effect of a break in work on career development or salary. The only development that might have a bearing on the issue was a pay agreement that had recently entered into force, which allowed anyone interrupting a career in the civil service to request reinstatement under the same conditions, within another department if necessary.

Turning to the case law on equality of pay, he said one judgement, dating from 1982, recalled that article 119 of the Treaty Establishing the European Community was directly applicable in Luxembourg and established that discrimination in respect of pay might also originate in collective agreements. The Court of Appeal had confirmed that judgement in at least two rulings, one of which, dated 2 May 1985, had found that a collective agreement in which an allowance paid to all married men but to married women only under certain conditions constituted discrimination and declared the agreement null and void. It had ordered the allowance to be paid to all married women. Lastly, a 1991 judgement had found unequal clothing and holiday allowances paid to male and female workers in cleaning enterprises to be discriminatory.

With regard to non-European Union citizens' participation in joint workplace committees, he said that, under current legislation, eligibility for membership of those committees was restricted, in the case of such persons, to those holding "C" work permits. Luxembourg had also been criticized on that score by the European Committee of Social Rights and had agreed to amend its legislation. A bill currently before Parliament would therefore extend eligibility to those holding "B" work permits. Those holding "A" permits, valid for a maximum of one year, would not in any case be eligible, as a prerequisite for eligibility was one year's employment in the workplace in question.

The ILO audit on Luxembourg's Works and Mines Inspectorate had been submitted some months previously, since when regular meetings had taken place with ILO experts on how to incorporate their recommendations into domestic law. The Minister of Labour had stated on a number of occasions that he intended to follow those recommendations. It was to be hoped that the bill that eventually emerged would satisfy all parties concerned. The Inspectorate currently had between 50 and 60 staff members.

Mr. THOMA (Luxembourg), replying to Ms. Bras Gomes's question on social inclusion measures, said inter-ministerial cooperation had been put in place to ensure implementation of the measures proposed in the first national plan of action for employment and to draft the second plan, currently under preparation. Similarly, the national social welfare service and the Employment Administration were cooperating to implement the social inclusion measures provided for under the Unemployment Act and the Guaranteed Minimum Income Act.

Mr. FABER (Luxembourg), replying to a follow-up question from Mr. GRISSA, said the minimum wage and the minimum income were indexed to the cost of living and to wages in general. The next adjustment would probably take place in July 2003.

The CHAIRPERSON invited the delegation of Luxembourg to reply to the issues raised under articles 10 and 12 of the Covenant.

Mr. THOMA (Luxembourg), referring to question 21 on the list of issues, relating to prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse of children and young people, said a number of measures had been introduced under the Act of 31 May 1999 to reinforce the relevant legislation. The possession of child pornography had been made a criminal offence and existing provisions of the Code had been extended to cover sexual exploitation of a minor aged under 18 and trafficking in children for the purposes of sexual exploitation. Any sexual offence committed by Luxembourg nationals abroad or by nationals of other countries in Luxembourg (sex tourism) could now be prosecuted in Luxembourg.

The Code of Criminal Procedure had been amended to allow children's hearings to be recorded. In addition, the Act of 25 July 2002 had established a committee on the rights of the child.

Referring to the status of children of incestuous relationships, he said that, under Luxembourg's Civil Code, filiation could only be established with regard to one of the parents in the case of children born of father/daughter or mother/son relationships, or of relationships between brothers and sisters. However, in the case of children born of uncle/niece or aunt/nephew relationships, filiation could be established with regard to both parents if the couple was granted a special dispensation to marry. Such a dispensation could be granted only if there were "serious grounds", which were interpreted in case law as referring to the birth of a child to such a couple.

Mr. BERNIS (Luxembourg), referring to the implementation of ILO Conventions No. 77 and No. 78, said that a new law on the protection of young workers had entered into force in March 2001. Under that law, regular medical examinations for young workers, including those in domestic service and similar occupations, were free. Under an earlier law, special benefits for disabled workers were also available to young people classified as at least 30 per cent incapacitated, irrespective of their age.

Ms. KRIES (Luxembourg), in reply to question 25 on the list of issues, said that a bill on domestic violence was before Parliament. Its aim was threefold: to prevent such violence, to make the perpetrators accountable and to make people aware that domestic violence was a serious matter. A significant change introduced by the bill was that the battered spouse was no longer forced to leave the family home but could have the violent partner expelled. The police had powers to expel someone who posed a risk to their partner, provided that they had authorization from the State prosecutor and there was compelling evidence of the risk of violence. The bill made it possible for the victims of domestic violence to apply to a court for a

summary order, strengthened the role of victims' associations and required the police to notify the social workers responsible for helping victims when a violent partner was expelled from the family home. The victim was also entitled to legal assistance and victims' associations were able to bring criminal proceedings on behalf of victims.

Mr. THOMA (Luxembourg), referring to the questions on measures to protect children from pornography, drew attention to three articles of the Penal Code: article 383 made the circulation of pornographic materials a criminal offence, with heavier sentences for making them available to children under the age of 18; article 384 made it an offence to possess material of a paedophilic nature; and article 385 bis made it an offence to sell or distribute pornographic materials, or display indecent objects, to children under the age of 16. With regard to measures to combat child prostitution, he drew attention to article 372 of the Penal Code, which made the performance of indecent acts on children an offence, with heavier sentences if the child was very young, and article 375, which classified sexual intercourse with a child under the age of 14 as statutory rape.

Mr. BERNIS (Luxembourg), referring to question 28 on the list of issues, relating to measures to combat drug abuse, said that the first measure taken by his Government had been to entrust coordination of action against drug abuse to the Ministry of Health. The budget of the Centre for the Prevention of Drug Abuse had been substantially increased between its establishment in 1995 and 2000. A new law had been introduced in 2001 to deal with the sale of drugs and drug abuse, and, more recently, new regulations governing the use of substitutes in the treatment of drug addiction had been introduced.

In reply to question 29, on health care and facilities for older people, he pointed out that, whereas the stated policy goal in neighbouring countries was to provide hospital beds for 4 per cent of the population over the age of 65, in Luxembourg hospital beds were already provided for almost 7 per cent of over-65s. Moreover, the Government had plans to increase the number of geriatric beds by a third in anticipation of the needs of an ageing population. The Ministry of Health had also introduced continuous training courses in palliative care, which were aimed in particular at general practitioners, and was taking measures to improve training in the field of geriatric psychology.

Mr. ATANGANA said that the new bill on domestic violence undoubtedly represented a major step forward, but enacting it seemed a very slow process. He would like to know what was being done to help victims in the meantime and would appreciate some indication of how widespread the problem of domestic violence was in Luxembourg. As many victims were too scared to lodge a complaint, he wondered what steps the Government was taking or planned to take in order to help them overcome their fear. The Committee would appreciate further details on how the special provision on applications for summary orders would work in practice with regard to the expulsion of the violent partner from the family home; in particular, it was not clear if the expulsion was definitive under such an order. He noted that the new bill proposed to do away with the defence that there were mitigating circumstances for violence against a spouse caught in the act of adultery, on the grounds that adultery no longer constituted an offence under the Penal Code. While such changes were welcome, perhaps there was a danger that the general drift of the changes being introduced would eventually undermine the institution of marriage.

Ms. BARAHONA RIERA said that she shared Mr. Atangana's concerns about the length of time it was taking for the bill on domestic violence to be enacted and that she would welcome some information on the preventive measures currently in force, before the bill became law. Moreover, it was unclear to her whether domestic violence and marital violence were to be classified as criminal offences or merely to be dealt with by administrative measures. She welcomed the introduction in the Code of Criminal Procedure of the exception to the principle of territoriality which would allow the courts in Luxembourg to try citizens or residents of Luxembourg for sexual offences committed abroad. The new procedure was a great step forward in efforts to curb sex tourism, but she wondered if anyone had yet been prosecuted under it. On the question of child prostitution, she said it appeared from the information provided by the State party that a girl aged between 16 and 18, though still presumably a minor, was not breaking the law if she engaged in prostitution; she would welcome clarification on that point. Finally, she asked for information on any reproductive health programmes in Luxembourg and on the country's abortion legislation, particularly as applied to young persons.

Mr. CEAUSU said that the information provided on article 12 of the Covenant was far from exhaustive, even though the Committee, in its guidelines on the form and contents of periodic reports, clearly set out the questions of interest to it. In general, the Committee was always interested in measures taken to improve the health of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged groups in a population, such as the old or disabled. Such groups, which needed special help from society, were to be found in every country, whatever its level of development. He was particularly interested in learning about any measures the State party might have taken to combat the abuse of tobacco and alcohol and to protect non-smokers, and would like to know whether it had any programmes or publicity campaigns to inform young people, who were often easy prey for advertisers, about the dangers of tobacco and alcohol. Finally, referring to paragraph 135 of Luxembourg's third periodic report (E/1994/104/Add.24), he noted that medical care was free of charge for "most of the population": he would like to know what happened to those who were not covered by the social security system and could genuinely not afford to pay for it.

Ms. BRAS GOMES said that she would like to know more about the role of the nonprofit service-providers discussed in paragraph 84 of the report. In particular, she would like to know if the Government monitored their performance, as well as the performance of public service-providers, so as to guarantee the quality of service provided. With regard to the care centres for children in distress mentioned in paragraph 98, she asked how precisely "in distress" was defined and what the average stay in such centres was.

Mr. SADI said that the idea of prosecuting citizens or residents of Luxembourg for sexual offences committed abroad was an

excellent one, although such a procedure could presumably be enforced only if Luxembourg had a bilateral agreement with the country concerned. He would be interested to know if there had already been any prosecutions for such offences. It seemed that suicide was quite a problem in Luxembourg and he wondered why, given that it was such a rich country with few obvious problems. He asked if there was any new legislation on same-sex marriages and expressed concern that sexual intercourse with a girl between the ages of 14 and 16 was not considered statutory rape, as it was in the case of girls under the age of 14; it seemed to him that all girls under 16 needed some form of protection.

Mr. MALINVERNI asked whether Luxembourg had legislation to protect children from exposure to violence and pornography on modern media such as the Internet. Like Mr. Sadi, he was concerned about the high rate of suicide in the country, particularly among young people, and he shared Ms. Barahona Riera's concern that minors between the ages of 16 and 18 could apparently engage in prostitution quite legally.

Mr. MARTYNOV noted that new legislation had lowered the age limit for entitlement to the guaranteed minimum wage from 30 to 25 years, but wondered if there was a minimum wage for workers below that age or whether their wages were regulated in some way. He too was concerned about the high suicide rate among young people and would like to know if the trend was upwards or downwards.

Mr. GRISSA, noting that Luxembourg was traditionally a transit country, asked about the prevalence of HIV/AIDS.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking in a personal capacity, observed that if the Committee was to judge the effectiveness of the Government's actions, it would need to have disaggregated and comparative data for the period since 1999, for instance in connection with the impressive sum spent on homeless shelters (report, para. 126), the apparently well-balanced food aid budget (paras. 127-129), or medical treatment for older persons. With regard to occupational health, the report (paras. 132-133) listed a number of laws enacted, but said nothing about how effectively they had been enforced and, again, offered no statistics. Also, it was not clear what medical care (para. 135), if any, was offered to illegal immigrants.

He referred the delegation to the Committee's General Comments No. 14 on the right to health and No. 15 on the right to water, and especially paragraphs 43 and 44 of the former regarding the core obligations of States parties in the implementation of rights.

The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 4.45 p.m.

Mr. BERNIS (Luxembourg) acknowledged that the unavailability of disaggregated and comparative data, which affected its reporting to European bodies as well, was a drawback. The Government was not yet equipped to provide such statistics, working as it did with absolute and very modest figures, but it recognized the problem.

The legal regime governing acts of violence was the Penal Code. Realizing that the protection it afforded was not adequate, the Government had taken further measures such as establishing shelters for victims of violence. Knowing that many victims feared to bring complaints, the Government had also launched a media campaign to urge people to speak out so that it could deal with the problem.

Prostitution was not a crime in Luxembourg, although incitement to prostitution and soliciting were. Any minors engaged in prostitution were consequently not prosecuted, but judges had the power to order a non-punitive change of social milieu in order to redress the situation and work on the root causes of the minor's behaviour. With reference to smoking and

alcohol abuse, Luxembourg was in strict compliance with WHO guidelines and European directives on the matter; but of course some neighbouring countries were not, and Luxembourg citizens did have access to advertisements in foreign newspapers and over 50 foreign television channels.

Mr. THOMA (Luxembourg) said that under article 315 of the Penal Code, both the material element of violence and the moral element of lack of consent must have been present for the crime of rape to exist. The absence of consent was assumed in persons under the age of 14 because they were deemed too young to understand the implications of the act or to defend themselves. Over that age, however, judicial authorities had to assess the individual's personality and situation in determining whether there was any degree of consent.

Article 5.1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure prohibiting sex tourism did not embody the usual requirement of criminal liability in both countries for acts committed outside Luxembourg. If the Luxembourg authorities learned that any Luxembourg nationals had engaged in sex tourism abroad, they could prosecute them in Luxembourg.

Ms. KRIES (Luxembourg) said that day-care institutions and shelters for children, whether they were officially licensed by the State or not, were subject to specific government regulations to ensure the quality of the care provided.

The wording of paragraph 135 of the report was inaccurate: actually, the entire population was covered by mandatory health insurance, part of which was paid for by the State. In the case of students, minors and needy persons, all health insurance was paid for by the State. Some persons also had additional voluntary health insurance.

Mr. FABER (Luxembourg) said that a distinction must be drawn between the guaranteed minimum income (revenu minimum garanti) discussed in paragraphs 59 to 61 of the report, for which the age limit had been lowered to 25, and the minimum wage (salaire social minimum), which covered all workers and must be complied with by all employers. The former, part of the Government's programme to combat poverty and social exclusion, was intended for persons with no other source of income, such as those unemployed for more than one year, disabled persons, caretakers of the ill or disabled, or even persons under 25 with a child receiving family benefits. The guaranteed minimum income was not offered to persons under the age of 25 in order to avoid situations in which there was an immediate transition from school to welfare. The Government did, however, have special programmes for persons between the age of 18 and 25 to assist them in finding employment, such as training to improve their skills or the special employment contracts

referred to at the previous meeting, which would guarantee them the minimum wage.

Mr. BERNIS (Luxembourg) said that all non-profit service organizations were held to minimum government standards and were monitored by the Government. If they met additional conditions regarding infrastructure and the like, they were also entitled to government subsidy as an incentive to improving their services.

Abortion had been decriminalized in 1976, but unfortunately he had no general sexual health statistics to provide. Regarding the prevalence of HIV/AIDS, even without specific statistics, his sense was that it was about average and certainly not higher than in other European countries, whereas the problem of suicide was.

The CHAIRPERSON invited the delegation to reply to the issues raised under articles 13 and 14 of the Covenant.

Mr. BERNIS (Luxembourg), replying to questions asked at the previous meeting, said that the Advisory Commission on Human Rights, established in 2000 on the French model, did include representatives of NGOs such as Amnesty International and others among its members. Its modest administrative costs were financed through a subsidy from the Office of the Prime Minister.

Regarding children born out of wedlock, the statement in the report that they received equal treatment as far as possible (para. 109) was misleading, for the law required absolute equality. There was a specific law on the rights of succession of children born out of wedlock. He himself did not believe that the use of the term "child born out of wedlock" carried a social stigma as it had done in the times of the Napoleonic Code, but he would raise that point with his Government.

Ms. GOEDERT (Luxembourg) said that there were generally no tuition charges for university studies in Luxembourg. Tuition charges only applied to a specific graduate programme for notaries (150 euros per year) and to the Master of Science in Banking and Finance programme, given by the Luxembourg School of Finance. The tuition fees for the latter were very high, about 17,500 euros per year, but it was generally paid not by the students but by their employers.

A law enacted in 2000 governed financial aid for students in higher education, and specified that all Luxembourg students were eligible for financial assistance for graduate studies. There was currently a plan to establish a fully-fledged university in Luxembourg with graduate studies programmes, but it had not yet been set up.

Education was compulsory for nine years, up to the age of 15. To discourage children from dropping out, the school system included a special structure that addressed the needs of pupils with poor academic achievement. For children over 15, there were a number of measures to assist them in finding jobs, including vocational education programmes in various fields. Many public efforts to help young people find work were managed at the local level, such as the "Action Locale pour les Jeunes" programme.

Initiation courses on human rights were given to secondary-school teachers during their training, and there were also projects aimed at teaching children and adolescents about human rights. "My School!" was an Internet site ([www.myschool.lu](http://www.myschool.lu)) devoted to communication with Luxembourg students. There were plans to maintain a "My School!" page especially devoted to human rights as from September 2003. The University Centre of Luxembourg was one of the institutions that coordinated the European Master's in Human Rights and Democratization, and the Luxembourg students that took part in those programmes regularly studied regional and international human rights mechanisms. Police chiefs took courses on the ethics of police work and on human rights, and lawyers and legal advisers were trained in human rights at the national school of the judiciary. Reference was regularly made in the courts to human rights instruments.

Mr. KERDOUN requested clarification about the implementation of articles 13 and 14 of the Covenant. The Luxembourg International University Institute was apparently the sole university-level educational establishment in Luxembourg. What subjects were taught at the Institute? Did it provide summer courses, or did it operate year-round? Were there any plans to introduce a summer programme on human rights?

Had the Luxembourg School of Finance been established for a specific purpose, and what was its relationship with the banks? What criteria did it apply when selecting candidates for the 25 places available in the Master's programme? He expressed concern that the programme, which was extremely costly, was restricted to employees of certain financial institutions, and was thus not accessible to all. Were human rights modules mandatory or optional in the university curriculum? It would be of interest to learn whether the future university would be a public or a private institution. Noting that compulsory education went only up to the age of 15, he asked whether there were any State programmes to help young people find work or decide upon a course of study. What was the minimum age for employment?

Ms. BRAS GOMES, noting that pre-school education was compulsory for children between the ages of 4 and 6 and that the Government intended to expand services for children under 4, asked how many children under 4 were currently enrolled in day-care centres, and whether such centres provided services free of charge. According to the report, the population included about 100 nationalities, and the delegation had informed the Committee that some 38 per cent of the population was non-national. In a context of such wide cultural diversity, had an effort been made to support cultural associations so as to help second-generation immigrants to assert their culture, and to assist in the construction of a genuinely multicultural society? That might also foster the political participation of non-nationals, as desired by the Government.

Mr. GRISSA said that the report lacked information about children who dropped out of school. According to the Economist Intelligence Unit, the gross enrolment rate for girls between the ages of 4 and 15 was 87 per cent. The same report cited a Eurostat survey that had found that some 47 per cent of people in the 20 to 29 age group had no upper secondary qualification, whereas the European average was about 31 per cent. Considering the wealth and small size of the country, such figures were very surprising. One reason for immigrant children to drop out of school was reportedly academic failure, as immigrants whose mother tongues were not French or German found it difficult to pass tests owing to a lack of comprehension skills.

According to some reports, the Government had decided to restrict the scope of programmes to be offered by the new university, as policy-makers felt that it was important for students to experience life in other countries. Was financing provided by the State for such studies, and if so, what criteria were used to decide whether grants should be given? It was disturbing that Luxembourg itself had no university and that the Government did so little to encourage secondary studies.

Mr. BERNIS (Luxembourg) said that three languages were used in Luxembourg: French, German and Luxembourgish a medieval Germanic dialect spoken by just 250,000 people. The entire community made use of all three, in different contexts. For example, when speaking among themselves the members of the delegation used Luxembourgish, their mother tongue; when taking notes or writing reports, they used French. The language most used in the press was German, but most people from Luxembourg spoke French in restaurants and cafés. The use of one language or another was never associated with the speaker's ethnic or geographic origin, but rather with the immediate situation. Schooling took place at the beginning of primary school in Luxembourgish, later in German, which was closer to Luxembourgish than French, and subsequently in French. The main subjects were thus generally taught in German at primary school, and subsequently in French at the secondary level. There had been some discussion of the possibility of introducing monolingual education for certain categories of persons who experienced difficulty integrating into the trilingual system, such as pupils who moved to the country during their schooling, but it was feared that abandoning trilingualism would run the risk of changing the significance of language in Luxembourg's society.

In addition to the country's three languages, approximately 15 per cent of the population was Portuguese, and the city of Luxembourg published all its official documentation in Luxembourgish, French, German and Portuguese.

The Government intended to introduce optional pre-school programmes for 3-year-olds free of charge. They were currently being phased in and would soon cover all communes. Pre-school education for children between 4 and 6 was compulsory, as was the nine years of schooling up to age 15. However, the education system did not simply leave children to their own devices at 15. Secondary education continued through to the age of 19, which was one year later than in neighbouring countries. The extra year was required because students must learn more languages and meet more stringent requirements.

The figures according to which nearly half the population lacked a secondary education had apparently been erroneously interpreted. It was nonetheless true that many high school students were encouraged to drop out because of the attractiveness of the job market, which offered many opportunities and had very low unemployment rates.

The fact that the country had no fully-fledged university was not perceived as a shortcoming. In practice it meant that Luxembourg students were exposed to life in other countries, which was all the more important as the country's economy was 95 per cent dependent on exports. The Government had concluded agreements for the mutual recognition of secondary

school diplomas with countries such as Germany, Austria, Switzerland and the United States of America, with a view to facilitating students' entry into their universities. If there was pressure for the establishment of a university in Luxembourg, it came mainly from industry and the research community, and from a sense of responsibility within the region.

University students received one year of general university-level education in Luxembourg, and were then sent to institutions in other countries. Because of the specific nature of Luxembourg's domestic law and the need to train recent law graduates upon their return, there was also a postgraduate programme for jurists. The Government planned to strengthen such programmes and hoped to expand the range of university courses so that they would eventually cover all fields. However, many citizens felt that such a development would do the country a disservice, as it would deprive students of exposure to other countries. The Government provided funding for studies in other countries, for example, for students from households that met certain income criteria, or for those who could justify the need to study at certain institutions. The criteria for awarding such grants did not discriminate between citizens and non-nationals resident in Luxembourg.

Ms. GOEDERT (Luxembourg) said that the future university would be a public institution. The State provided guidance and integration services for children who dropped out of school.

The CHAIRPERSON thanked the delegation for a fruitful, frank and open dialogue. It was to be hoped that the Committee's concluding observations would assist in ensuring the further enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights in Luxembourg.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.